



MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK, COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS

FEBRUARY 2, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on February 2, 2017 at 7:30p.m.

ROLL CALL

Plan Commission: Kevin Bergthold
John Domina
Anthony Janowski
Peter Kroner
Lori Kappel
Mark Moylan
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Tim Stanton

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner I
Patrick Connolly, Village Attorney
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK called to order the Regular meeting of the Plan Commission for February 2, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the January 19, 2017 regular meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A motion was made by COMMISSIONER BERGTHOLD, seconded by COMMISSIONER SHAW, to approve the Minutes as presented. The motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK 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 2, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #1: PUBLIC HEARING: MOBILITIE – 19100 RIDGELAND AVENUE – SPECIAL USE PERMIT & SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR NEW GROUND EQUIPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTED ANTENNA SYSTEM (DAS)

Consider a request for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan approval from the Applicant, Carrie Lindenberg of Mobilite, LLC, for new ground equipment accessory to a distributed antenna system (DAS) at 19100 Ridgeland Avenue within the ORI PD (Office and Restricted Industrial, Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The proposed DAS includes antennas that will be mounted on the existing structures, related ground equipment, and a privacy fence and landscaping that surrounds the ground lease area. The proposed DAS will provide improvements to cellular service within the vicinity.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Kevin Bergthold
John Domina
Anthony Janowski
Peter Kroner
Lori Kappel
Mark Moylan
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner I
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

Guest(s): Carrie Lindenberg, Mobilite, LLC
Sekhar Kota, Mobilite, LLC
Dominic Kowalczyk, Construction Concepts of Illinois

A motion was made by COMMISSIONER BERGTHOLD, seconded by COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI, to open the Public Hearing on MOBILITIE – 19100 RIDGELAND AVENUE – SPECIAL USE PERMIT & SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR NEW GROUND EQUIPMENT FOR DISTRIBUTED ANTENNA SYSTEM (DAS) at 7:35 p.m. The motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK 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 MATUSHEK 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.

STEPHANIE KISLER, Planner I, presented the Staff Report and gave an overview of the request for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan approval for new ground equipment accessory to a distributed antenna System (DAS) at 19100 Ridgeland Avenue within the ORI PD (Office and Restricted Industrial, Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. She noted that the proposed DAS includes antennas that would be mounted on the existing structures, related ground equipment, and a privacy fence and landscaping that surrounds the ground equipment lease area. The proposed DAS will provide improvements to cellular service within the vicinity. She added that the proposed DAS antennas will be mounted on the

existing structure and existing light poles, which is allowed as a Special Use per Section III.V.1.b.(4). of the Zoning Ordinance. Site Plan Approval is required for the proposed ground equipment accessory to the DAS.

MS. KISLER continued by noting that the site is currently home to the Hollywood Casino Amphitheatre. She added that a personal wireless service facility (cellular tower) does not exist as the site currently; however, the Amphitheatre typically brings in a Cell on Wheels (COW) to the site during concert season (May through September) to provide improved cellular service for concert-goers. A Special Use Permit was granted for this purpose in June of 2016 (Ordinance 2016-O-037), which approved the COW and the use of a permanently affixed antenna on the Amphitheatre structure. She noted that the proposed DAS will offer better cellular service than the COW and increase the number of cellular service providers at the site.

MS. KISLER noted the zoning for the subject parcel is ORI PD (Office and Restricted Industrial, Planned Unit Development). The site is surrounded by commercial/industrial uses to the west and north, residential uses (golf course) to the south, and unincorporated Forest Preserve to the east (Bartel Grassland). She added that the nearest residential dwelling is over 1,600 ft. away.

MS. KISLER continued by discussing that the Applicant provided an updated diagram showing the location of the light poles where antennas are proposed to be mounted. She noted that the antennas proposed for five (5) of the existing light poles would be attached at a height of twenty to twenty-five feet (20-25'). The base of the light pole would have a power source, which would be enclosed by a fence. She noted that the proposed fencing at the base of the light poles is of wood material, which is more likely to show weathering. She noted that the Plan Commission should review the new 'photosims' from the Applicant in their packet and on the screen to determine if wood fencing or PVC fencing should be utilized. She noted that in addition to fencing, the Applicant will install landscape screening around the ground equipment area's fencing.

SEKHAR KOTA, Mobilitie, LLC made a presentation showing additional DAS projects that they have built. He noted that the property owner, Live Nation, asked them to use a wood fence rather than a PVC fence as it would match other fencing currently at the location.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN and COMMISSIONER KRONER stated they were leaning towards PVC fencing. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated he agreed and preferred the PVC fencing as previously stated because it is more durable and aesthetically pleasing. COMMISSIONER KRONER added that precedence should be set for similar projects in future to use PVC fencing.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, noted that during the Applicant's presentation an email was received by MS. KISLER from BRIAN RUTKOWSKI, General Manager, Live Nation (Manager and Owner of Hollywood Casino Amphitheatre). He noted he has been working with Mobilitie and has requested wood fencing to match the fencing on the property and to minimize the difference in fencing materials on the property and surrounding property. He said that by bringing in the PVC fencing it would add an additional fence material to the property and would not appear uniform with the other existing fencing.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK restated he prefers the PVC fencing. He noted this email would not necessarily alter the opinions of the Commission. He said that as long as the color and the tone of the vinyl panels are similar to the wood in tone, it would match and the wood would not be as durable. He respectfully disagrees with this request from Live Nation.

COMMISSIONER SHAW understands the intent to match the existing fencing and has no objection to wood to be consistent but also recognizes the durability of the PVC versus wood. He said that he would not reject the petition solely on that point.

MR. KOTA stated that as an option Mobilitie would be willing to do a maintenance plan at their expense in order to use the wood fence. A subcontractor would inspect and maintain the fence if the Commission would consider this.

MS. WALLRICH stated that the Commission has deviated in terms of the shelter as the Village has required brick shelters in the past and this is probably a cost issue. She suggested that they are saving money on the shelter and so that savings should go into the PVC fencing.

MR. KOTA stated that they would use a vinyl fence instead of a wood fence.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN thanked MR. KOTA for his comments and said that this project would create a lot of value to the Village.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK advised this is a Public Hearing and asked if there were any objections on the part of the Commissioners or the audience. No one offered any comments.

COMMISSIONER KRONER made a motion, seconded by COMMISSIONER DOMINA, to close the Public Hearing. The motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK asked MS. KISLER to review the Standards for Site Plan Approval and the Findings of Fact for the Special Use Permit.

MS. KISLER noted that this project requires both a Site Plan Approval from the Plan Commission and a recommendation for approval of a Special Use Permit from the Plan Commission, which would then be final approved by the Village Board. She presented the Findings of the Fact for the Special Use Permit and noted that the Applicant met the conditions for Site Plan Approval.

Standards for Site Plan Approval:

- It is a Permitted Use in the district in which the property is located.
- The existing site has adequate parking, access, and lighting.
- Adequate ingress and egress exists for the different Cellular carriers to get to it.
- They don't have any outdoor trash enclosures associated with this project.
- There is no issue with the location of any of the site plan components such as the antennas or the ground equipment. It is all placed in an appropriate area based on the site.

Findings of Fact for the Special Use Permit:

- The project will bring better cell service to the amphitheater area.
- It will not impair the property values because there are no dwelling units within 1,600 ft. from the ground equipment shelter area.
- The antennas will not impede development.
- This will contribute to Tinley Park as a whole by increasing the cellular coverage at the Amphitheatre. Music is our brand and we want people to use the venue.

A motion was made by COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI, seconded by COMMISSIONER DOMINA, to grant the Petitioner, Carrie Lindenberg of Mobilitie, LLC, of behalf of Live Nation, Site Plan Approval for ground equipment accessory to a Distributed Antenna System (DAS) at 19100 Ridgeland Avenue (Hollywood Casino Amphitheatre) within the ORI PD (Office and Restricted Industrial, Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The proposed DAS includes antennas that will be mounted on the existing amphitheater structures, antennas mounted on up to five (5) existing light poles at a height no greater than twenty-five (25) feet, related ground equipment, and an eight (8) foot tall PVC privacy fence and landscaping that surrounds the ground equipment lease area, in accordance with plans (included in the meeting packet) prepared by Terra Consulting Group, LTD. with revision dates of 12/20/2016 and 1/18/2017.

AYE: PLAN COMMISSIONERS JOHN DONIMA, KEVIN BERGTHOLD, ANTHONY JANOWSKI, LORI KAPPEL, PETER KRONER, MARK MOYLAN, KEN SHAW, CHAIRMAN ED MATUSHEK

NAY: None

ABSENT: PLAN COMMISSIONER TIM STANTON

The motion was approved unanimously by roll call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the Motion approved.

A motion was made by COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI, seconded by COMMISSIONER KRONER, to recommend that the Village Board grant a Special Use Permit to the Petitioner, Carrie Lindenberg of Mobilitie, LLC, of behalf of Live Nation, for new antennas and ground equipment accessory to a Distributed Antenna System (DAS) at 19100 Ridgeland Avenue (Hollywood Casino Amphitheatre) within the ORI PD (Office and Restricted Industrial, Planned Unit Development) zoning District. The proposed DAS includes antennas that will be mounted on the existing amphitheater structures, antennas mounted on up to five (5) existing light poles at a height no greater than twenty-five (25) feet. The Plan Commission conditions this recommendation on the requirement that all equipment areas around the light poles and the ground equipment lease area must be surrounded by PVC fencing.

AYE: PLAN COMMISSIONERS JOHN DONIMA, KEVIN BERGTHOLD, ANTHONY JANOWSKI, LORI KAPPEL, PETER KRONER, MARK MOYLAN, KEN SHAW, CHAIRMAN ED MATUSHEK

NAY: None

ABSENT: PLAN COMMISSIONER TIM STANTON

The motion was approved unanimously by roll call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK 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 2, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #2: WORKSHOP: TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK ZONING ORDINANCE (SECTION XII: LEGACY CODE)

Continued discussion per direction of the Village Board and the Plan Commission regarding the Legacy Plan and Legacy Code, including the following topics:

- Street Level Commercial Requirements;
- Permitted, Special, and Prohibited Land Uses;
- Landscape bufferyards; and
- Scrivener’s errors related to legal descriptions and District boundaries.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Kevin Bergthold
John Domina
Anthony Janowski
Peter Kroner
Lori Kappel
Mark Moylan
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner I
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated no action will be taken on the proposed text amendments during the workshop meeting.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director gave a presentation giving background information regarding the Text Amendments. Back in October of 2015 the Board adopted Text Amendments to the Legacy Code (Ordinance 2015-O-045) adopted in 2011. Subsequently the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was created to discuss the Legacy Code and more specifically the adopted Text Amendments. In May of 2016 the Village Board rescinded those same amendments (Ordinance 2016-O-025) returning the Legacy Code to its original state. Community Development Staff was directed to review the rescinded Legacy Code Text Amendments referenced in Ordinance 2016-0-025 and make recommendations regarding any future Text Amendments to the Legacy Code.

MS. WALLRICH noted that a Public Hearing was held in June of 2016 and subsequent meetings with the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Plan Commission provided additional input related to these amendments and resident concerns expressed at the Public Hearing. In November of 2016, the Plan Commission held a workshop at the Central Middle School to address the Legacy Code and the Text Amendments that were rescinded as part of Ordinance 2016-0-025. This was the first workshop since the Public Hearing held in June of 2016 which provided public input on these same amendments. At the workshop Staff provided a general background of the Legacy Plan and Legacy Code along with their research on how other communities address “Street Level Commercial”: In addition Brad Bettenhausen, Village Treasurer presented information regarding the fiscal impact of commercial uses in the Legacy District.

The discussions at the first workshop and subsequent meetings with the CAC have provided Staff with direction regarding a comprehensive review of the Legacy District. Staff recommended the Commission conclude their review of the Text Amendments rescinded with Ordinance 2016-0-025 as that time and continue discussions for future amendments as a subsequent phase of the review of the Legacy Code.

MS. WALLRICH continued her presentation noting that the amendments encompassed five categories. She noted that another workshop will be held on February 16th and a Public Hearing is tentatively scheduled for March 2nd to consider if there are any Text Amendments the Plan Commission would like to recommend to the Village Board.

MS. WALLRICH then outlined the five categories:

1. Street Level Commercial “Required” versus Street Level Commercial “Permitted” in the Downtown Core and Neighborhood Flex Districts.
2. Modifications of the list of Permitted, Special and Prohibited Uses within the Legacy District
3. Landscape bufferyard requirements
4. Correction of various Scriveners’ errors related legal descriptions for District boundaries.
5. Correction of errors on various figures based on corrections to legal descriptions with the Legacy Code.

COMMISSIONER MATUSHEK noted Street Level Commercial is required and he stated he does not understand why it was changed in the first place. We will give it a full hearing and see if there is any rationale to determine why it was originally changed. The consensus of the Commission to this point is that it fulfills one of the objectives of the Legacy Plan which was to maximize the economic future of the downtown area.

Street Level Commercial in the Downtown Core and Neighborhood Flex Districts

MS. WALLRICH noted staff researched street level/ground floor commercial regulations in successful downtown areas in other nearby communities. The analysis overwhelmingly indicated the encouragement of commercial uses on the first floor by prohibiting dwelling units on the street level/ground floor in downtown areas. It was noted that rather than state what was “required” most of the communities said what was “prohibited” in mixed-use buildings. This meant prohibiting first floor dwelling units.

MS. WALLRICH showed a diagram of the Legacy Plan and the Legacy Code. The Legacy District currently prohibits dwelling units at the front of a building at street level in mixed-use buildings according to Section 3.B.3.a of the Legacy Code. The diagram showed orange dots along Oak Park Avenue and North and South Streets in the Downtown Core prohibiting residential single-use structures in these areas, yet allowing them in other areas of the Downtown Core District – thus, the need to identify where “street level commercial” is required. She noted that this was a clear indication that the placement of the orange dots was purposeful.

MS. WALLRICH noted that during discussions with the CAC, it became obvious that further explanation was needed. Staff provides the following for discussion as an amendment to the Legacy Code:

- **Street Level Commercial:** Commercial space which fronts a public right-of-way and is above or on the same plane as the sidewalk or street fronting the building. Commercial space shall include office or retail uses as permitted in the Legacy District but does not include dwelling units. Accessory Residential Uses may occupy a portion of the Street Level Commercial Space in accordance with the limitations.

MS. WALLRICH noted that the amount of Accessory Residential Uses that could be allowed should relate to the building size and that it is possible to address this as a Special Use.

- **Accessory Residential Uses:** A use that is subordinate to residential dwelling units in a mixed-use structure which contribute to the comfort and convenience of the dwelling units. An Accessory Residential Use may include, but not be limited to: recreational space, laundry facilities, sales/rental offices, and/or parking for the private use of those residents of the dwelling units in a mixed-use structure. Accessory Residential Uses must maintain the same commercial architectural character or appearance as the street level commercial space in a mixed-use structure.

MS. WALLRICH noted the code as written now is consistent with what the plan is telling us to do. What we are trying to do is make sure it is clear as to what Street Level Commercial means.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN asked for clarification regarding 50% of a 350' building for Accessory Residential Uses. MS. WALLRICH explained the term and responded it could also be Special Use rather than having a certain percentage as permitted.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated he would feel more comfortable when there is 50% range that the Village Board be involved and it should be Special Use with more scrutiny.

COMMISSIONER KRONER noted no building should have 50% Accessory Residential Uses on the street level. He noted that he understood the need for a leasing office, but street level parking should not be allowed. It should be above the commercial space. He also stated that the 50% allowance directly affects the downtown and goes against the spirit of the Legacy Plan. Also, a fitness area only for the residents on the first floor takes away from the commercial space. A leasing office may be necessary, but should be right off the entry way of the building.

COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI noted the Accessory Residential Uses should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. A leasing office should not be in view of the street.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated it sounds like the general consensus is for requiring Special Use.

COMMISSIONER KAPPEL is working on a building in Portage, Indiana. She noted that amenities for these buildings, such as fitness centers, cyber cafes, and clubhouses, are all things that are now being included in multi-family developments.

COMMISSIONER SHAW stated he agrees with the consensus regarding the amount of non-commercial use on the first floor. It is reasonable to have Accessory Residential Uses to some extent, but 50% is too much. He agreed with the approach that above a certain percentage would require a Special Use Permit. He did not feel a strict 0% Accessory Residential Use allowed on the first floor but put a total cap on requiring certain amounts needing a Special Use. COMMISSIONER SHAW questioned if any parcels have a frontage of 350' and expressed concern about losing too much valuable commercial space in the downtown, especially to something that will not be generating revenue for the community. He felt further study was needed and recommended Staff look at a few parcels we have in town and see what percentage of the building was occupied by Accessory Residential Uses.

MS. WALLRICH stated there could be criteria for Special Uses. She questioned what percentage the Commissioners would suggest as a guide to an applicant. She noted North and South Street could possibly have larger parcels for this type of development. She questioned whether 25% for Accessory Residential Uses would work for larger buildings or the Commission could require all Accessory Residential Uses to obtain a Special Use Permit. She also noted that the height of the buildings impacts the amount of Accessory Residential Uses. The downtown allows seven stories, which may make a difference on the amount of amenities.

COMMISSIONER KRONER stated all Accessory Residential Uses should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. He noted that he was not in favor of having parking as an Accessory Residential Use allowed on the street level commercial frontage. In addition, he asked that the percentage of parking allowed on the ground floor table that Staff had submitted for the Commission review be rejected and removed from consideration.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated he preferred that everything in these areas should be Special Use and the Board should have to sign off on it. It should require a full Public Hearing for anything involved in Accessory Residential Use.

MS. WALLRICH stated it is important to provide definitions.

PATRICK CONNELLY, Village Attorney, stated the discussion was excellent and noted that the Commissioners want to protect the commercial nature of the Legacy Code. He recommended the Commission lean toward being stricter and if someone has a different idea let them come before the Commission.

COMMISSIONER SHAW noted the Tinley Pointe Centre building on 183rd is a perfect example of what we should have.

MR. CONNELLY noted the depth of the commercial on the first floor should also be defined. He mentioned that a minimum depth requirement may be something to consider.

COMMISSIONER KRONER stated he did not want a Laundry Facility as an allowable use on the first floor.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about clarifying above grade/below grade. MS. WALLRICH stated 6' is the cut off. 6' about grade is street level. She stated that Staff would provide a definition for Street Level.

Modification of the list of Permitted, Special, and Prohibited Uses within the Legacy District

STEPHANIE KISLER, Planner I, explained also included in the Text Amendment was a change to the Prohibited Uses. With the adoption of Ordinance 2015-0-045, there were two additions to the Prohibited Use List.

- Medical marijuana dispensing facility
- Tobacco, hookah, cigarette, cigar, e-cigarette, and vapor sales establishments and any related on-site consumption, as a primary use.

She noted that Staff is recommending the Commission consider re-adopting these Text Amendments. As discussions continue with the CAC, there may be additional changes to this table that can be incorporated in future Legacy Code Text Amendments.

COMMISSIONER KRONER stated if we get a distillery or a microbrewery a lot of men and women like to go to a cigar shop for a cigar afterwards. He felt a good cigar shop should not be prohibited.

MS. WALLRICH noted the possibility of taking the cigar lounge out of Prohibited Uses and put it in the Special Use category.

MR. CONNELLY noted all these smoking facilities need to be in a stand-alone building per the Illinois Smoke Free Act.

COMMISSIONER SHAW agrees that the cigar lounge should be considered as a Special Use.

COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI stated we should not limit hookah lounges and also put this under the Special Use category. Some people have a preference for that and we want to keep people in the downtown.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated we should prohibit stand-alone tobacco retail stores. Lounges would be okay, but retail would not be okay. Medical marijuana should be kept as a prohibited use.

Landscape Bufferyard Clarification

MS. WALLRICH noted during the review of some of the more recent developments in the Legacy District, Staff discovered an issue related to required landscape bufferyards that had not been adequately addressed previously in the Legacy Code. Specifically, there was concern regarding the treatment of bufferyards for properties adjacent to Non-Legacy Code Areas. Staff proposed the following change to the regulation:

Properties Adjacent to Non-Legacy Code Area

A bufferyard is required between an alley and a parcel located outside of the Legacy Code Area and/or between the rear of any property that has a surface parking lot and a parcel outside of the Legacy Code Area. The minimum standard shall be a minimum bufferyard of 5'.

The Commissioners did not voice any issues with the proposed changes.

Correction of Various Scrivener's Errors Related to Legal Descriptions for District Boundaries

MS. KISLER noted that Staff has researched the various Scrivener's errors that were included in the previously approved Text Amendments in Ordinance 2015-0-045 and found them to be legitimate. Staff recommends the Commission include

these corrections in any proposed amendments. She noted that the Staff Report shows a table of the affected properties. She mentioned that all affected property owners will be identified and notified of these corrections.

The Commissioners did not voice any issues with the proposed changes.

Correction of Errors in Various Figures Based on Corrections to Legal Descriptions

MS. KISLER noted that, correlating to the correction of the Scriveners' errors, Staff is recommending revisions to nineteen affected Figures within the Legacy Code. This Text Amendment would visually codify the verbiage from the corrected legal descriptions. She noted that one other figure must be corrected since it was labeled incorrectly.

The Commissioners did not voice any issues with the proposed changes.

MS. WALLRICH noted that all comments from tonight will be addressed and put into Text and discussed at the next Workshop on February 16, 2017. The CAC is meeting on Monday, February 6th and will discuss the same topics and also review the Plan Commission's comments from this meeting.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2017 REGULAR MEETING
ITEM #3: WORKSHOP: TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK ZONING ORDINANCE (SECTION II: AND SECTION IX) RELATED TO SIGN REGULATIONS

Continued discussion regarding proposed Text Amendments to the Village's Sign Regulations.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Kevin Berghold
John Domina
Anthony Janowski
Peter Kroner
Lori Kappel
Mark Moylan
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kislner, Planner I
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, asked the Commissioners to look through their packets and review the draft of Section IX. The proposed amendments will be further discussed at the next meeting.

RECEIVE COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Resident #1: Expressed concern regarding the discussion of the Accessory Residential Uses. He noted Street Level Commercial should be required.

Resident #2: I am in favor of cigar and hookah lounges to be considered as Special Use.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, asked the Village Attorney to clarify that Staff was directed to look at the Text Amendments.

PATRICK CONNELLY, Village Attorney, responded that is correct.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a Motion was made by COMMISSIONER MOYLAN, seconded by COMMISSIONER DOMINA, to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of February 2, 2017 at 9:58 p.m. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the meeting adjourned.