

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 15, 2015 MEETING

PUBLIC

HEARING #1: EAGLE BUFFET (JOYCE LEE, PETITIONER) – 18305 LA GRANGE ROAD – SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A SUBSTANTIAL DEVIATION FROM THE MIDCONTINENT PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR AN INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF WALL SIGNS

Consider a petition from Joyce Lee of Eagle Buffet (formerly Hope Buffet and Grand Buffet) for a Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation from the Midcontinent Planned Unit Development/B-3 PD (General Business and Commercial, Planned Unit Development) Zoning District for one (1) additional wall-mounted sign to allow for a total of three (3) wall-mounted signs at Eagle Buffet located at 18305 La Grange Road.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners:	Bob McClellan Maureen McLeod Mark Moylan Art Pierce Bill Reidy Rita Walker, Chairman
Absent Plan Commissioners:	Jeff Ficaro Tom Mahoney
Village Staff:	Amy Connolly, Planning Director Stephanie Kisler, Planner Debra Kotas, Commission Secretary

CHAIRMAN WALKER opened the Public Hearing at 7:33 p.m. 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. She requested anyone present who wished to give testimony, comment, engage in cross-examination or ask questions during the Hearing stand and be sworn in. The record reflects no one presented.

CHAIRMAN WALKER reported that Village Staff received a telephone call yesterday indicating that the Petitioner intended to withdraw the petition; however, Staff had not yet received this withdrawal in writing. She further explained that due to the fact that no one is here to represent the Petitioner, the Plan Commission cannot hear evidence, take testimony or cross examine the Petitioner on the variation petition. Therefore, the Public Hearing must be closed and no action taken.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN seconded by COMMISSIONER PIERCE to close the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.

AYE: Plan Commissioners Bob McClellan, Maureen McLeod, Mark Moylan, Art Pierce, Bill Reidy, and Chairman Rita Walker
NAY: None

ABSENT: Plan Commissioners Jeff Ficaro and Tom Mahoney

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the Motion approved. CHAIRMAN WALKER further explained that if the Petitioner wishes to appear before the Plan Commission again, they will require a new petition and must go through the review and public notice process all over again.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 15, 2015 MEETING

PUBLIC

HEARING #2: BICKFORD SENIOR LIVING (RICHARD EBY, EBY REALTY GROUP, PETITIONER) – 17301 S. 80TH AVENUE – MAP AMENDMENT/REZONING, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, VARIATIONS, AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A 60-UNIT CONGREGATE ELDERLY HOUSING FACILITY

Consider a proposal from Richard Eby of Eby Realty Group for a new, single-story, sixty (60) bed congregate elderly housing facility providing both assisted living and memory care comprising 37,000 square feet and related site improvements within 6.8 acres of a 19 acre site. The subject site is generally located east of 80th Avenue and south of Dooneen Avenue and is comprised of approximately nineteen (19) acres and is currently unincorporated.

This proposal requires the Plan Commission recommending to the Village Board the granting of the following:

1. Map Amendment/Rezoning from R-1 (Single-Family Residential) Zoning District to R-6 (Medium Density Residential) Zoning District, subsequent to annexation;
2. Special Use Permit for a congregate elderly housing facility within the R-6 Zoning District;
3. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for approximately nineteen (19) acres;
4. Variations for a monument sign:
 - a. A two foot (2') variation from Section IX.D.4.a.(1) (Height Limitations) to allow a six foot (6') high sign where four feet (4') is the maximum allowed; and,
 - b. A nineteen (19) square foot variation from Section IX.D.3.a (Sign Face Area) to allow an approximate twenty-four (24) square foot sign face area where five (5) square feet is the maximum allowed.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Bob McClellan
Maureen McLeod
Mark Moylan
Art Pierce
Bill Reidy
Rita Walker, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioners: Jeff Ficaro
Tom Mahoney

Village Staff: Amy Connolly, Planning Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner
Debra Kotas, Commission Secretary

Guest(s): Richard Eby, Petitioner
Eric Mancke, Sr. Project Manager, Manhard Consulting
David Silverman, Attorney
Bill Crandall, Managing Principal, Carr Baier Crandall, LLC

CHAIRMAN WALKER opened the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m. 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 and notices were also sent to residents within 250' of the proposed site. She requested anyone present who wished to give testimony, comment, engage in cross-examination or ask questions during the Hearing stand and be sworn in.

DAVID SILVERMAN, Attorney representing Bickford Senior Living, stated the Petitioner is seeking Site Plan Approval, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Variations, and Rezoning of approximately six (6) acres of the site from R-1 to R-6 to construct a congregate elderly care facility. He introduced the Petitioner, RICHARD EBY, and ERIC MANCKE, Sr. Project Manager for Manhard Consulting Ltd. He requested the Village Staff Report and Petitioner's Findings of Fact be submitted for public record.

RICHARD EBY, Director of Development for Bickford Senior Living, reviewed the request to construct a 60-unit elderly housing facility at 17301 80th Avenue whose focus will be to provide assisted living and memory care. He stated Bickford Senior Living is a family-owned business based out of Olathe, Kansas that currently owns and operates fifty (50) assisted living facilities. Locations in the Chicagoland area include: Rockford, Crystal Lake, St. Charles, Oswego and Crown Point, Indiana. He explained the proposed Tinley Park facility will be very similar to the Crown Point location. He proceeded to review photographs of the Crown Point facility, noting its single-story, residential appearance. He showed the front façade consisting almost 100% of brick/stone and also noted the many architectural features including asphalt shingles, copper eyebrow panels over the windows, shutters, a significant amount of landscaping surrounding the building, and two (2) outside courtyards.

MR. EBY reported that their typical assisted living resident is eighty-five (85) years or older and requires assistance with daily living including meals, cleaning, and medication supervision with the remainder of the residents being memory care patients who require much more specialized care.

MR. EBY proceeded to review photographs of the inside of the facility including common areas consisting of living room/sitting areas, dining rooms, a bistro, salon, remembrance stations, and individual resident rooms. He stressed the facility will have a residential feel, stating the goal is to keep patients engaged and out of their individual rooms. He also stressed the importance of safety at the facility. He reported the building will have 24-hour security and those patients with a tendency to wander will have a watch/bracelet with a transmitter that will notify staff if they leave the premises.

MR. EBY reviewed an aerial view of the proposed site explaining the 19-acre parcel will be subdivided into separate parcels that will include the Bickford residential building that is being constructed approximately 160 feet back from 80th Avenue where there is more stable soil, an access road, and stormwater detention area with the remaining 13-14 acres of the site being left zoned R-1 for any future use. He stated the Bickford organization is not interested in further developing that area.

MR. EBY reviewed architectural renderings of the site noting the service area of the building will be located on the south side of the facility that will house a screened-in dumpster and generator, where there is no residential housing. He reviewed the landscape plan noting the significant amount of trees and landscaping that will be added, in addition to the existing large evergreen tree, on the north side of the facility that will help shield the facility from nearby residential homes.

Concluding the Petitioner's report, MR. EBY highlighted the following:

1. The Bickford residential facility is a one-story building with a residential appearance and low impact use;
2. Traffic impact on the area is low, noting that traffic flow will consist mostly of employees during shift changes and service deliveries including dumpster pickup and food deliveries, each only twice weekly; He reviewed ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) and American Senior Housing Association traffic studies and parking ratios from other Bickford locations;

3. Bickford Senior Living will be a quiet neighbor since their residents typically do not leave the facility and the only noise will be from traffic generated during daytime hours only (approximately 13 vehicles per peak hour); He further noted the parking areas will be on the south side of the facility, away from the neighboring residential areas;
4. No impact on public safety stating all employees will have criminal background checks, elder abuse checks, and ongoing drug screenings;
5. Neighborhood privacy with residents typically not leaving the facility and a secured building;
6. Minimal drainage/stormwater output by decreasing the rate of run-off and providing additional compensatory storage;
7. High quality landscaping; and
8. A photometric study was conducted and the facility will have fourteen foot (14') residential pole lights with shields to ensure no light spillage onto the residential neighbors.

AMY CONNOLLY, Planning Director, presented the Staff report. She explained the Petitioners request includes:

1. Annexation of the site to the Village since the site is currently unincorporated;
2. Rezoning following annexation from R-1 (Single-Family Residential) to R-6 (Medium Density Residential) since this is a congregate elderly housing facility that is only allowed in R-6 zoning;
3. Obtaining a Special Use Permit for congregate elderly housing since the facility will provide both assisted living and memory care;
4. A Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to subdivide the property into parcels;
5. Site Plan Approval for the building, stormwater detention area, elevations and landscaping; and
6. Two variations for a monument sign.

MS. CONNOLLY explained this has been a lengthy process, originating in Summer 2014 when pre-application meetings were held with various Village departments to discuss general requirements including stormwater, building requirements, etc. She reported plans were then submitted at the end of October 2014. These plans were reviewed by all Village departments and initially presented to the Plan Commission in December 2014. She complimented the Petitioner on being very cooperative and receptive to Staff comments and recommendations. She further explained this site was marked as a potential site for senior housing use according to the Village's Comprehensive Plan from 2000.

MS. CONNOLLY explained this Public Hearing by the Plan Commission will be followed by another Public Hearing at the Village Board level regarding annexation, which is a 20-year agreement between the Village and the Petitioner. She further explained the Plan Commission is a recommending body only and that final decisions are made by the Village Board.

MS. CONNOLLY reviewed the subject property, which is the location of the former Jones Farm, explaining the site is burdened with low quality soil conditions and drainage issues. She reported both Staff and Petitioner are working diligently with both the Village Engineer and the Petitioner's Engineer to ensure there will be no adverse impact on the neighborhood regarding flooding. She reported the Petitioner will not only be retaining stormwater from their own site but also providing compensatory water storage since it is in the floodplain. She proceeded to review Village floodplain maps, topography, and elevations of properties. She confirmed that the Bickford building will be elevated so it will not be in the floodplain elevation.

MS. CONNOLLY reviewed the zoning of the surrounding areas that includes a mix of R-1, R-2, R-4 and R-5. She stated the requested rezoning to R-6 is appropriate since the facilities anticipated use will be residential in nature. She proceeded to review the proposed Plat of Subdivision that includes Lot #1 zoned R-6, that will contain the Bickford building, access road and stormwater area; and, Lot #2 zoned R-1, whose use has not yet been determined, that will contain the compensatory water storage with easements.

MS. CONNOLLY reviewed the Site Plan that includes the Bickford building, parking areas on the west and south side, two (2) detention sites and proposed fire lanes already reviewed by the Fire Department.

MS. CONNOLLY reviewed the landscape plan noting that Village Staff requested additional landscaping and trees on the north side of the site near the residential area that would provide year-round coverage. She confirmed the Petitioner agreed to be responsible for care of the existing 30-40 foot evergreen tree currently on the site. She reported a sidewalk would be installed along the east side of 80th Avenue and around the Bickford building.

MS. CONNOLLY showed photographs of the Bickford building complimenting the architectural features of the facility including unique roof peaks and the building's residential appearance. She confirmed the building meets all building material requirements.

MS. CONNOLLY showed a photograph of the proposed monument sign explaining a six foot (6') monument sign is appropriate for the location due to the speed of traffic along 80th Avenue, setback of the Bickford building and setback of the sign (10' from 80th Avenue). She stated that Staff is supportive of the sign variations.

Upon conclusion of the Staff report, CHAIRMAN WALKER opened the Hearing to questions or comments from the Public Body who were previously sworn in.

BILL MACYAUSKI, 7913 W. 172nd Street, claimed the road on 80th Avenue is sinking. He expressed concerns regarding soils on the site and questioned the type of fill that will be used. MR. MANCKE agreed that soils on the site are not favorable for construction; however, the building will be placed out of the soils. Based on the soils that were sampled by a geotechnical consultant, the soils will be undercut to an allowable bearing strength and then backfill used to construct the road and keep it from moving. Once construction takes place, he confirmed the proper materials will be used to ensure proper compaction. He reported that soil boring reports indicate the soil on the east side of the site is suitable for this type of fill and it is the plan to move as much of this good soil to the other areas.

MS. CONNOLLY confirmed Village Engineers have reviewed the soil boring reports. She stated the access road being installed will be a private street and not owned by the Village, therefore, the developer has the risk of building something without suitable soil without liability to the Village. She clarified the Village will ensure there will be no negative impact on drainage, public utilities, stormwater or wetlands.

THERESA SAURIOL, 17330 Ozark Avenue, expressed concerns regarding the impact that digging on the site will have on nearby homes, specifically foundation cracks or eroding soils. She also expressed concerns regarding noise from service vehicles and lighting levels from the facility. MR. MANCKE again explained undercutting is planned for the entire bad area underneath the building and no pilings are mentioned in the soils report. He reported a lighting study was submitted and there will be no light spillover from the site.

DAVID ROMPOLA, 7912 W. 172nd Place, reported several questions have arisen and requested answers to these questions in writing from the Plan Commission. He suggested broadening the area of notification for proposed projects. He inquired if his home and surrounding properties could be classified as a flood area.

MS. CONNOLLY explained determination of a floodplain is done by elevation models at FEMA and unless there is a change in elevation of a property, a property cannot be placed in a floodplain. She confirmed the surrounding properties are not in the floodplain and the proposed project is not changing the elevation of these properties. She also reported the Village has several brochures on the website relative to floodplain information and agreed to provide answers to those questions submitted.

SUSAN KISCHLIEL, 17709 Dooneen Avenue, expressed concerns regarding easement flooding and the affect this facility will have on the value of her home.

CHAIRMAN WALKER explained the facility will be properly screened from neighboring residential properties, the project is a low impact use and is actually improving the area of property within the Village, therefore, adding value to

the area. Agreeing there is a lack of drainage, MR. MANCKE again explained an underground storm sewer is being installed along the edge of the building that will collect the water and taken to the detention areas.

MICHAEL ROCHE, 7934 Dooneen Avenue, inquired if anything was planned for the remainder of the parcel of Lot #2. MR. EBY again stated the Bickford organization is not interested in further expansion on this site reporting that less than half of that parcel is developable due to bad soils and flooding but explained the entire parcel needed to be purchased and subsequently annexed in order to proceed with their project.

MR. ROCHE expressed concerns regarding the amount of parking spaces available during holidays or special events. MR. EBY stated that the new private access road can be used for additional parking and if necessary, an off-site facility such as a church or school can be used with busses being used to transport visitors.

MR. ROCHE also requested clarification regarding the monument sign. MR. EBY showed a photograph of the monument sign at the Carmel, Indiana location that will be the same as the Tinley Park location. He confirmed the sign will be set back ten feet (10') from the new sidewalk on 80th Avenue and will be surrounded by significant landscaping and will be lit via a flood light.

BRIAN KROTSER, 7931 W. 172nd Place, believes there was a lack of communication with residents. He submitted a petition from surrounding residents that opposes construction of the facility on this site. He presented a list of questions from residents and requested answers in writing. He also expressed concerns regarding flooding on the site.

MR. MANCKE again stated the Petitioner is fully aware of flooding on the site and will compensate for any fill done in the area of the floodplain, and is actually providing more water storage than at present, therefore, providing a benefit to the area. He stated construction drawings, studies, calculations, computer models and analyses will be submitted to the Village and the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD) for review and any necessary changes will be made.

MR. KROTSER requested all information being presented during this Hearing by Staff and the Petitioner become available for the public. MS. CONNOLLY reported that all packet information including the Staff Report and drawings are included on the Village's website. She added that she will ensure the Power Point presentations from this evening will also become available.

CHAIRMAN WALKER read the questions submitted by MR. KROTSER repeating the answers already given during the Hearing. She stated the answers will also be provided in writing and posted on the Village website.

MR. EBY suggested also visiting the Bickford Senior Living organization website, www.enrichinghappiness.com or www.BickfordSeniorLiving.com.

MR. SILVERMAN added that the project has not been finally engineered and this Public Hearing is intended for Site Plan Approval, Preliminary Plat of Consolidation and Rezoning purposes only. MS. CONNOLLY added that there will be another opportunity for public comment when the Public Hearing is held at the Village Board level.

There being no further questions or comments from the Public Body, CHAIRMAN WALKER opened the Hearing to discussion by the Plan Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER REIDY requested clarification regarding water tie in on Lot #1. In order to ensure proper water pressure, MS. CONNOLLY explained there will be a looped water main to serve the site which means there will be two different connections into the water main at two different locations. She reported the Petitioner is spending a significant amount of money installing this water system that will be located on the northwest corner of the site on Lot #2 noting this will improve the value of the building in addition to improving the water pressure that she stated pleased the Fire Department greatly.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN agreed that flooding seems to be the main concern; however, final engineering has not yet been completed. He believes this is an aesthetically pleasing project and is the best use for this unincorporated parcel of land on such a challenging site, noting that much of the land will remain undeveloped. He commented the Petitioner has been very cooperative throughout the entire process and recommends moving forward with the project stressing the Plan Commission is only a recommending body with final decisions made by the Village Board.

COMMISSIONER PIERCE stated he resides in this area. He agreed that the area initially had flooding issues that were subsequently addressed. He noted it is the primary goal of the Village when it relates to development is to increase value. He believes this project accomplishes that noting the addition of sidewalks and intense landscaping, therefore, has no objections to the project.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN confirmed that the sewers on this particular site will be separate from the surrounding residential properties. He stressed the importance of addressing any additional questions or concerns from residents.

COMMISSIONER REIDY proceeded to review the following Findings of Fact and respective responses with regards to the Rezoning and Special Use Permit:

Rezoning (Map Amendment) from R-1 Single-Family Residential to R-6 Multiple-Family Residential

1. The proposed zoning is consistent with the existing uses in the area.

The predominant land uses in the area are both single-family residential (to the north and east) and multiple-family residential to the south. The Bettenhausen Recreation Center is located to the west of the subject site. Based upon this mix of uses, the proposed zoning (R-6) is consistent with existing uses in the area.

2. The proposed zoning is compatible with present zoning in the area.

The proposed site is currently zoned R-4 Single-Family Residential within Cook County because the site is currently un-annexed to the Village of Tinley Park. The property is surrounded by R-2 Zoning to the North, R-4 Zoning to the east, R-5 Zoning to the south and R-1/R-2 zoning across 80th Avenue to the west. Note that while the proposed zoning is not the same zoning as neighboring areas, the proposed zoning (R-6) is not incompatible with the surrounding zoning. The site is large and significant portions of the subject site are undevelopable because of soil conditions. As a result, it is unlikely that any use of the land would resemble a single-family residential subdivision.

3. The existing zoning is not suitable for the property or its surrounding area.

Once the subject parcel is annexed into the Village by the Village Board, it will automatically be zoned R-1 Single-Family Residential. In order to fulfill any development of the site beyond its existing use as one single-family residence and a family farm, the zoning must change to a multiple-family residential district. The site cannot be developed as a cohesive single-family residential neighborhood due to bad soil conditions. The development of the property is more likely to occur in higher densities in the small areas of the site with acceptable soil conditions, as opposed to low density in all areas of the subject property.

4. The proposed zoning is consistent with the trend of development in the area.

This parcel of land is among the last parcels to be developed in the area. Surrounding developments are relatively recent and are not likely to be redeveloped. The subject site has been minimally use/vacant for many years due to unfavorable soil conditions.

5. There is a need for the proposed rezoning.

The subject site is not likely to be redeveloped or used for anything other than its exiting use if the property is not annexed into the Village and rezoned. The proposed zoning to R-6 was selected by the Applicant because that is the only zoning district where Congregate Elderly Care is allowed and is a Special Use. In order to

develop into a low-impact, residential development for the elderly, the site must be rezoned to R-6. There are no other zoning districts in town that allow Congregate Elderly Care.

Special Use Permit (Special Use for a Congregate Elderly Care Facility in the R-6 Zoning District)

- 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.
- *The Applicant has met all dimensional standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance (except the variation for sign height and sign face area);*
 - *The Applicant is proposing to construct a new private access drive and new fire lanes in order to ensure safe access to the site;*
 - *The Applicant is providing a new detention pond to hold stormwater and, because the community is aware of significant flooding issues on the property, the Applicant is providing additional compensatory storage areas that will be necessary during heavy rainfalls;*
 - *The Applicant's use is residential in nature and provides a service to the Tinley Park community by housing elderly residents in need of different levels of care;*
 - *The Applicant has represented that they will provide security and safety for their patients; and*
 - *The proposed use is residential in nature and is complimentary to the residential uses that surround the subject property.*
- 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.
- *The Applicant and the Village are taking care to ensure that this development will not impact the existing drainage patterns established by existing development and that the site will contain and detain all the stormwater it will create from the development;*
 - *The Village and the Applicant understand that this site has troublesome soils and the development proposed will be engineered to take soils into account and will not create a negative impact to the existing developments in the area;*
 - *The proposed use has minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood as most of the residents of the facility will not be driving and will be safely housed within a secure facility;*
 - *The Applicant proposes to dramatically improve the value of the site through the development and, thus, will add value to the surrounding neighborhoods and improve property values.*
- 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.
- *The proposed site plan indicates that the site is self-sufficient, with its own driveway/access, its own stormwater facilities, new water and sewer lines (water line is proposed to be looped), and fire lanes to ensure access for emergency vehicles.*
 - *The subject site is surrounded by previously developed property and, therefore, is the last property in the area to be developed. As such, it does not impede any future development.*

- *The project is divided into two phases: 1.) the first phase is the development of the Bickford facility and related improvements and 2.) a second phase would be the development of the properties within the eastern half of the site. The development of the first phase has been designed to accommodate a future residential development within the eastern half of the site. The accommodations include a central driveway going through the middle of the site (that could be extended east), compensatory storage that will benefit the eastern half of the property, utility planning that incorporates the ability for future access for the eastern half of the property, and a site design/layout that does not prohibit a future development on the eastern half of the property.*
- D. That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
- *The Applicant proposes to meet all Village engineering requirements, particularly for the provision of utilities, access driveways and streets, and stormwater facilities;*
 - *The Applicant is proposing to add an access road, new utilities (including a looped water system to ensure adequate water pressures), stormwater detention facilities, stormwater compensatory storage facilities, fire lanes, and areas designed to accommodate public safety vehicles, such as ambulances and fire trucks.*
- 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.
- *The Applicant will be working with the Cook County Department of Transportation to achieve one single access point to the site. This is preferable for access management along 80th Avenue. The Applicant will apply for a full access point along 80th Avenue; however, we are unsure at this point if the Cook County Department of Transportation will allow a full access or restricted access driveway.*
 - *The proposed use does not create a significant amount of traffic because very few of the residents drive.*
 - *The Applicant will install street lights that meet Village standards along the east side of 80th Avenue to add to the safety of traveling along 80th Avenue.*
 - *The Applicant proposes to install sidewalks along the 80th Avenue frontage, as well as sidewalks going from the 80th Avenue sidewalks to the main entrance of the facility.*
- 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 Applicant is requesting a variation from the Village's sign ordinance. However, the Applicant does meet all of the remaining Village codes and regulations, as relating to the development of the site.*
- G. The extent to which the Special Use contributes directly or indirectly to the economic development of the community as a whole.
- This project contributes directly to the economic development of the community as a whole by developing property that has been minimally used as a single-family residence and family farm for many years. The proposed project improves the assessed value of the property and, thus, creates economic improvement for the Village as a whole.*

Variations

1. That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in the district in which it is located.

The Applicant has asked for two sign variations – one for sign face area and one for sign height. These variations are being considered due to the following issues:

- a. *The subject site is located adjacent to 80th Avenue, which is an arterial street with a posted speed of 40 miles per hour.*
- b. *There are currently no stop lights or traffic control devices this portion of 80th Avenue that encouraging the slowing or stopping or traffic adjacent to the subject site.*
- c. *The result of this arrangement is that vehicles will be traveling at a high rate of speed.*
- d. *This high rate of speed will require that a sign be designed at a height and with letters of a certain size as to be visible from the roadway at traveling speeds between 40 and 50 miles per hour.*
- e. *The proposed Bickford building will be set back from the roadway and will not contain signage on the walls of the proposed building. Therefore, the Applicant is asking for a larger monument sign than is allowed by current codes.*

2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.

The unique circumstance is that the Applicant is a residential use that will require visitors from the medical community, family visitors from out of town, and certain staff members. So, thus, while it is a compatible use for a residential district, the use is somewhat commercial in nature. As a result, there is a unique need for a larger sign than is allowed in the Village's residentially-zoned districts. This is a unique circumstance that was not anticipated in the Village's Zoning Ordinance.

3. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

We do not believe that essential character of the area will be changed with a larger sign height and sign face. This is due to the amount of commercial development along 80th Avenue and the distance the proposed sign will be set back from 80th Avenue, creating good line of sight and an additional landscaped feature on the site.

4. Where there are practical difficulties or particular hardships, taking into consideration the extent to which the following facts favorable to the Applicant have been established by evidence. The particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the specific property would result in a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of law was carried out;

The subject site is located along an arterial street (80th Avenue). Due to significant soil issues and stormwater detention needs, the proposed building is set back well beyond the traditional front yard setback requirement. As a result, there is a need for a larger monument sign to provide way finding and branding to the subject site. The Applicant is not asking for the maximum sign height allowed in Tinley Park, but an amount well below the maximum allowed in commercial zoning districts (10' is the maximum allowed).

5. The conditions upon which the petition for a variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification;

Other properties zoned R-6 and used as single- or multiple-family residential would have no need for a similar petition with a similar height for a sign. However, the proposed congregate elderly care use is an allowable Special Use within the R-6 Zoning District and should be allowed a larger sign due to the more commercial nature of the use and the travel conditions along 80th Avenue.

6. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property;

The purpose of the variation is for effective sign visibility. The Applicant does not plan wall signage on the building. The monument sign will be the primary signage for the site. This particular sign is used at all locations of the same company, Bickford Senior Living.

7. The alleged hardship was not created by the owner of the property, or by a previous owner;
The owner is developing the property, as allowed by the Village of Tinley Park Zoning Ordinance.
8. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the other property or improvements in the neighborhood upon which the property is located;
The sign height variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or neighboring properties. Line of sight will be properly maintained, the sign base will be landscaped, and the sign will be aesthetically pleasing and will improve the site.
9. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property or substantially increase congestion in the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
Line of sight will be properly maintained so that vehicles will not have any danger at the intersection of the proposed private street and 80th Avenue. The sign will not contain a changeable message so there will be no distractions with the sign. The sign base will be landscaped. The sign will be aesthetically pleasing and will improve the site and the value of the neighboring properties.

There being no further questions or comments regarding the Findings of Fact, COMMISSIONER REIDY made a motion to grant Site Plan Approval for the proposed redevelopment of approximately 6.8 acres at 17301 80th Avenue, including a new approximately 37,000 square foot Congregate Elderly Care facility and related site improvements for use by Bickford Senior Living.

Additionally, we recommend that the Village Board grant, to Bickford Senior Living at 17301 80th Avenue, the following approvals and adopt Findings of Fact submitted by the Applicant and Findings of Fact made by Village Staff and the Plan Commission at this meeting, specifically:

1. A rezoning (map amendment) for 6.8 acres of the 19 acre site, after annexation, from R-1 Single-Family Residential to R-6 Multiple-Family Residential;
2. Special Use Permit for a Congregate Elderly Care Facility within the R-6 Multiple-Family Residential District;
3. A two (2) foot Variation from Section IX.D.4.a.(1) (Height Limitations) to allow a six (6) feet high sign where four (4) feet is the maximum height allowed in residential zoning districts;
4. A nineteen (19) square foot Variation from Section IX.D.3.a. (Sign Face Area) to allow an approximately twenty-four (24) square foot sign face area where five (5) square feet is the maximum sign face area allowed in residential zoning districts; and
5. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

The Plan Commission recommends these approvals with the following conditions, which can be satisfied prior to appearance at the Village Board:

1. The Fire Department provides final approval of the proposed fire lane along the south and east side of the building, ensuring a design that accommodates fire trucks and materials agreed to by both the Applicant and Village;
2. Street lights along 80th Avenue will be added to the plans, consistent with Village standards; and
3. Village Engineer reviews and approves the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, particularly related to the wording of the access easements and any easements required for stormwater.

The Motion was seconded by COMMISSIONER PIERCE.

AYE: Plan Commissioners Bob McClellan, Maureen McLeod, Mark Moylan, Art Pierce, Bill Reidy, and Chairman Rita Walker

NAY: None

ABSENT: Plan Commissioners Jeff Ficaró and Tom Mahoney

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the Motion approved.

A motion was made by COMMISSIONER PIERCE, seconded by COMMISSIONER MCLEOD to close the Public Hearing at 10:11 p.m. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the Motion approved.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAN seconded by COMMISSIONER MCLEOD to adjourn the regular meeting of the Plan Commission of December 18, 2014 at 10:12 p.m. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKER declared the meeting ADJOURNED.