



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLAN COMMISSION, VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK,
COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS**

February 20, 2020

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on February 20, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
 Mary Aitchison
 Eduardo Mani
 Curt Fielder
 James Gaskill
 Angela Gatto
 Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
 Lucas Engel

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Planning Manager
 Dan Ritter, Senior Planner
 Douglas Spale, Village Attorney
 Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN GRAY called to order the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission for February 20, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the January 16, 2020 Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER FIELDER, seconded by COMMISSIONER AITCHISON to approve the minutes as presented. CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved by voice call.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2020 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #1 WORKSHOP: TOP HOSPITALITY LLC D/B/A MARRIOTT - COURTYARD & RESIDENCE INN – 9551 & 9555 183rd STREET

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant Top Hospitality LLC (Property Owner) a Map Amendment (rezoning) and Variations from the Zoning Code for two parcels that total approximately 8.7 acres in size at 9551 and 9555 183rd Street (off of White Eagle Drive and south of 183rd Street). The parcels are proposed to be zoned B-3 (General Business & Commercial) upon annexation. Upon annexation, the granting of these requests will allow for the lots to be developed as two Marriott-brand hotels: The Courtyard and Residence Inn. The request will also include a Plat of Resubdivision and Site Plan approval.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
Mary Aitchison
Eduardo Mani
Curt Fielder
James Gaskill
Angela Gatto
Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
Lucas Engel

Guests: Chris Patel, Top Hospitality LLC, Partner
Bill Zalewski, Engineer
Tiffany Gorman Thompson, Petitioner Attorney

Daniel Ritter, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report. He introduced the Petitioner, Top Hospitality LLC, and noted they are requesting Rezoning upon Annexation, Final Plat of Subdivision approval, Variations, and Site Plan approval for their site to be developed with two Marriott brand hotels: The Courtyard and Residence Inn. The subject property is located on the east side of White Eagle Drive and south of 183rd Street. The 8.7-acre subject site is proposed to be subdivided into two lots and zoned to the B-3, General Business and Commercial zoning district.

The Courtyard hotel includes an 83,722 sq. ft. four story building with 125 guest rooms, a banquet hall, meeting rooms, exterior patio, fitness center, indoor pool, lounge with dining area and bar. The Residence Inn hotel is marketed towards extended-stay guests and includes an 87,875 sq. ft. four story building with 118 guest rooms, fitness center, dining room, meeting room, lounge room, indoor pool, outdoor basketball court, and exterior patio. In addition, there is a proposed shared stormwater detention pond and existing wetland area on the site.

The property consists of two vacant parcels totaling 8.7 acres in size. The property is located in unincorporated Cook County and zoned C-4, General Commercial (similar to the Village's B-3 zoning district). The land is undeveloped and has historically been used for farming purposes. There is a small portion of the southwest corner of the subject property

encumbered with an existing wetland that is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The annexation will include the adjacent unimproved IDOT right-of-way previously planned for the 183rd Street extension and will result in the annexation of a total of 9.15 acres.

To the south of this property is the WLS radio tower site that is also located in unincorporated Cook County (c-4 Zoning District). To the north and east of the property is a parcel zoned ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial): west is a vacant parcel zoned B-3 (General Business & Commercial). The property is nearby the I-80 LaGrange Road northbound exit. Currently existing to the southwest of the property is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that includes two hotels (Hilton Garden Inn and Country Inn & Suites), two standalone restaurants (Texas Roadhouse and Jumbo Crab), and a third vacant pad that is planned for an additional standalone restaurant.

The site is located within the Urban Design Overlay District (UDOD), which promotes walkability, decreased front yard setbacks, and overall a more urbanized look.

With this proposal there is a Plat of Subdivision. Currently, there are two existing lots that will be divided to accommodate the two hotels. Appropriate easements will be recorded for cross-access, cross-parking, signage, and public utilities as part of the Final Plat approval.

The design of the lots is unique because the Residence Inn/ Lot 2 will not have direct access to the adjacent White Eagle Drive right-of-way and will require permanent access through a cross-access (ingress/egress) easement with the Courtyard/Lot 1. The Zoning Code specifically allows for properties with unique lot, land, or use circumstances to have a lot that does not abut public right-of-way, subject to appropriate cross-access and utility easements. In this case, the lot and site design were chosen due to the existing wetland location, detention location/topography and the large building footprint required for a hotel.

Additionally, the desire to divide the detention pond location made it even more difficult to have a separate right-of-way frontage for the Residence Inn/Lot 2. The lot configuration was designed to roughly divide the parking lots and detention pond based on the supply needed for each site. The shared ownership of the pond ensures responsibility for maintenance by both owners since covenants or a property owner's association can be changed in the future.

The petitioner also hopes to mitigate the existing wetland through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the future to allow for a third lot for use as a restaurant, office, or other commercial use. The land is not currently developable due to the wetland encumbrance and has been included as part of Lot 1.

The Petitioner is requesting annexation into the Village. The Annexation Agreement is scheduled to be reviewed by the Community Development Committee and the Village Board.

Mr. Ritter explained there are two possibilities for zoning this property based on the surrounding zoning and proposed land use: either the B-3 (General Business and Commercial) or the ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial) zoning districts can accommodate the proposed hotel use as a permitted use. While both districts will allow for hotel land uses the assignment of the B-3 zoning district will allow it to serve as an extension of the B-3 designation for the existing hotel properties and undeveloped property along the LaGrange Road corridor.

The B-3 zoning district allows for hotels as a permitted use on lots over five acres in size. The Courtyard parcel (Lot 1) is 5.57 acres and therefore meets the size requirement. The Residence Inn (Lot 2) comprises 3.13 acres and therefore requires a Variation of the five-acre requirement. Staff believes the development of both hotels meets the intent of the lot size zoning requirement.

The B-3 zoning district limits structures to a maximum of three stories and 35 feet in height. The proposed hotels are both proposed at four stories: the proposed heights are 55' 10". Variation requests to allow for additional height have been reviewed in regards to the surrounding area's development pattern and neighboring uses.

The site is located within the Urban Design Overlay District (UDOD), which was designed to promote walkability, lesser front yard setbacks and an overall more urbanized look. A Variation is required due to the unique lot design and lack of a true front yard on the Residence Inn site. Staff has worked with the Petitioner to ensure that the spirit of the UDOD is met where possible. There are three Variation requests regarding the maximum front yard setback, permitted front yard parking, and the maximum number of curb cuts.

The site plan includes the two hotel buildings, drop off canopies, parking, walkways, landscaping, outdoor patios, and dumpster enclosures. There is a shared stormwater detention pond and an existing wetland area located on the site.

The two hotels will be located on separate lots, but the overall project is designed comprehensively. Hotel amenities will be separate, the sites will share curb cut access and the overall parking. Future cross-access has also been established to the vacant lot that wraps around the subject property to the north and east. The cross-access points are proposed at the northeast and southeast corners. If cross-access is not required in the future, the drive aisle connections can be converted to parking stalls.

The hotel will have two driveways off White Eagle Drive. Guests will primarily enter the site at the south entrance which leads to the front entrances of both hotels. Both hotel entrances will have a circular drop-off/check-in location. The Courtyard will have an overhead porte-cochere canopy while the Residence Inn entrance will be open. A separate building entrance on the north side of the Courtyard will allow banquet guests a separate entrance without needing to go through the hotel.

Staff has recommended that the Petitioner investigate adding a boulevard entrance with a center island separating the drive aisles. A boulevard entrance will assist in identifying the driveway as the main entrance and increase the attractiveness of the site overall. This can also assist with installing a shared monument sign that complies with the required setbacks. Depending on the specific design of the entrance, the changes may result in a small reduction of parking spaces.

The current proposal proposed all drive aisles as 24 feet in width instead of the minimum 26 feet requirement. Staff is supportive of a reduction to a 24 feet drive aisle width except for the main aisle accessing White Eagle Drive which serves both hotels and as long as the site allows for proper circulation of a fire truck and full-size semi-truck. The Petitioner has stated they agree to this change and will make the necessary revisions.

The Petitioner has proposed installing a public sidewalk along the White Eagle Drive and private walkways throughout the development.

Mr. Ritter then discussed the proposed 42' X 50' outdoor basketball court on the Residence Inn property at the northwest corner of the building. The court is proposed to be surrounded by an eight feet high brick wall that matches the hotel and an eight-foot-high chain-link fence. Mr. Ritter expressed concern for the proposed basketball court's location. Due to the design and proposed location, it is expected that balls will bounce out of the enclosure and have the potential to cause vehicle damage or injury to guests. Mr. Ritter recommended alternate outdoor activities in lieu of the basketball court.

Dumpster enclosures are placed near the back of the two hotel lots and positioned for easy access to waste trucks.

Mr. Ritter noted that the overall site engineering is preliminary and will require revisions based upon final comments from the Village Engineer, MWRD, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The proposed landscaping plan is in general conformance with code requirements. Any deficiencies are offset by additional plantings in other areas of the site. Mr. Ritter provided suggestions for landscape revisions to be made prior to the public hearing including:

1. Add additional islands/bufferyard space at the two driveway entrances to comply with the 15-foot bufferyard requirement. This allows for more attractive entrances and additional space for the ground signs to be located. Meeting this requirement will result in a reduction of four proposed parking stalls.
2. Add canopy trees to the two internal islands located between the hotel buildings.
3. Add shrubs around the proposed basketball court wall and fence.

Mr. Ritter then began discussing the architecture and building materials for the two hotels. He noted that the masonry requirement for structures exceeding 80,000 sq. ft. is 25% of each façade to be face brick or decorative stone with the balance of the façade to be constructed of alternate masonry products of which 15% can use non-masonry products for architectural treatments.

Mr. Ritter explained that the proposed hotels meet the recommended minimum of 50% face brick, but the remaining portion of the structure has proposed non-masonry materials exceeding the maximum 15% requirement. The alternative materials utilized are fiber cement board for the Residence Inn and stucco for the Courtyard. Fiber cement board has previously been supported as an alternative to masonry due to its durability, quality, and modern appearance. The primary concern is with the use of stucco on a large portion of the Courtyard building. The Petitioner presented revised plans for fiber cement board to replace the stucco.

The overall design of the building was chosen to meet with each brand's approved corporate design. The Residence Inn is modern in design and has a residential look that is purposeful in regards to their branding. The Courtyard has a modern, box-style design. All roof-top mechanical equipment is proposed to be screened from view of neighboring properties and roadways by the building parapets.

Mr. Ritter expressed concern with the Courtyard building's lack of articulation and dimension in the building above the first floor and recommended using different materials types, colors, and design elements to make for a more interesting design. Mr. Ritter displayed examples of another Courtyard building in Kansas City with a more modern design that included more glazing including a glass tower at one end of the building.

The wall signs proposed on the north, south, and west elevations of both hotels are generally in conformance with Village Code.. The wall signs will each be individually mounted aluminum backed letters. Two ground signs are proposed at the main entrance and located on Lot 1. Staff has recommended revising the two ground signs in exchange for a shared monument sign to be located within a landscaped boulevard at the main entrance. The Petitioner agreed to consider this recommendation and provide a revised plan.

Mr. Ritter then discussed parking noting that the Zoning Code requires one parking space per hotel room plus one parking space for each employee that may be on-site at any time. There are 125 rooms at the Courtyard and 118 rooms at the Residence Inn. The Petitioner has indicated a maximum number of ten employees at the Courtyard and six employees at the Resident Inn. The proposed site plan provides 135 parking spaces on the Courtyard lot and 124 on the Residence Inn lot meeting the required minimum and complying with the Zoning Code. This will be a shared parking lot with a total of 259 spaces. Mr. Ritter noted that there may be a loss off six parking spaces with the introduction of the boulevard entrance and western bufferyard requirements.

Mr. Ritter then discussed the photometric plan which is in compliance with the lighting ordinance for parking lot, walkway, and building-mounted lighting. Off-site light spillage is minimal and within the allowable limits. All light fixtures will be full-cutoff and downcast to avoid any off-site glare. Parking lots, walkways, steps, entrances, and exits are all adequately lit for safety and security purposes. Parking lot lights will be mounted at a height of 25 feet.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked the Petitioners if they had any comments.

Tiffany Gorman Thompson, Attorney noted they are very excited about this project and they are willing to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked the commissioner for comments.

COMMISSIONER MANI noted the architecture looks nice. The stucco is a durable material and would be a good product to use if applied correctly.

COMMISSIONER GATTO noted she likes the design of the Kansas City building that Mr. Ritter displayed. Something close to this building would be more acceptable. The basketball court on the northwest side of the building would be better in another spot.

COMMISSIONER FIELDER noted there could be a better use than a basketball court. Basketball courts get run down and there is a lot of upkeep necessary. He questioned if this was a pet-friendly hotel and if it is then this might be a good area for pet use. COMMISSIONER FIELDER questioned what the cost difference to change this design to a design similar to the building in Kansas City. He stated he did not like the proposed architecture and felt it looked like an old design from the 1970's. Regarding the parking, he inquired if there was a designated place for parking of trucks or busses? Mr. Ritter stated similar to other hotels there was not designated parking for these vehicles. They typically park far away from the entrance in unused stalls.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted it could be dangerous to guests being hit by balls that bounce out of the basketball court. There is also a noise issue for guests that are trying to sleep. Trees could be put in to get a buffer zone around the basketball court but in general not supportive of the basketball court.

Chris Patel, Petitioner noted he will speak with Marriott to see if there could be another use for the basketball court. Mr. Patel noted the cost difference would be significant to change to design to look like the Kansas City building.

CHAIRMAN GRAY inquired about the traffic flow. Mr. Ritter replied that the entrances are designed for two way traffic and that every aisle throughout the site is two-way. A revised auto turn will be required in response to the Fire Departments concern for fire truck access

COMMISSIONER FIELDER inquired if the detention pond would have water in it. Bill Zalewski, Engineer replied that it will be a naturalized wet bottom design. Mr. Ritter noted it will not look like the rendering on the first page of the staff report.

COMMISSIONER AITCHISON noted the proposed design of the building is outdated and she likes the design of the Kansas City building. There should be a better use for the basketball court. She does not feel the basketball court fits with the use and design of the site.

COMMISSIONER VICK noted the height Variation is not an issue, however the parking situation could be an issue. During busy times with concerts and banquets, there could be an issue with parking. What size is the proposed banquet room? He stated that the setback Variation is not an issue for him nor are the landscape deficiencies and that he would not want to take away any parking spaces for landscaping.

Mr. Patel stated the banquet room is 5,000 sq. ft.

CHAIRMAN GRAY agreed that the parking is more important than the additional landscaping. He had a question regarding the wetland on the southeast. Will they be mitigating it after development and how realistic would it be noting how expensive it could be.

Mr. Patel replied they do not know at this time until after the development.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted the Variance for height is not an issue due to the other buildings in the area. He questioned how far the hotel will be from the subdivision to the east. Mr. Ritter wasn't sure, but thought it was aver 600 feet to

homes on the east. He noted there will be landscape buffering along the east property line. He noted there is a vacant parcel between the subject parcel and the residential subdivision and his hope is that the vacant property will develop and provide additional buffering between the hotel and residential uses. He feels that the B-3 makes more sense than the ORI. He questioned whether the decision is final to use the stucco on the building.

COMMISSIONER MANI is an architect and has no problem with the stucco, EIFS is the bigger concern. He feels the shared monument sign is a good addition. Mr. Patel noted they are looking at samples of the fiber cement board for the siding on Courtyard.

COMMISSIONER MANI noted he feels the stucco is fine as long as it is installed correctly.

Mr. Ritter noted that stucco has not been used in the Village recently as a substitute for masonry. It does exist on some older buildings. It can be good though depending on the specifications and how it is installed.

Mr. Patel noted the shared sign will be 5 feet off the right-of-way. Mr. Ritter noted the visibility for the shared sign is better than the two signs and 5 feet would likely be acceptable.

Mr. Ritter identified the Open Items:

1. The Petitioner shall revise the Final Plat of Subdivision and Easements based on staff comments.
2. Discuss proposed B-3 (General Business and Commercial) zoning district upon annexation.
3. Discuss Variation request to permit a hotel to be developed on a lot less than 5 acres in size.
4. Discuss Variation request to permit hotels to exceed a maximum of three stories and 35 feet in height.
5. Discuss three Variation requests from the Urban Design Overlay District in regards to maximum front yard setback, permitted front yard parking, and the maximum number of curb cuts.
6. Revise plans to indicate all proposed structure setbacks.
7. Discuss staff's suggestion of a boulevard entrance at the main (south) driveway.
8. Revise plans to indicate locations of traffic control signage and striping.
 - They have agreed to do the traffic control signage.
9. Revise the primary entrance aisle to the hotels to be a minimum of 26 feet in width.
10. Discuss the Variation request to reduce the minimum drive aisle width to 24 feet from a minimum of 26 feet.
11. Discuss proposed outdoor basketball court location, appearance, and possible alternatives.
 - The Commission expressed concerns about the basketball court and the Petitioner has agreed to speak with Marriott about alternatives.
12. Review the proposed site plan layout, design, pedestrian connections, and traffic circulation.
13. Discuss the proposed Landscape Plan, in regards to deficiencies/required waivers and staff recommendations.
 - a. Agreed to look into recommendations and revise plans.
14. Discuss Variation to permit non-masonry materials to be utilized on greater than 15% of the building. Discuss staff's suggestion to utilize fiber cement board or another high-quality and durable material to replace stucco on the Courtyard building.
 - They agreed to look at other materials.

15. Discuss the overall architectural design of each hotel in regards to Architectural Design standards. Discuss staff's recommendation for changes in building material and additional articulation above the first floor of the courtyard building.
 - They have agreed to look at the design of the Kansas Courtyard architecture. And work with their architect based on the Commission's desire for a less flat and more interesting design.
16. Discuss the setbacks of proposed ground signs and Variation for ground sign setbacks.
17. Discuss the Variation for an off-site sign to allow the location of the Lot 2/Residence Inn ground sign to be placed on the Lot 1/Courtyard site near the shared main entrance.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted the Public Hearing will be on March 5, 2020.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2020 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #2 WORKSHOP: WHISTLE BANQUET FACILITY - 7537 159TH STREET

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant Stephanie Mikesell and Bobby Sanfilippo, on behalf of Whistle Events and Catering, a Special Use Permit for a Banquet Facility located in the Brentowne Mini-Mall at 7537 159th Street in the B-1 (Neighborhood Shopping) zoning district.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
Mary Aitchison
Eduardo Mani
Curt Fielder
James Gaskill
Angela Gatto
Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
Lucas Engel

Guests: Mark Mikesell, Petitioner
Robert Sanfilippo, Petitioner

Paula Wallrich, Planning Manager, presented the Staff Report for Whistle Events and Catering (WEC). The Applicants, Stephanie Mikesell and Bobby Sanfilippo, on behalf of Whistle Events and Catering, are requesting a Special Use Permit for a Banquet Facility located in the Brentowne Mini-Mall at 7537 159th Street in the B-1 (Neighborhood Shopping) zoning district.

Ms. Wallrich reported that the property is zoned B-1 (Neighborhood Shopping District) and is located in the Brentowne Mini-Mall. The Village Board recently adopted Ordinance 19-O-48 which limits banquet facilities in the B-1 District to no greater than 4,000 sq. ft. in area. It also requires parking to be provided at a ratio of 1.5 spaces per 100 sq. ft. of usable floor area. It is the intention of the Applicants to restructure the event space currently operating under the business and liquor license of the Whistle Sports Bar & Grill (WSBG) into an independent business operating under the name Whistle Evens and Catering (WSBG).

The WSBG currently operates the event space adjacent to the restaurant/bar under the same business and liquor license as the Whistle Sports Bar & Grill. They would like to run the catering business independent of that. Per the amended code for stand-alone banquet facilities they will need a Special Use to operate independently from WSBG because they are located in a B-1 district.

The Brentowne residential subdivision preceded the Brentowne Mini-Mall. In 1974 the apartment complex immediately to the east of Brentowne Mini-Mall was constructed. The mall is surrounded by residential uses but fronted the 159th Street commercial corridor. The Mall is comprised of 28,400 sq. ft. Of the twelve tenant spaces available there are five vacant spaces. Three of these are retail on the north end of the west side and two of them are office areas on the south side. The WSBG opened in June of 2017. They occupy 4,450 sq. ft. and are located in the northeast corner of the center with approximately 128 seats and an occupancy limit of 166 people. Ms. Wallrich noted that with their success they would like to expand to an event and catering business.

Ms. Wallrich then outlined the chronology of events related to the Special Use request noting that in May of 2019, the Petitioners approached the Village to obtain a liquor license for the new business. At that time, they were unaware that banquet facilities were not allowed in B-1 and therefore could not operate a banquet facility in the Brementowne Mini-mall. Staff outlined the only option they have was to open the banquet business as part of the existing WSBG business with a door connecting the two businesses. Mr. Sanfilippo stated at that time that he wanted an independent business known as WEC. Staff advised them that the only option was to present a Text Amendment to the Village Board. The text amendment process began in June of 2019 when it was presented to the Community Development Committee for review. Ms. Wallrich noted that at that meeting the overwhelming issue was parking in the B-1 district. As a result of that meeting the maximum size for a banquet facility was reduced from 5,000 sf to 4,000 ss. ft. She noted that the B-1 district is the most limited business district due to its close proximity to residential areas. She emphasized the need to make sure there was no parking spillage into the residential areas. She stated that we must be respectful of the residential character of the neighborhoods.

Ms. Wallrich outlined the next step in the process was to take the text amendment to the Plan Commission and then to the Village Board where they also expressed concern about parking in the B-1 district. The Village Board recommended that the parking requirements be changed from 1.0 parking spaces per 100 sq. ft. to 1.5 spaces per 100 sq. ft. The Text Amendment was adopted in September of 2019.

The WBSG submitted their application to extend their business into the adjacent tenant space for an event space. They were told they had to keep a doorway between the two and the plans were approved with the doorway connecting the two spaces. The building permit was issued in September 2019. Upon final inspection it was noticed that the doorway between the two was not installed as required by the approved building plans and the inspection failed. Subsequently a doorway was constructed and on February 6, 2020, the Occupancy Permit was issued. Prior to issuance of the Occupancy Permit the applicants stated they wanted a separate business and liquor license from WBSG however staff again informed them that they needed a Special Use to accomplish that. The applicant filed a Special Use application on February 11, 2020.

Ms. Wallrich then presented the zoning for the project noting that the subject property is zoned B-1 (Neighborhood Shopping District) and is bordered by 159th Street on the north, the 7-11 Convenience store to the west zoned B-3 (General Business and Commercial) and multifamily uses zoned R-5 (Low Density Residential) just south of the 7-11 store. South of the center are single family homes zoned R-4 (Single Family Residential) and immediately east of the subject parcel is an apartment complex (Residences at 159) zoned R-6 (Medium Density Residential).

She noted that the B-1 District is intended “to provide area for retail and service establishments to supply convenience goods or personal services for the daily needs of the residents living in adjacent residential neighborhoods. The district is designed to encourage shopping center with planned off-street parking and loading and to provide for existing individual to small groups of local stores”.

Ms. Wallrich then explained the new definition that was adopted with the new text amendment which defines a Banquet Facility as:

BANQUET FACILITY: “A facility that is available for lease for private events including, but not limited to weddings, anniversaries, corporate or family parties and other similar celebrations. Such use may or may not include on-site kitchen or catering facilities”.

She explained that the applicants have supplied a business plan in the packet which states “Whistle Events and Catering has the objective of providing excellent food and service for everyone’s Catering and Private Party needs. Our target market will be catering and providing a party room to local business and residents”

Ms. Wallrich noted they will not be producing the food there; they will be catering from the outside or from the WSBG.

Ms. Wallrich then instructed the Commission that with Special Use the Commission will be reviewing at the proposed use and evaluate its impact on the surrounding uses.

Ms. Wallrich noted the two standards that she encourages the Commission to look at would be “b” and “f”.

Ms. Wallrich identified the Standards for Special Use.

- a. That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the Special Use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare;
- b. That the Special Use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood;
- c. That the establishment of the Special Use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district;
- d. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided;
- e. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets; and
- f. That the Special Use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the Village Board pursuant to the recommendation of the Plan Commission. The Village Board shall impose such conditions and restrictions upon the premises benefited by a Special Use Permit as may be necessary to ensure compliance with the above standards, to reduce or minimize the effect of such permit upon other properties in the neighborhood, and to better carry out the general intent of this Ordinance. Failure to comply with such conditions or restrictions shall constitute a violation of this Ordinance.
- g. The extent to which the Special Use contributes directly or indirectly to the economic development of the community.

Ms. Wallrich noted that Staff’s biggest concern is the parking. There are 185 parking spaces that surround the Brentowne Mini-Mall. She referenced a graphic that indicated there were spaces on the north (54 spaces), west (52 spaces) and the east (51 spaces); there are 28 spaces on the south side of the property. The entrance for The WSBG is on the east side of the building WEC will have its entrance on the north side of the building which includes one vacant tenant space. The remaining commercial tenants primarily use the west parking field where there are two vacant tenant spaces. The south parking area primarily servicing the professional offices where there are two vacant spaces.

Ms. Wallrich then proceeded with a discussion on the parking situation at Brentowne Min-Mall. Overall, without taking individual users, such as restaurants, into consideration, the ±28,400 sq. Ft. center requires 190 parking spaces at a ratio of one parking space per 150 sq. ft. (Section III S.2.) Restaurants are required to provide one space for each three seats plus one space for each employee (Section VIII A.10.) The WSBG has 128 seats/15 employees; therefore 58 spaces are required. Banquet Facilities in the B-1 are required to provide 1.5 parking spaces per 100 sq. ft. The proposed WEC comprises 2120 sq. ft. therefore 32 parking spaces are required. These two uses alone have a total parking requirement of 90 spaces or 47% of the existing parking, leaving 100 spaces for the balance of the tenants in the center (occupied and vacant). Deducting the square footage of these two spaces from the total for the center (28,400 sq. ft. for the Whistle, 6,570 sq. ft. for WEC) results in 21,830 sq. ft. left for remaining tenant or vacant spaces, again without considering the use of the tenant spaces. . This balance of tenant space translates to a parking need of 146 spaces (using the general formula of one parking space per 150 sq. ft.) resulting in a deficit of 46 parking spaces. She noted that even this uses the generic formula of one space per 150 sq. ft. there are two restaurants in the center.

Ms. Wallrich identified a table summarizing the parking statistics:

	AREA (SQ. FT.)	PARKING REQ.	PARKING PROVIDED	PARKING DEFICIENCY
Bremetowne Mall	28,397	190*	185	5
Whistle Bar/Grill	4,450	58		
WEC	2,120	32		
Other tenants/vacancies	21,830	146		
Total for tenants		236*		46

* Based on general commercial uses at 1 space/150 sf- does not account for special requirements for restaurants, medical or professional offices or personal services

Ms. Wallrich requested the Police Department to do a parking evaluation on a Friday evening at 9:00. The Police stated there was 116 cars parked in the lot. Staff is requesting the Applicant do a Professional Parking Study to make sure the parking does not impact the neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN GRAY invited the Petitioners to comment.

Mr. Mikesell and Mr. Sanfilippo both approached the podium. Mr. Mikesell thanked Paula and the Commission for their time.

Mr. Mikesell stated that he opened the Whistle in 2017 which has been very successful. They want to open an Events and Catering business separate from WSBG. They are already operating the Bar and Grill and the Catering Business. Whether there are two businesses or one business there will be the same parking needed. The other businesses in the Mall don't have a lot of cars at the same time. The Chiropractor has 4-5 cars during the day. The Liquor store has 3-4 cars at any time. The Mexican Restaurant has 10-12 cars and the Grocery store has 10-12 cars. They will be doing bridal showers and funeral lunches during the day and won't be too busy on the event side. He noted that when the restaurant is at capacity with two parties there is still about 20 spaces open. Many of the neighbors from the residential area park on the lot instead of their driveways. We do not want to tow them. They want to operate as separate businesses. They do not see the parking as an issue.

Ms. Wallrich noted that the code requires a Special Use if you wish to operate a banquet facility separate from the existing sports bar. The code was amended purposefully so that the Village Board can consider potential impacts from a banquet use on adjacent uses and in this case to protect adjacent residential property. They can continue to operate as they are as an extension of the WSBG and the parking will be handled through typical enforcement mechanisms. The specific concern regarding parking for this project is if there are vacancies in the Mall that when filled will impact the parking count.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked for comments from the Commissioners:

COMMISSIONER VICK noted he lives right over there and has patronized some of the businesses. He has noted there is adequate parking in the lot. When there are big games on Sunday the lots are fuller. The peak times for the other businesses are different from the Whistle.

Ms. Wallrich noted the banquet facility has a seating capacity of 78 and a fire capacity of 99.

COMMISSIONER GASKILL noted his concern would be the parking. With the spaces per sq. ft. it takes up half the lot.

COMMISSIONER AITCHISON noted when some business are busy others are not. I have been to the Whistle and have not had a problem with parking. The only concern would be on Sunday when there is a Bear's game.

COMMISSIONER FIELDER noted it is already operating as a banquet facility under the Whistle. Will we have time to prove that parking is not an issue? Can we give them 6 months to see how it works out? At this time the parking is working. If the landlord fills up the Mall it could become a problem. Parking may or may not be an issue if the Mall is full.

Ms. Wallrich replied, the parking situation could continue to be monitored however they are requesting to separate the businesses. The Special Use was created to allow for an independent Banquet Facility which requires a different parking requirement from a restaurant use. They have expressed they do not want to keep the two businesses together. There are 128 seats designed by the architect and a fire occupancy of 166 for WSBG; the event space has 76 seats with an occupancy of 99. Between the two spaces the total is 204 seats designed with a maximum occupancy of 265.

COMMISSIONER GATTO noted she was there on the night of a fight and the parking lot was full. She had to drive around the parking lot three times to get a parking spot. People were parking on the street. This was a night when people were occupying the banquet area. If they are having a banquet facility that holds 90 people and the bar & grill, it could be a problem. I feel they should have a parking study done.

Mr. Mikesell noted he has never had problems with parking on a Sunday night. He noted they could be in touch with Marquette Bank for shared parking. Mr. Ritter noted Marquette Bank is in Orland Park and across a busy 4 lane commercial roadway (159th Street). Ms. Wallrich noted the Ordinances for Orland are similar to Tinley Park and do not allow off premise parking. COMMISSIONER MANI noted if a study on the parking would be done, it would have to be done when the Mall is completely full.

COMMISSIONER VICK noted both spaces are up and operating. The two businesses would need an administrative side to help cut the cost. The parking now is not an issue as they have been operating now.

Ms. Wallrich noted if the vacancies become occupied that could be a problem and we would not want to be in a position to put pressure on an existing business that could result in closing it down. We encouraged the Applicants to apply for a Special Use in the beginning prior to beginning construction and they elected not to do that. There are vacancies and the mall owner will try to get them occupied.

Mr. Mikesell noted there is no room at the Mall for another restaurant. If they do fill up the Mall will they ask him to shut down?

COMMISSIONER GRAY noted the plan all along was to have two separate entities. In June of last year, the ball was rolling on the banquets. Why didn't they wait to see what the protocols are for the Special Use? They do have a good business. A parking study should be conducted by a professional. As other business come in there could be potential for parking problems.

Mr. Mikesell replied they did not realize there was a parking problem when they had already signed the 5-year lease. We did not realize this was a B-1. If we would have known all this we would not have signed the lease. He noted they are open until 2:00 am and the other businesses are not open at that time. We have made \$100,000 in donations to the community and we have a quarter million investment in the property. If he knew he had to do a professional parking study we would have already done that. He will investigate it.

Ms. Wallrich noted the Public Hearing has been noticed for March 5, 2020.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2020 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #3 **WORKSHOP: WHISTLE BANQUET FACILITY - 7537 159TH STREET – OPEN AND TABLE**
Consider recommending that the Village Board grant Stephanie Mikesell, on behalf of Whistle Events and Catering, a Special Use Permit for a Banquet Facility located in the Brementowne Mini-Mall at 7537 159th Street in the B-1 (Neighborhood Shopping) zoning district.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
 Mary Aitchison
 Eduardo Mani
 Curt Fielder
 James Gaskill
 Angela Gatto
 Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
 Lucas Engel

Guests: Mark Mikesell, Petitioner
 Robert SanFilippo, Petitioner

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER GASKILL, seconded by COMMISSIONER VICK to open the Public Hearing on The Whistle Banquet Facility - 7537 159th Street.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted that Village Staff provided confirmation that appropriate notice regarding the Public Hearing was published in the local newspaper in accordance with State law and Village requirements.

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested anyone present in the audience who wished to give testimony, comment, engage in cross-examination or ask questions during the Hearing stand and be sworn in.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER FIELDER, seconded by COMMISSIONER VICK to table the Public Hearing on The Whistle Banquet Facility - 7537 159th Street to March 5, 2020.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2020 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #4 WORKSHOP: TEXT AMENDMENT – MASONRY & SHORT-TERM RENTAL CLARIFICATION

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant a proposed text amendment to the Tinley Park Zoning Ordinance clarifying Section XII.3.A. (Legacy Code Uses) and Section V.B. (Schedule of Regulations) for short-term rental uses and Section V.C.4.B. (Masonry Requirements) for residential masonry requirements. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify portions of two recent code updates for Masonry requirements on residential properties and for short-term rental allowances.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
Mary Aitchison
Eduardo Mani
Curt Fielder
James Gaskill
Angela Gatto
Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
Lucas Engel

Daniel Ritter, Senior Planner gave a presentation as noted in the Staff Report. Recently the Village approved two text amendments to the Zoning Code relating to exterior masonry requirements(December 17, 2019; 2019-O-074) and for short-term rental uses (July 2, 2019; 2019-O-035). During the course of drafting and implementing the text changes, staff encountered a few text corrections to ensure the intent behind these codes is clear. This report clarifies the text corrections for each.

Masonry. The masonry requirements for residential properties were generally left as they previously existed in the Comprehensive Building Code and just moved into the Zoning Code. The definition of “masonry” was changed to include precast concrete panels. The definition change was intended for commercial properties to have some additional flexibility. However, based on the code’s wording, it could be interpreted that residential homes are permitted to be constructed with precast concrete panels on the first floor. Staff is proposing a minor wording change to clarify that homes must utilize face brick or decorative stone on the first story on a new home as was originally intended.

Short-term rental. The short-term rental (STR) use text amendment has two clarifications that are needed. First, in the Medium-Density (R-6) and High-Density (R-7) residential zoning districts the regulations do not address STR use in single-family detached, single-family attached and two-family dwellings despite the fact they are allowable uses in those districts. The requirements in other residential zoning districts state that STR units in single-family detached, single-family attached and two-family dwellings “are only permitted when separated 500 feet from all property lot lines” from another STR. That distance requirement needs to be addressed in the Medium-Density (R-6) and High-Density (R-7) residential zoning districts as well. Second, the STR use was not addressed in the Legacy Code and clarification is needed for those zoning districts.

The masonry requirements for residential properties were left as they were previously stated in the building code. The definition of masonry was changed to include pre-cast concrete panels to allow for some flexibility as an alternative masonry material on commercial and industrial structures. Due to the working on the residential masonry section, it can be interpreted

that precast concrete panels can be used to comply with first-floor masonry requirements, which was not the intent. The following change was made.

In all single-family detached, single-family attached, townhomes, and in all single-family semi-detached dwellings, exterior walls shall be constructed of face brick or decorative stone, ~~or other approved masonry products as defined herein~~. Said construction shall commence from the finished grade and shall extend to the uppermost portion of the first story of such dwellings.

Short-Term Rental Background

Following a complaint about a short-term rental property in 2018, staff was directed to look into regulations for short-term rental uses. The proposed text changes were reviewed by Plan Commission in January 2019 and adopted by the Village Board in July 2019 with some minor changes that added requirements to limit the density of short-term rental in a particular area. Short-term rentals are required to obtain a license through the Village Clerk’s office and must also comply with applicable zoning district regulations. Staff has identified two issues with the proposed Zoning Code text amendments which were not anticipated during the initial review.

The final adopted use chart and regulations are as follows:

SHORT-TERM RENTAL: *A dwelling unit that is used as a primary residence by owners or renters, or portion of such a unit, that is rented for less than 30 days at a time, with the exception of dwelling units owned by the federal government, the state, or any of their agencies or political subdivisions and facilities licensed by the state as health care facilities.*

	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-7	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	ORI	M-1	MU-1
Other Uses															
<u>Short-Term Rental, accessory to a dwelling unit</u>	P ^p	P ^p	P ^p	P ^p	P ^p	P ^q	P ^q	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

^p Short-term rentals are only permitted when separated five hundred (500) feet on all property lot lines from another short-term rental property line.

^q Short-term rentals in a multi-family cannot exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of units.

Medium (R-6) and High-Density (R-7) Residential District Homes

The only criteria noted in current STR regulations for Medium-Density Residential (R-6) and High-Density Residential (R-7) zoning districts is “Short-term rentals in a multi-family cannot exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of units.” While this regulation provides guidance for multi-family units in the R-6 & R-7 zoning districts it also permits lower density single-family attached, single-family detached, and townhomes. The requirements for a 500-foot separation between STR properties that applies to other lower-density residential zoning districts, was not applied to those medium-density and high-density residential zoning districts. Staff is recommending the same restrictions for single-family attached, single-family detached, and townhomes in other single family districts also pertain to the R-6 and R-7 districts.

To clarify this portion of the code, staff is proposing the text additions as indicated in red below:

	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-7	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	ORI	M-1	MU-1
Other Uses															
<u>Short-Term Rental, accessory to a dwelling unit</u>	P ^p	P ^p	P ^p	P ^p	P ^p	P ^{p/q}	P ^{p/q}	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

^p Short-term rentals located in a single-family detached, single-family attached, single-family semi-detached, and two-family dwellings are only permitted when separated five hundred (500) feet on all property lot lines from another short-term rental property line.

^q Short-term rentals in a multi-family dwellings cannot exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of units.

Legacy Code Allowance

During the original adoption of the STR regulations, the discussion was focused on traditional residential zoning districts, and did not address STRs in the Legacy Code districts. The Legacy Code encompasses the downtown and Oak Park Avenue corridor between 167th Street and 183rd Street. Within the Legacy Code, all types of housing/dwellings are permitted depending on their specific zoning district (Downtown Core, Downtown Flex, Neighborhood General, etc.) and redevelopment status (Heritage Site or Redevelopment Site). Staff is looking to clarify the regulations for STRs in the Legacy District. Due to the lack of discussion on this topic during the original STR adoption, staff is looking for direction on the matter from the Commission. Options include prohibiting short-term rentals in the Legacy Code districts or allowing the use with conditions similar to the traditional zoning districts that relate to distance separation or a percentage of the total number of units in a multi-family structure.

The advantages of allowing STR in the Legacy District relates to the adjacency of the area to the Metra station, which could be an incentive for visitors to stay in the downtown area and patronize local businesses. While the current licensing requirements of STRs limit rentals to one license per year, that requirement could change in the future and is independent from zoning district decisions. Any allowance of STRs in the Legacy District needs to clearly outline how to regulate the use with a diverse mix of residential uses in the Legacy District (mixed-use, single-family, multi-family, etc.)

By prohibiting STRs, it will eliminate the possibility that STR may negatively impact current or future uses due to the transient nature of the occupants. A “Boarding/Rooming House” is a similar use that is currently prohibited in the Legacy Code Districts.

If Plan Commission wishes to recommend prohibiting STRs in the Legacy Code Districts. “Short-term Rentals” would be added under the list of prohibited uses in Section XII.3.A. (Page 55) of the Legacy Code. If the STRs were to be permitted, staff recommends identifying any conditions that may help mitigate any perceived impact of the use on adjacent properties.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked for comments from the Commissioners regarding the Legacy Code.

COMMISSIONER MANI, GATTO, FIELDER, AITCHISON, & GASKILL had no comment on prohibiting it.

COMMISSIONER VICK noted it is easy to prohibit. Are there any other towns that have done STR in their downtown?

Ms. Wallrich noted this could be an economic advantage in the downtown. It would be good to wait and see how the demand is.

Mr. Ritter noted there are not towns he is aware of that have treated their downtown differently. It would be good to look at the zoning in general, not just the Legacy district.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted as demand becomes more concrete you may need to tweak it down the road. It would be good to leave the door open.

Ms. Wallrich noted it could be prohibited now and change it later. It is getting complicated, even if the Board approved it, they can only have one a year.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted it would be good to visit it later. Prohibiting it now could be the right choice.

There will be a Public Hearing on this March 5, 2020

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2020 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #5 WORKSHOP: TEXT AMENDMENT – MASONRY & SHORT-TERM RENTAL CLARIFICATION – OPEN AND TABLE

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant a proposed text amendment to the Tinley Park Zoning Ordinance clarifying Section XII.3.A. (Legacy Code Uses) and Section V.B. (Schedule of Regulations) for short-term rental uses and Section V.C.4.B. (Masonry Requirements) for residential masonry requirements. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify portions of two recent code updates for Masonry requirements on residential properties and for short-term rental allowances.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
Mary Aitchison
Eduardo Mani
Curt Fielder
James Gaskill
Angela Gatto
Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
Lucas Engel

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER FIELDER, seconded by COMMISSIONER GASKILL to open the Public Hearing on Text Amendment – Masonry & Short-Term Rental Clarification.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted that Village Staff provided confirmation that appropriate notice regarding the Public Hearing was published in the local newspaper in accordance with State law and Village requirements.

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested anyone present in the audience who wished to give testimony, comment, engage in cross-examination or ask questions during the Hearing stand and be sworn in.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER AITCHISON, seconded by COMMISSIONER GASKILL to table the Public Hearing on Text Amendment – Masonry & Short-Term Rental Clarification to March 5, 2020.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2020 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #6 PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING MAP UPDATE

Consider recommending that the Village Board adopt the Village's Official Zoning Map reflecting map amendments through December 31, 2019.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Garrett Gray, Chairman
Mary Aitchison
Eduardo Mani
Curt Fielder
James Gaskill
Angela Gatto
Stephen Vick

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton
Lucas Engel

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER GATTO, seconded by COMMISSIONER FIELDER to open the Public Hearing on the 2019 Zoning Map Update.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted that Village Staff provided confirmation that appropriate notice regarding the Public Hearing was published in the local newspaper in accordance with State law and Village requirements.

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested anyone present in the audience who wished to give testimony, comment, engage in cross-examination or ask questions during the Hearing stand and be sworn in.

Dan Ritter, Senior Planner gave a presentation as noted in the Staff Report. As required by the state to annually update the Zoning Map. Nothing is being rezoned. The is an annual review.

The Illinois Municipal Code (65 ILCS 5/11-13-19) requires municipal authorities to annually publish an Official Zoning Map by March 31st each year.

(65 ILCS 5/11-13-19) (from Ch. 24, par. 11-13-19) Sec. 11-13-19. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the corporate authorities shall cause to be published no later than March 31 of each year a map clearly showing the existing zoning uses, divisions, restrictions, regulations and classifications of such municipality for the preceding calendar year. The map published by the corporate authorities shall be the official zoning map.

The Village's GIS Consultant maintains the on-line map and update's it with any changes throughout the year; however, an official map must still be approved each year. Staff has reviewed the current Zoning Map, made corrections based on map amendments through December 31, 2019, and provided a proposed draft of the Official Zoning Map for the Plan Commission's review.

Changes to the Zoning Map are as follows:

One annexation took place in 2019:

- The Lenny's Food N Fuel property at 19420 Harlem Avenue was annexed per Ordinance 2019-O-055 and is zoned B-3, General Business & Commercial per Ordinance 2019-O-056.

Staff has also identified various corrections to the Official Zoning Map for 2019, including:

- The shopping center property at 7130-7164 183rd Street, commonly referred to Cornerstone Centre, was incorrectly labeled as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), which was removed from the updated Zoning Map. That portion of the shopping center is zoned B-3 and subject to a Unified Sign Plan, but was not approved as a PUD. The shopping center does have a portion zoned B-4 PD (18201-18219 Harlem Avenue, Glen Swilly/Cornerstone Centre PUD), which was correct.
- The Edenbridge Apartments, located at 66th Court and 181st Street, was incorrectly labeled as a PUD and the label was removed from the updated Zoning Map. The subject property was originally zoned R-5A with variations, but it was not a PUD. In 1978 the Zoning Code was rewritten and the R-5A zoning district became R-6. The scrivener's error listing the zoning district as a PUD appears to have been made shortly after that 1978 update.
- The property at 6809 Brementowne Drive was incorrectly listed as R-1 zoning and was corrected to R-6 zoning on the updated Zoning Map. The zoning of the property was originally R-5A (later changed to R-6 as part of the 1978 Zoning Code update) and was approved as a two-family dwelling structure and lot. When the residential properties to the south of the subject lot were rezoned from R-6 to R-1 by the Village in 1994 (94-O-101) the lot was erroneously included in the map change. However, the subject lot was specifically excluded from that rezoning and not listed in the Ordinance due to its unique design and previous approval as a two-family dwelling.

The Village's GIS Consultant, MGP, Inc., has provided an updated map that reflects the corrections and annexation as noted by Staff. The updated map has been included in the Plan Commission packet in draft form.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER FIELDER, seconded by COMMISSIONER VICK to recommend approval of the 2019 updated Zoning Map to the Village Board.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER FIELDER, seconded by COMMISSIONER GATTO to close the Public Hearing on The Zoning Map Update.

AYES: AITCHISON, MANI, FIELDER, GASKILL, GATTO, VICK & CHAIRMAN GRAY.

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the Motion approved. This item will be heard by the Village Board on March 3, 2020.

GOOD OF THE ORDER:

Ms. Wallrich, Planning Manager noted the following:

1. The Community Development has appointed a new Building Official, Jim Ostrom
2. The CD Department is finally training on a new software program and will be going live soon. Cashiering will be done in the department to be customer friendly.
3. There is an application for a Thornton Gas Station on 191st and Panduit Drive.
4. Delta Sonic will have some changes to their site on 159th and Oak Park Avenue
5. Dan has finished working on fees and will go into effect on March 1, 2020
6. The 7-Eleven project was approved by the Village Board
7. Holiday Inn will be bringing in their building permit soon.
8. Lenny's on 183rd has their permit in now.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

None at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None at this time.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, a Motion was made by PLAN COMMISSIONER FIELDER, seconded by PLAN COMMISSIONER AITCHISON to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of January 20, 2020 at 9:50 p.m. The Motion was unanimously approved by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN GRAY declared the meeting adjourned.