



MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK,
COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS
MAY 18, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on May 18, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL

Plan Commission: Mark Moylan
Kevin Berghold
Peter Kroner
Tim Stanton
Lori Kappel
Ken Shaw
Anthony Janowski (arrived at 7:34 p.m.)
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): None

Village Officials and Staff: Michael Glotz, Trustee
Tom Condon, Village Attorney
Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner I
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK called to order the Regular meeting of the Plan Commission for May 18, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

COMMISSIONER STANTON stated in the May 4, 2017 minutes he asked about security cameras being installed at McDonald's and would like the minutes to be amended to state that question and the Petitioner's answer.

Minutes of the May 4, 2017 regular meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER

MOYLAN to approve the Minutes as amended. 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 MAY 18, 2017 REGULAR MEETING
ITEM #1: PLAT APPROVAL: FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH – 7025 179TH STREET – PLAT OF CONSOLIDATION

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, First Baptist Church, approval for a Plat of Consolidation upon Annexation. The proposed Plat of Consolidation would combine PIN 28-31-300-013-0000 and PIN 28-31-300-014-0000 into a single parcel encompassing approximately 66,573 square feet (1.53 + acres).

Present were the following

Plan Commissioners: Mark Moylan
Kevin Bergthold
Peter Kroner
Tim Stanton
Lori Kappel
Ken Shaw
Anthony Janowski (arrived at 7:34 p.m.)
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): None

Village Officials and Staff: Michael Glotz, Trustee
Tom Condon, Village Attorney
Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner I
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, stated the Applicant proposes to consolidate their two (2) parcels into one (1) single lot at the time that the property annexes into the Village. The Annexation Agreement has already been drafted. There is a minimum lot size for churches of two (2) acres. The Agreement acknowledges that the combined parcel is less than the two (2) acre minimum requirement for churches; however, the Agreement notes this as a legal nonconformity.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked why two (2) acres are necessary. MS. WALLRICH replied that this is possibly due to the attendance a church may have on Sunday and the need to accommodate parking.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN asked if there were plans for sidewalks in the future. MS. WALLRICH replied that when 179th Street is improved, the Annexation Agreement does provide for that. When this property expands, redevelops, or has a different use than its existing structure, they would have to participate in the development of 179th Street.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK, with there being no further comment, asked for a motion.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER MOYLAN, seconded by COMMISSIONER KRONER, to recommend that the Village Board grant approval for a Plat of Consolidation to the Applicant, First

Baptist Church, to combine PIN 28-31-300-013-0000 and PIN 28-31-300-014-0000 into a single parcel encompassing approximately 66,573 square feet (1.53 + acres), located at 7025 179th Street.

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

NAY: NONE

The Motion was approved 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 MAY 18, 2017 REGULAR MEETING
ITEM #2: WORKSHOP: PARALLEL VERIZON CELL TOWER – 6775 PROSPERI DRIVE – SITE PLAN APPROVAL, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, AND A VARIATION FOR MAXIMUM HEIGHT

Consider granting Site Plan Approval and consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, Kathleen Groark of Insite, Inc. as agent for PI Tower Development LLC, Parallel Infrastructure, and Verizon Wireless, a Special Use Permit for a new personal wireless service facility (cell tower) in the southeast corner of the site at 6775 Prosperi Drive in the ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial) Zoning District. Additionally, the Village of Tinley Park proposes to co-locate antennas on the aforementioned cell tower which brings the overall height of the cell tower to one hundred fourteen feet (114’); therefore, the Petitioner also requests a fourteen foot (14’) Variation from Section III.V.2.a. of the Zoning Ordinance where the maximum allowable height for a personal wireless service facility, which is one hundred feet (100’).

Present were the following

Plan Commissioners: Mark Moylan
Kevin Berghold
Peter Kroner
Tim Stanton
Lori Kappel
Ken Shaw
Anthony Janowski (arrived at 7:34 p.m.)
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): None

Village Officials and Staff: Michael Glotz, Trustee
Tom Condon, Village Attorney
Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kislner, Planner I
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

Guest (s): Kathleen Groark, Insite, Inc.

STEPHANIE KISLER, Planner I, stated the proposed cell tower will primarily service the amphitheater area. The initial carrier will be Verizon and the Village will add some antennas on the top of the structure for Village needs. There is additional room on the monopole for another co-location in the future. She stated to the west of the proposed site is Oak Park Avenue, to the north is Prosperi Drive, and the property just north of the site is the Tinley Park Corporate Center, which is just south of I-80. She said south of the proposed site is the north access road to the amphitheater.

MS. KISLER added that the zoning is ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial). It is currently owned and operated by a Community Services Foundation which is a non-profit organization. The nearest residential structure is over 2,000 feet away from the proposed cell tower, so the cell tower will not negatively impact any residential dwellings if constructed at this location. She said the Site Plan includes the proposed cell tower and the related ground equipment, a six foot tall vinyl privacy fence will surround the ground equipment, and improvements to landscaping. The proposed cell tower will have Verizon antennas centered at seventy feet and three antennas for the Village of Tinley Park – one centered at eighty feet and two at the top of the monopole with a maximum height of one hundred fourteen feet. There is also room for a future co-location at ninety feet. There will also be a lightning rod which will be five feet tall bringing the total height up to 114 feet. The Village code states the maximum height is 100 feet, so there will be a Variance required for the Village antennas. Staff recommends an eight foot tall fence to give more coverage of the ground equipment. Staff also recommends improvements to landscaping at the site in the north bufferyard per the approved Landscape Plan for 6775 Prosperi Drive.

KATHLEEN GROARK, Insite, Inc., gave a presentation of the proposed cell tower plan. MS. GROARK noted that the eight foot tall fence is acceptable and she has been working with the property owner on the improvements to the Landscape Plan.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK agreed that the eight foot fence is a good idea for security purposes.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked if the small sliver of property adjacent to the site is a buildable lot and who owns the property. He also noted he agrees with the need for an eight foot fence. MS. KISLER replied the triangular property to the east of the site is owned by the same person that owns the amphitheater.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked if the notification was made to Community Service Foundation. MS. GROARK replied that this was brought before their Board and was acceptable.

COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI asked if there are wetlands on this property. MS. GROARK replied that a Wetland Delineation was done on this site and they are reaching out to the Army Corp of Engineers and the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District regarding this location.

COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI noted there are two sites where the approved fences were never erected around the cellular ground equipment. MS. KISLER replied that the work is not complete and final inspections have not been done at these locations and she will follow-up.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE MAY 18, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #3: WORKSHOP: THE RESIDENCE AT BROOKSIDE GLEN – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MAGNUSON LANE AND 191ST STREET – SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Consider granting Site Plan Approval and consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, Andrea Crowley of Griffen & Gallagher, LLC on behalf of Karli Mayher and KJM-Vandenberg Brookside Joint Venture, a Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation from the Brookside Glen Planned Unit Development and any related Exceptions to develop a one hundred forty-four (144) unit multi-family residential project (a.k.a. The Residence at Brookside Glen) at the properties generally located west of Magnuson Lane and John Michael Drive in the R-5 PD (Low Density Residential) Zoning District.

Present were the following

Plan Commissioners: Mark Moylan
Kevin Bergthold
Peter Kroner
Tim Stanton
Lori Kappel
Ken Shaw
Anthony Janowski (arrived at 7:34 p.m.)
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): None

Village Officials and Staff: Michael Glotz, Trustee
Tom Condon, Village Attorney
Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Kisler, Planner I
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

Guest (s): Andrea Crowley, Griffin & Gallagher, LLC
Karli Mayher, KJM-Vandenberg Brookside Joint Venture
Scott Shalvis, The Shalvis Group

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated he had a letter to read to the Commission from MAYOR VANDENBERG:

May 18, 2017

To: Plan Commission of The Village of Tinley Park

It has come to my attention that certain social media sites have alleged that I have some sort of interest in the “Residences” at Brookside Glen which is before you tonight. I want to be clear that this information is patently false.

First, I have no interest in this property to project whatsoever. That includes financial or otherwise as defined by the Tinley Park Village Code or any other ethics statute I’m aware of. My uncle, my father’s brother, is the owner of the property in question. I want to reiterate that I personally am not involved nor do I have any interest in this endeavor or any other company or endeavors that my uncle, Scot Vandenberg, is involved in.

Moreover, I have never and will never use my position, either as Trustee or Mayor, to advocate for or against this project or any other project that a family member may be involved in. I hope this information helps you in analyzing this project like all others before you in accordance with the Zoning Code of Tinley Park and all other State and Federal laws.

Respectfully,

Jacob C. Vandenberg
Mayor

cc: Village Board
David Niemeyer, Village Manager
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney

COMMISSIONER STANTON stated, pursuant to the Village of Tinley Park’s Code of Ethics, “I hereby disclose that I have an indirect family relationship with the owner of the subject property. I have spoken to the Village Attorney and he has advised me that in the interest of caution I should avoid any occurrence of impropriety, that I should refrain from participating in any conversation or deliberation regarding this Petition and abstain from any vote taken.”

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK noted that this is Workshop, not a Public Hearing. He noted there will be time for Public Comment at the end of the meeting.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, stated the approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) for this area allows for nine (9) 16-unit structures for a total of 144 units. The developer has a right to develop according to the approved plan. As a consequence of the Petitioner’s Market Study which outlined current market trends, the market is different than it was back in 2000 when the Substantial Deviation was approved. She noted that the Village is trying to attract young professionals to the area. The Petitioner has proposed a plan that complies with the approved density and unit count; however, instead of nine (9) structures, they are proposing two (2) multi-family structures. The reduction in the number of structures will provide for more green space with luxury amenities.

MS. WALLRICH stated when the PUD was approved in 1990 there were plans for community shopping (commercial uses) adjacent to 191st Street and 80th Avenue, south of the commercial was planned to be office and restricted industrial, and south and west of that was planned for condo and apartments. A Substantial Deviation was approved in 2000 which identified nine (9) structures with sixteen (16) units in each structure. In 2007, a developer proposed nine (9) buildings with eight (8) units each and one (1) building with sixteen (16) units. This proposal did not obtain Plan Commission approval and did not make it to the Village Board for approval. In 2014, a proposal was submitted for 123 units in seventeen

(17) buildings comprised of between four (4) to fifteen (15) attached single-family attached rowhouse-style dwelling units per building. The developer did not consider the pipeline that traversed the property and therefore the project did not move forward with revised plans. Thus, the PUD plan that was approved in 2000 still stands which included 144 units in nine (9) buildings.

MS. WALLRICH noted the subject property is surrounded by the R-5 Zoning District. Across Magnuson Lane is commercial zoning and then to the south is R-2 single-family residential zoning. There is a pump station on the south end of the proposed site and detention on the north. The PUD notes commercial sites located both at the southwest and southeast corners of 191st Street and 80th Avenue. There are condos over to the east of 80th Avenue along Greenway Boulevard which are similar in height and architectural design in that they are 4-story buildings with semi-underground garages. In addition to straight R-5 zoning there is an Overlay District in this area, which is an Urban Design Overlay (UDO) District. The whole point of this district is to prioritize the architecture and the streetscape and not the vehicle. There are specific guidelines that are required, such as making sure that the property is not fronted with parking along the public right-of-way. In negotiating with this Developer, Staff made sure that the building was moved up to the front and the parking was pushed back behind and to the side the structures.

MS. WALLRICH stated the Brookside Glen PUD was originally 828 acres in 1990 when the original builder came in and Master Planned the area. They did their best to plan how the area might develop; however, with market and economic changes since that time, developers have had to adapt to what the market is dictating. A PUD it is flexible regarding zoning regulations and anything can be negotiated at the time of the approval of the PUD. If it was straight zoning they would have to abide by the regulations within the Zoning Ordinance. With a PUD, the developer and the Village negotiate to comprehensively master plan an area and exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance can be considered. When the Plan Commission looks at a Variation they must consider the burden of proof on the developer to prove that there is a hardship for that Variation. They also must look at the precedence that it is setting. The beauty of a PUD is that it is not a straight Variation; it is looked at as an exception. The burdens of proof and the Finding of Facts are not the same. When the Plan Commission looks at these types of exceptions, they will look and judge and make the decisions based on the original intent of the PUD.

STEPHANIE KISLER, Planner I, discussed the Site Plan. She noted that the buildings wrap around Magnuson Lane. She noted that Magnuson Lane will connect north to 191st Street. There are two (2) residential buildings with a one-story clubhouse structure in the middle with many amenities on the site.

MS. KISLER said originally when this developer came to the Village the plans showed two (2) residential buildings but behind the buildings there were long rows of garages. There was no first floor subterranean level parking under the building – it was all surface parking and garages. This presented an issue with fire code and with the overall aesthetics of the project. Staff worked with the developer to improve the Site Plan and reconfigure parking. Staff also suggested changes to the access points near the proposed dog park. Staff worked with the developer to increase the greenspace and amenities at the site. The developer removed the garages and now there are 144 indoor parking spaces and 144 surface parking spaces which allow for two (2) parking spaces per dwelling unit. The developer proposes to land bank additional parking. There are outdoor grilling stations with a sink, Frisbee golf and many other amenities.

MS. KISLER showed the current Site Plan with improvements. She said the developer has reconfigured the access points to the garage so there are two (2) entrances to the main parking garages. They have also land banked some of the parking spaces. In the latest proposal, there is no parking in front of the buildings. They are proposing 72 land banked parking spaces if additional parking becomes necessary. Currently there are two (2) parking spaces per unit (one interior and one exterior) and if more parking is needed the land banked spaces will make it 2 ½ spaces per dwelling unit. There are 48 two bedroom units and 24 one bedroom units per building.

MS. KISLER stated the Urban Design Overlay District requires a maximum building setback of 20 feet. Proposed building setbacks range from 14 to 36 feet from the property line along Magnuson Lane. In this case, the intent of the overlay district is to push the buildings forward, but we want to make sure the building is respectful of the scale of the building and the character of the street. There will be green space between the street and the building. Additionally, the curvature of the street and the resulting sight lines along with the curvature of the building provides for a more pedestrian scale to the streetscape.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked what the setback is on the existing condo buildings. MS. KISLER replied the setback for the condos is about 24-30'.

COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI asked about the locations for snow removal. MS. WALLRICH replied that the land banking will provide areas for the snow removal and more green space.

MS. KISLER showed a view of the Landscape Plan with a plentiful number of plantings and green space. There will be berming around the base of the structures to mitigate appearance of the blank walls of the parking structure. The developer has incorporated a lot of amenities, including a clubhouse with an outdoor pool. Inside the clubhouse there will be a fitness center, locker rooms, meeting rooms, lounge, computer room with free Wi-Fi and a great room with kitchen. Outside by the pool there will be cabanas. There will be outdoor grilling areas for each building which include a grill station, fire pits, outdoor seating, a pergola and a service sink. There will be Frisbee golf baskets around the site, interior and exterior bike storage, electric car charging stations, exterior exercise circuit equipment, an arboretum area with seating, a dog park with seating and a water fountain, a bike trail connection to a major bike trail system which will meet up with the Old Plank Road Trail. There will be a landscape buffer around the dog park. Each unit has at least one private balcony.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked about underground parking shown in yellow on her diagram. MS. KISLER replied this is additional garage space to make sure there is one indoor parking space per unit. This also gives the residents a rooftop terrace area which is an additional amenity. COMMISSIONER KRONER also asked about the size of the parking spaces. MS. KISLER replied that the parking spaces meet the Village's size requirements.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN asked about moving the dog park from the area close to the townhouses to the other side. SCOTT SHALVIS, The Shalvis Group, architect on behalf of the developer, replied that is not possible as there is a retention area on the other side.

MS. KISLER stated there will be adequate lighting for the parking lot with no light spilling on the neighboring properties. There will be decorative light fixtures. Staff has asked them to add wall sconces near the entry doors and garage doors to add to the aesthetics and the residential character of the building.

MS. KISLER stated the Applicant has provided an interior trash room for the tenants. They will have a management company handle the trash collection from interior to the exterior trash enclosures. The outdoor trash enclosures will be constructed with materials matching the façade of the buildings with sturdy gates and landscaping around them.

MS. WALLRICH stated condo financing has become very difficult. The developer must have at least 80-90% of the units sold before starting construction. This is what is steering the market right now to start to look at rental properties rather than ownership. The market studies state Tinley Park has low vacancy rate in terms of apartments. This is what is pushing the market towards a rental project on this site. A concern could be the long term upkeep and maintenance of these facilities. She stated that staff reviewed the quality of the materials and the development and the amenities on the property. Staff reviewed this

project and worked with the developer to increase the number of luxury amenities and improve the architecture, and thereby the cost of the buildings. This somewhat insures a certain rate of return the owner is going to want.

MS. WALLRICH said Staff worked with the developer on the architecture. Staff requested some modulation of the roof line, a better demarcation of the entryway, and to make sure the parking floor was screened and somewhat mitigated in terms of the height. The street façade had a central architectural feature to identify the street access. Staff appreciated the floor to ceiling windows adding to the overall luxury feeling of the building. The top floor has 13' ceilings. The amount of balcony space was increased with one to two balconies per unit. There is a roof deck with no HVAC units on the roof. Each unit has its own HVAC unit.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked about the HVAC units. He said it reminds him of a hotel HVAC system. He stated he doesn't remember any luxury apartments in Chicago having this type of unit; usually it is a water based unit or their own furnace with one thermostat per room. MR. SHALVIS replied that this is not his experience. He stated these are vertical units that are self-contained. He said this is like a furnace that has duct work to it. With this system, it is possible to have extra compressors on site for maintenance. If something goes out they can replace the one unit. It is a maintenance and efficiency issue. He said there will be one thermostat per unit. It also makes conversion to condominiums easier.

MS. WALLRICH stated the following unit types are proposed:

- 44 two bedroom, two bath units with square footages of 1,286 – 1,356
- 4 two bedroom, two bath units with a study with square footages of 1,616
- 4 one bedroom, one and a half bath units with square footages of 1,073
- 20 one bedroom, one bath units with square footages of 924 – 987

She noted all units exceed the minimum size requirements.

MS. WALLRICH stated on the first floor, there will be landscaping trained against the wall on the parking garage. Staff wanted to see something that broke up the expanse of each façade through the articulation and the insets and the outsets of the building and the undulating roof line and the modulating berm across the front. There is a pergola structure over both entrances on the east and west side. The terrace over the garage is 47 x 93 feet. This is a common terrace for everyone to enjoy. The outside corner units have wrap-around balconies. The standard balconies are 13 x 6 feet.

MS. WALLRICH added that one of the considerations when you look at the R-5 district is that the maximum building height is 35'. The existing condos on Greenway Boulevard are 62' tall. When this was originally approved in 2000, there was an allowance in building height from 3 stories to 4 stories along with underground parking. Later, in the agreement it mentions 56' in height; subsequent to that the buildings were built at 62'. It is important to look at the scale of these buildings in relationship to those buildings. In the proposed structure at the tallest peak over the entrances it is 71' but building height is defined as the mean height. In that case, the tallest roof would be 65' and the most predominant thing you would see is the ridge at 64' which is 2' taller than the existing condos. When you judge height, it is the perception from the street from the pedestrian scale that is important. .

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked about building setbacks. These existing buildings average 24-30', an average of 27' plus or minus 3 feet with a variance of 11% rounded to 10%. He said the developer is asking us to go to a 14' setback in some instances. To keep consistent with the units around there, the developer is proposing plans with 14-36' building setbacks. This is 25' plus or minus 11' or a variance of over 40%. MS. WALLRICH replied it is not so much the average because the way the Urban Design Overlay District is written it encourages the buildings to be closer to the street. The intent of the District

is to make sure the automobile and parking is not dominating the streetscape. In terms of setbacks, the ordinance states a maximum of 20'. The existing buildings have a maximum of 34' which is 14' further back from the ROW. The buildings being proposed here are 16' beyond the maximum of 20', so there is only 2' difference between the setback of the proposed structures and the existing condos. She noted that a 14' setback meets code and anything under 20' meets code. She added that this is not a straight zoning issue, because the property is part of a PUD and you have to consider the context of what is already constructed in the area. The existing structures are 2' less in height and 2' less in setback. The predominant horizontal line of the proposed building is 64' and the predominant horizontal line of the existing building is 62'. The setback of these buildings is 14' out of maximum conformance which is in code. She also noted how buildings curve along Magnuson Lane will mitigate the scale and setback of those buildings.

MS. WALLRICH noted the exceptions that the Plan Commission needs to consider would be building height and building setbacks. The other structure on site is the clubhouse. Staff felt the original proposed elevation of the clubhouse was not consistent with the architecture proposed on the residential buildings. The architect was asked to modify the east facade to reflect more of a street presence. The building materials are consistent with the residential structures and the clubhouse measures 19' in height.

MR. SHALVIS gave a presentation on the building materials. The proposed plans call for using precast panels with embedded thin brick on the façades.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked what type of construction materials were used on the existing buildings on Greenway Boulevard. He inquired about using pre-cast on the proposed buildings.

MR. SHALVIS stated the existing buildings are brick and block. The proposed buildings are using precast because of the quality of material and speed and time of construction. This will be a true brick on the exterior. You could not build the proposed buildings the way the existing buildings were built. The clubhouse will be a brick and block construction. He stated he has built other luxury buildings with this type of construction and they are beautiful. The precast is more expensive but will take less time. He added the precast shell is \$7.5 million.

ANDREA CROWLEY, Griffin & Gallagher, LLC, attorney on behalf of the developer, gave a presentation regarding the proposed development. She stated this Project is on a piece of property that currently supports the zoning. She stated they are not asking for any deviations from the density that was approved. She stated constructing the two (2) buildings looks better than what was originally proposed. She noted a Market Study was done and was made available to Staff just prior to the meeting.

KARLI MAYHER, KJM-Vandenberg Brookside Joint Venture, developer, gave a presentation regarding the proposed development. She stated the rents will be from \$1,500 to \$2,500 based on the other rents in the area.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN asked about the 3% vacancy rate in Orland Park at the 9750 apartment building.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about the current plan and whether it is a single-phase development. He also asked if the proposed amenities will be what is truly offered and if they will be available to the first occupants versus being added later on. He noted the hallways seem very long and straight. He asked if this be 100% rental and are there any plans to convert to condo at a later date if the market changes? Lastly, he asked about the height of the parking.

MS. MAYHER responded that these are the amenities and they will be there right from the start. There are no plans to convert to condos in the future but it would be possible. The units are all self-contained.

MR. SHALVIS responded that the hallways will have areas that will break up the hallways with seating areas and elevators. The parking height was raised to 13'.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked about public transportation and proximity to the train stations. He also noted he would really like to see the Market Study.

MS. MAYHER replied that people could use bikes to get to the train station.

MS. WALLRICH stated that the Village is looking at plans to extend the bike trails in the area and there will be future bike improvements along 80th Avenue.

COMMISSIONER KAPPEL asked about the anticipated construction schedule. She noted that she would like to see details on the pool fencing prior to the Public Hearing.

MS. MAYHER stated they would like to break ground this fall and the construction would take 10 to 12 months. She noted the pool will be fenced in.

COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI asked why the 2014 proposal was not approved. He said he looked at the Plan Commission minutes from that time and there was nothing in the minutes.

MS. WALLRICH replied that the issue was related to the pipeline on the property and it never went further.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about security cameras.

MS. MAYHER stated there will not be security cameras; all the residents will have key fobs. There will be a system at the main entrance where you can be buzzed in with your cell phone.

RECEIVE COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Resident #1- Had comments regarding the Pumping Station in his back yard. He stated a request to go from 3 stories to 4 stories never got to a vote. If it didn't get to 4 stories it didn't require an elevator. They were concerned about set back from the people. He felt it was odd that this was all approved in 1990 but never voted on. On Pumping station itself – there are major swale issues. That building was put up 10 ft. higher than what it was approved for. Foundation poured 10 ft. too high and it was determined at that point that it's too to change. 100 year flood plane in our back yard adding 10 ft. where this apartment building is, what will that do? It is already a cyclone there, what will that do to rain. No one here on this board can say a rental community in Tinley Park is good. He is concerned about residents on the 4th floor looking in his window. He questioned what is going to happen with schools? He felt it would be difficult to try to get tax dollars out of people who don't live here.

Resident #2 – Treasurer of Homeowners Association. He asked if the negotiations on PUD, includes the issue of ownership vs. rental. Is that something that has to be a variance? He stated that the reason he moved to Brookside Glen was because of all the amenities it had to offer and rental was not one of them. He feels that bicycling to the train is not going to happen. He felt that at \$1500 To 2500 rents anyone can get a home in Brookside Glen, so how can they command those rents.

Resident #3 – Stated they reside in a townhouse adjacent to the property right across from the proposed parking lot. An influx of 144 to 300 transient residents in our community does not support the mission or core values of what we built and tried to maintain for so many years. They stated they oppose the construction of 144 units that will bring people to our community who are not invested.

Resident #4 – Questioned if this project is on the White Board?

Resident #5 – Stated that this project has not been mentioned before. He mentioned that on March 9th he attended a meeting on 80th Ave. improvements and asked someone from the building department if there were any plans for this property. Person said no one has shown interest in this land.

Resident #6 – stated that the 2014 US Census indicates a population of 57280 in Tinley Park , and 58,656 in Orland Park; the number of rental units in Orland Park is 1621, the number of rental units in Tinley Park is 2654. He noted that with 1000 more rental units the Village is saturated with rental units. He feels that rental units have an impact on property values. Too many renters stagnate or decrease home values. This is unfair to the Brookside Glen Community to have more renters. I ask that you side with the homeowners rather than one builder.

Resident #7 – Echoed comments by other residents – and expressed concerns on the part of the Commission to look at the Market Study. He stated that when the density was approved in 1990 – none of the Commissioners were around then. What was approved in 1990 has no bearing on what is happening now. What is the purpose of the Plan Commission?
Can this support \$1500 – 2500 per month rent?

ATTORNEY CONDON noted this Commission has Limitations of Section 7 relating to PUD

Resident #3 (AGAIN) – Section 7, sub section 2J, dictates it has to be within public interest. The fact that this is above the current Ordinance in height, means we can say we do not prefer it. I would like to change it and have it set back 24 ft.

Resident #8 – There is a substantial deviation from the plan. The primary justification seems to be if you do not deviate from the plan you will not be able to build this? The resident stated the project has a direct impact on them; they areas close to it as you can be. There may be a lighting nuisance. A large platform

parking garage will be about 50 yards from where I live and probably about as tall as my townhouse. I will lose any sense of privacy. This will reduce my property values. My back deck is right there. There are really strict guidelines in our HOA. Will the guidelines apply to this complex?

Resident #9 – The addition of 144 cars in our neighborhood will be a hazard to the children in the neighborhood.

Resident #10 – Why is the dog park right behind our property?

Resident #11 – I live on the east side of OP Avenue. The amount of homes for sale in Tinley Park now is 499. There are 2000 rental units. Homes and condos are being rented out. There are abandoned and foreclosed homes. Why will someone come back and rent a luxury apartment in Tinley Park? When you do the Market Analysis, please note all the rentals in TP. Please listen to the citizens. Delay the next meeting because of the June 1st graduation.

Resident #12 – VP of Condo Assn. On the special use Permit five of the issues fail to meet the criteria for this Site Plan. Ingress and egress traffic out of this subdivision is impossible. Once the bridge is completed this will make it worse. There are only 2 entrances.

Resident #3 (Again) - There will be a 232% increase in residential living units for one single entrance and exit.

Resident #13 – 2 huge buildings are not good to look at.

Resident #14 – Will there be a signal needed on 191st and Magnuson? Another traffic study needs to be done – times have changed from the last study. Will the Village be responsible for snow removal? Does the developer own the section to the East? Have you considered Village costs for the future? Police, fire, Public Works...we will be covering that cost value.

Resident #15 – Are there any other complexes in TP that have an in-ground pool? I ask for safety sake? Will the developer have liability insurance?

Resident #16 - Graduation is on June 1, you are missing out on 200 families. The next meeting needs to be rescheduled for 4 weeks.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a Motion was made by COMMISSIONER MOYLAN, seconded by COMMISSIONER KAPPEL, to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of May 18, 2017 at 10:30 p.m. The Motion was unanimously approved by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the meeting adjourned.