



MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK, COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS

JUNE 1, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on June 1, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL

Plan Commission: Mark Moylan
Kevin Berghold
Peter Kroner (arrived at 7:41 p.m.)
Tim Stanton
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Anthony Janowski
Lori Kappel

Village Officials and Staff: Michael Glotz, Trustee
Michael Mangin, Trustee
Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK called to order the Regular meeting of the Plan Commission for June 1, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the May 18, 2017 regular meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER SHAW, seconded by COMMISSIONER STANTON to approve the Minutes. 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 JUNE 1, 2017 REGULAR MEETING
ITEM #1: PUBLIC HEARING: 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. 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 is one hundred feet (100’).

Present were the following
Plan Commissioners:

Mark Moylan
Kevin Bergthold
Peter Kroner
Tim Stanton
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s):

Anthony Janowski
Lori Kappel

Village Officials and Staff:

Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney

Guest (s):

Kathleen Groark, Insite Inc.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER SHAW, seconded by COMMISSIONER STANTON to open the Public Hearing on PARALLEL VERIZON CELL TOWER – 6775 PROSPERI DRIVE SITE PLAN APPROVAL, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, AND A VARIATION FOR MAXIMUM HEIGHT. 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.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, stated Ms. Kathleen Groark of Insite Inc. is in attendance and is seeking Site Plan Approval, a Variation for 14' and a Special Use Permit for a new personal wireless service facility (cell tower). Per the Village Ordinance, anytime a new tower is being erected it requires a Special Use and Public Hearing. The maximum height for a cell tower is 100'. She noted that the Village needs several Public Safety antennas in this area and is requesting use of the tower which will extend the tower by 14'. The height of the proposed tower is 114'; the last 14' is to accommodate the Village.

The Applicant proposes to locate the new cell tower at the southeast corner of the site. The site is owned by Community Services Foundation (CSF), which is a nonprofit agency that provides services to individuals with intellectual disabilities and chronic mental health disorders. The property is located off Oak Park Avenue, south of I-80 and is currently zoned ORI surrounded by M-1 (General Manufacturing) to the north, west, and east, and ORI and M-1 to the south. To the southeast is the Hollywood Amphitheater. The proposed plans indicate a 6' fence, Staff recommends an 8' PVC vinyl fence which the applicant has agreed to.

At the last meeting landscaping improvements were discussed. The southeast area of the property is all naturalized wetland area, so there is no need for additional landscaping in this area. Staff has recommended the bufferyard on the north side of the building be enhanced to meet the original plans for this area and meet the bufferyard requirements.. The Applicant has agreed to do that and Staff will review the plan as part of the occupancy permit.

The Village utilizes an outside consultant to review the RF studies; their analysis supported Verizon's claim of need for this area. Parallel Infrastructure/Verizon has provided the "proof of need" for the Prosperi Drive Tower Site noting that there is an existing need for increased communications capability especially during concerts and other outside events that occur in this area. MS. WALLRICH noted that open items have been satisfied.

KATHLEEN GROARK, Insite Inc., gave a presentation regarding the proposed Parallel Verizon Cell Tower.

COMMISSIONER KRONER requested MS. GROARK inform the property owner that he would like the families of their clients that work in the facility know of the plan to erect the Cell Tower. MS. GROARK replied that this has been done.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about the capacity on the tower. He also asked about the landscape plan. MS. GROARK replied there could be another carrier on the tower depending on the needs of the carrier.

MS. WALLRICH discussed the Standards for the Site Plan Approval, Special Use and Variations.

MS. WALLRICH noted that the issue of adequate landscaping is the most significant outstanding item at this time. Staff is suggesting the approval be conditioned upon final approval of the Landscape Plan with Staff.

MS. WALLRICH stated that when the Commission reviews the Special Use Standards they may wish to consider impact on neighboring property. She noted this is 2000' away from the closest residential.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK hearing no further comment he asked for a Motion to close the Public Hearing.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER SHAW, seconded by COMMISSIONER MOYLAN, to close the Public Hearing on PARALLEL VERIZON CELL TOWER – 6775 PROSPERI DRIVE – SITE PLAN APPROVAL, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, AND A VARIATION FOR MAXIMUM HEIGHT. The Motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the motion approved.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK, hearing no further comment, he asked for a Motion on the Site Plan Approval.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER STANTON, seconded by COMMISSIONER KRONER to recommend that the Village Board grant the Applicant, Kathleen Groark of Insite, Inc. as agent for PI Tower Development LLC, Parallel Infrastructure, and Verizon Wireless, Site Plan Approval for ground equipment accessory to a personal wireless service facility (cell tower) at 6775 Prosperi Drive within the ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial) Zoning District in accordance with plans as noted on the List of Reviewed Plans within the Staff Report. The Plan Commission also adopts the Standards for Site Plan Approval proposed in the Staff Report and discussed at this meeting.

...with the following conditions:

1. That the Applicant installs an eight foot (8') tall vinyl privacy fence around the ground equipment.
2. That the final Landscape Plan be approved by Village Staff prior to release of the Building Permit.

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

NAY: None

ABSENT: PLAN COMMISSIONERS ANTHONY JANOWSKI AND LORI KAPPEL

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

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK, hearing no further comment, asked for a Motion on the Special Use Permit.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER STANTON, seconded by COMMISSIONER SHAW to recommend that the Village Board grant the Applicant, Kathleen Groark of Insite, Inc. as agent for PI Tower Development LLC, Parallel Infrastructure, and Verizon Wireless, a Special Use for a personal wireless service facility (cell tower) at 6775 Prosperi Drive within the ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial) Zoning District. The Plan Commission also adopted the Findings of Fact proposed in the Staff Report and discussed at this meeting.

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

NAY: None

ABSENT: PLAN COMMISSIONERS ANTHONY JANOWSKI AND LORI KAPPEL

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

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK, hearing no further comment, asked for a Motion on the Variation.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER STANTON, seconded by COMMISSIONER SHAW to recommend that the Village Board to grant the Applicant, Kathleen Groark of Insite, Inc. as agent for PI Tower Development LLC, Parallel Infrastructure, and Verizon Wireless, a fourteen foot (14') Variation from Section III.V.2. of the Zoning Ordinance where the maximum allowable height for a personal wireless service facility (cell tower) is one hundred feet (100'). This Variation will allow the cell tower to be maximum height of one hundred fourteen feet (114') in order to accommodate the Village of Tinley Park's antennas at the top of the monopole. The Plan Commission also adopts the Findings of Fact proposed in the Staff Report and discussed at this meeting.

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

NAY: None

ABSENT: PLAN COMMISSIONERS ANTHONY JANOWSKI AND LORI KAPPEL

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 JUNE 1, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

Item #2: PUBLIC HEARING: THE RESIDENCE AT BROOKSIDE GLEN – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MAGNUSON LANE AND 191ST STREET – SITE PLAN PPROVAL AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Consider granting Site Plan Approval and consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, Andrea Crowley of Griffin & 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 Residences at Brookside Glen) fort the properties generally located west of Magnuson Lane and John Michael Drive.

Present were the following
Plan Commissioners:

Mark Moylan
Kevin Bergthold
Peter Kroner
Tim Stanton
Ken Shaw
Ed Matushek III, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s):

Anthony Janowski
Lori Kappel

Village Officials and Staff:

Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney

Guest(s):

Andrea Crowley, Griffin & Gallagher, LLC
Karli Mayher, KJM-Vandenberg Brookside Joint Venture
Scott Shalvis, The Shalvis Group
Carole Ruzich
Steve Gregory

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER SHAW, seconded by COMMISSIONER KRONER to open the Public Hearing on THE RESIDENCE AT BROOKSIDE GLEN – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MAGNUSON LANE AND 191ST STREET – SITE PLAN PPROVAL AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A SUBSTANTIAL DEVIATION. 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.

COMMISSIONER STANTON stated due to his earlier notification at the Workshop held on May 18, 2017, he abstains.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated he had a notification to read on COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI'S behalf:

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I sincerely apologize, but unfortunately I will not be in attendance for tonight's meeting. I would like to express as previously mentioned at the last meeting, that many children are graduating on June 1st in the Tinley Park community, my son, as well is one of these individuals graduating. The residents are an impactful component of any public hearing and this solidifies a positive force in building our community in its entirety. With many residents not available to attend due to the school graduation conflict, consideration should be conveyed in making transparent decisions on agenda items that are being proposed at the June 1st Plan Commission meeting that can impact our community.

Sincerely,
COMMISSIONER TONY JANOWSKI

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK noted this meeting is a Public Hearing. The Plan Commission does not have the power to approve this; all we can do is make recommendations to the Village Board to do the approval. If we conclude this Public Hearing tonight, it will be up for approval at the Village Board meeting on June 20. If the Public Hearing is continued it will be up for approval at the Village Board meeting on July 11 for First Reading and July 18 for approval.

ATTORNEY PATRICK CONNELLY noted the procedure.

- Staff will present their report.
- Petitioner will then give their presentation.
- The Commission will have a chance to discuss among themselves.
- Public Comments.

This Commission is here to make zoning decisions based on the Village Code and State law.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, stated the original PUD was approved in 1990 with a Substantial Deviation approved in 2000 which provided for 22 buildings with 16 units in each structure for a total of 352 dwelling units. To-date thirteen (13) of these buildings have been constructed ((208 dwelling units) thereby leaving nine structures of 16 units (144 units total) approved for construction in the subject area. . The Applicant is requesting the same density as approved (144) but instead of 9 buildings, they are asking for 2 buildings. The Applicant will provide information on the amenities they plan on providing. When there is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) regular zoning district regulations are suspended and a variance of Code is looked at as an Exception rather than a Variation which involves certain findings and also establishes precedence. She noted that when you review exception requests you do it in the context of the original PUD rather than the strict rules of variations of underlying zoning districts.

The History of this property is:

- In 1989 the PUD was part of a Pre-Annexation agreement, Ordinance 89-0-052. There was a variety of land uses considered.

- In 1990 the annexation agreement was approved as Resolution 90-R-002.
- In 2000, a Substantial Deviation from the PUD was approved for twenty-two 16 unit condo buildings.
- In 2001, Final Plat for buildings 1-7 was approved
- In 2002, Final Plat for buildings 8 & 9 was approved.
- In 2004, Final Plat for building 10-13 was approved
(MS. WALLRICH noted that with the original approval which provided for 22 buildings of 16 units each, the remaining 9 buildings are located on the subject property and noted as buildings 14-22 on the PowerPoint)
- Between 2004 and 2007 there were various proposals that came before the Village on the subject parcel..
- In 2007 there was a proposal for 9 two story (8 unit) townhome buildings with one 4-story, 16 unit structure for a total of 88 dwelling units. It did not receive a positive recommendation from the Plan Commission due to architecture and orientation of buildings.
- In 2014 there was a proposal for 123 3-story row house buildings - 17 buildings in all. This went through several meetings of the Plan Commission and at that time they were unaware of the pipeline, so the project stopped and never went to Village Board for approval.
- In July 2016 the current proposal submitted an application. The first submittal did not include underground parking; instead separate rows of garages bordered the property. Since that time Staff has been working with the Applicant to improve the site plan and the architecture of the project.

The Zoning on the property dates back to 1990 when the Annexation Agreement for the property noted it as R-6. She reminded the Commission of her earlier comment that zoning regulations of the district are suspended with a Planned Unit Development.

The property is bordered by the ComEd transmission lines to the west, B-3 PD to the east, R-5 PD to the south and southeast and R-2 PD to the far south. This site is located within the Urban Design Overlay District.

MS. WALLRICH presented an exhibit which indicated distances to the nearest existing townhome to the garages is 195' and 198' to the front of the building.

A Market Study was delivered today from Tracy Cross & Associates. It will be posted on the Village web site.

The Site Plan Review shows 2 multi-family residential structures and a club house. The buildings follow the curve of the Magnuson Lane which helps to mitigate the impact and scale of the buildings. The Applicant has provided an updated Site Plan based on comments from the 5/18/2017 Plan Commission meeting. The revised Site Plan is different from the previous one because it shows the southern access point being combined. Additionally, parking has been land banked nearest the proposed private dog park to reduce the number of vehicles near the adjacent townhomes and the area closest to Magnuson Lane to effectively place all parking behind the building setback. Constructed parking has been provided will be 2 parking spaces per unit with land banking totaling a ratio of 2.5 spaces per unit.

The setback in the Urban Design Overlay District (UD-1) is set at 20' as a maximum. Building 1 is 20 to 24' and building 2 is 22 to 36'. The point of the Urban Design Overlay District, which establishes a maximum front yard setback of 20', is to make sure we are not lining the front of these buildings on the street with parking. These setbacks are consistent with the existing buildings. She also noted that the UD-1 is intended to provide specific design standards for non-residential buildings; however, Staff

elected to apply the intent of these standards to this project due to the scale of the project and the desire to protect the streetscape and eliminate its possible dominance by parking.

The Applicant has submitted some changes to the landscape plan based on our Landscape Architect's consultant. They have agreed to meet the intent of all Code Requirements. She noted that special attention will be paid for the area between the dog park and the back of the townhouses and will request the use of evergreens.

There will be 2 parking spaces per unit and additional land banking spaces. There are 144 spaces under the building and 144 surface spaces with an additional 72 that are land banked. The public sidewalks will be extended and connected along Magnuson. The detention pond will be improved to Village standards. There will be a bike trail installed to connect to the Brookside Glen trail.

Lighting Photometric Plan meet the Village Code. Staff recommends decorative lighting on the building.

The Applicant has agreed to provide security cameras on site per the Commission's request at the May 18th Plan Commission meeting.

MS. WALLRICH noted that there are several amenities proposed by the Applicant that will be discussed further in their presentation. Amenities include:

- Indoor ground-level parking garages with at least one space per dwelling unit;
- A club house including an outdoor pool with cabanas, a fitness center, locker rooms, free Wi-Fi, a lounge, a meeting room, a computer room, and a great room with a kitchenette.
- Outdoor grilling areas for each building, including grill stations, fire pits, outdoor seating, pergolas, and a service sink;
- Disc golf baskets;
- Bike storage (interior and exterior);
- Electric car charging stations;
- Exterior exercise circuit equipment;
- A dog park (for private use by the residents) including a large and small dog area, complete with seating area, a drinking fountain, and training fixtures such as a jump bar and weave poles;
- An arboretum area at the north end of the site featuring outdoor seating;
- A bike trail connection to a major bike trail system;
- Over 4 acres of open space; and
- Outdoor terraces available to the residents in addition to their own private balconies.

MS. WALLRICH then discussed the Architecture noting that a lot of time was spent on the roof line which resulted in an increase of the overall height of the building. She noted that originally there was not enough articulation on the roof line. She also highlighted the middle entrances noted the different brick pattern and taller roof. There are floor to ceiling windows, larger terraces and roof gardens. There is a raised elevation for the parking level similar to the existing buildings on Greenway. The building material has texture and there is the addition of landscaping vines growing on the side of the parking structure. Each unit will have a wall HVAC unit. The louvers are painted to match the brick color. There will be no roof or ground units.

There are 72 units per structure with the following breakdown of unit type:

Unit Type	Area (SF)	# of Units
2 bedroom/2 bath	1,286-1,356	44
2 bedroom/2 bath/study	1,616	4
1 bedroom/1.5 bath	1,073	4
1 bedroom/1 bath	924-987	20

Building height is addressed in the Substantial Deviation of 2000. In one section of the Ordinance it talks about increasing the original PUD approvals by increasing it to 4-stories with 1 story parking underneath it. Later it provides for increase in the building height to allow for 4 story buildings not to exceed 56' in height. This leaves some interpretation in that it is not clear if this is just referring to the height of the 4 stories and not the parking level. The buildings that are constructed are 62'. MS. WALLRICH discussed how building height is defined in the Zoning Ordinance as the mean height of the highest roof.

The proposed multi-family structures are constructed predominately of masonry materials. The façade of the residential units is constructed of a thin brick embedded in precast panels that will be installed as horizontal panels. The ground floor includes a stamped precast stained panel that matches the accent areas of the club house.

There was much conversation regarding R-5 vs R-6 Zoning and the current zoning of the property.

MS. WALLRICH stated the Zoning Map shows the property being R-5. The Annexation Agreement indicates the property as R-6. The Substantial Deviation of 2000 notes a R-5 zoning; however, Staff is unable to find any documents showing it was rezoned from R-6 to R-5. She noted the exhibits that indicate R-6 zoning and "Condos/Apts" in the subject area and the condo area by Greenway Boulevard. She noted that PUD is what is significant. PATRICK CONNELLY, Village Attorney, stated the idea of the PUD is to take a larger parcel that will require a unique plan that will not fit into R-5 or R-6 and you create the development standards within the PUD.

COMMISSIONER KRONER questioned where in the Ordinance is there zoning for apartments.

MS. WALLRICH referred to Exhibit C which identifies condo/apartments.

MR. CONNELLY explained there is case law that makes it problematic to make a sole zoning decision on a multi-family setting based on whether it is a condominium or an apartment. This would say you are now turning into the ownership of the unit rather than the density. For example, if it was all condominiums, everyone could rent them out and they are still having the same amount of renters. They are asking for a change in what was approved. He noted it is problematic to make this a issue of apartment vs condominium.

MS. WALLRICH noted that a more useful mechanisms to control ownership is Covenants and Restrictions, not zoning. She stated that C & R's are a strong regulatory power.

ANDREA CROWLEY, Griffin & Gallagher, gave a presentation about the proposed project. She explained there is no market for condominiums anymore and that the trend is now luxury rentals. She stated they are a "for profit" developer and would not be doing this project without a Market Study showing this would be successful. As future tax payers of Tinley Park, we want what is best for Tinley Park.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN asked if there were a certain number of pre-rentals in order to get financing on this project. There were no comparables on the study from Will County.

COMMISSIONER KRONER noted we just received the summary on the Tracy Cross Study today and we are unable to make a decision without seeing the full study and complete information. MR. KRONER also stated that he can find nowhere in the Ordinance that says anything about apartments. On page 10 of the Ordinance it talks about the impact on the school and park districts. When this Ordinance was written it is clear that they were talking about condos, townhouses and homes that had impact on the school and park districts and services. Will you be paying impact fees that are stated in this Ordinance?

MS. CROWLEY replied that they will be paying all the fees required by ordinance..

STEVEN GREGORY, Landscape Architect, gave a presentation about how they arrived at the Site Plan and why they are excited about the project. He explained how the transition of housing types provides a buffer from the ComEd lines, 191st Street and future commercial. He stated he agreed with the original PUD by putting the lowest density away from 191st Street and the higher density closer to 191st Street. He stated that engineering has not been commissioned yet because they are waiting for the site plan approval. He noted that the nine buildings would be closer to the existing townhomes than the proposed two buildings. He stated that he feels the tradeoff provides more green space and opportunity for amenities.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN noted he was out at the site and saw that the Pump Station is about 15' higher in grade compared to the townhomes. Taking into consideration the patios and the elevation, this causes a privacy issue for the existing townhomes.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK asked about the privacy issues and the distance between the buildings and the townhomes.

MR. GREGORY stated that the proposed distance between the townhomes and the building is 195'. He stated that he understood they were not residents but they want to be by creating a viable quality project and that the trend is not for ownership at this time. He stated they are reacting from the market pressure to build rental units.

MS. WALLRICH stated the base elevation will be considered when the engineers evaluate it. Regarding the privacy issue staff has suggested that an enclosed green screen is a possibility for the roof terrace.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked if there will be on-site management.

MR. GREGORY stated there will be management and there will be rules that the tenants will have to abide by.

SCOTT SHALVIS, Architect, gave a presentation and presented examples of the building materials to include pre cast brick samples.

There was significant discussion from the Commissioners regarding the proposed building materials. The Commissioners requested examples of residential buildings in the local area that have used the pre-cast brick. It was also requested that Tracy Cross explain in their study the impact on the property values when using this type of building material.

MS. WALLRICH asked MR. SHALVIS to explain the installation process and the difference between brick and block vs pre cast brick.

MR. SHALVIS stated

- Brick and block walls are done in several phases. A block wall has to be built with concrete block (CMU) which is 50% hollow, then grout it, reinforce it and water barrier it. It requires redundant scaffolding. The concrete block is only 8 inches.
- The proposed pre-cast is a thin brick with 10" of solid concrete behind it. It is better for sound, better for thermal performance and better for water protection. He noted this is a modern technology and provides a much greater PSI (Pounds per Square Inch) strength than the typical brick and block construction. He also noted that block and brick is dependent upon the weather and consistency of labor talent.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about the occupancy rate mentioned at the Workshop being 3% in the 9750 in Orland Park building. In the Tracy Cross study it states 4.7%. He asked if the Orland Park buildings have altered their rental rates?

MR. GREGORY stated the rates have increased.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked if it is in the Tracy Cross scope to be able to submit an opinion as to whether putting up these buildings with precast materials would hurt the value of properties that were put up in the immediate area with brick and block. Please ask them to add this to their final study and submit it to the Commission. It was committed to the Commission by Mr. Gregory and Ms. Crowley that the Plan Commission and Staff would have the Tracy Cross Market Study presented no later than June 12, 2017. Those statements were made on behalf of the Petitioner.

COMMISSIONER MOYLAN asked about the location of the walking and bike path. MR. MOYLAN also noted before a decision could be made a complete report from Tracy Cross would be necessary.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK noted the primary issues are the height exceptions and the Site Plan. MR. MATUSHEK asked for additional questions from the Commissioners regarding those issues.

MS. WALLRICH stated the request before you is the Site Plan and the Special Use. The Urban Design Overlay District does establish a setback; however, the UD-1 only references non-residential buildings.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about entitlement. What is entitled without any Special Use? This is 9 buildings with and 16 units. The Ordinance as approved talks about 16 buildings at 22 units. There was an error in the Ordinance. Clarifying what is entitled without exception is 9 buildings with 16 units. The staff report emphasizes additional open space and the advantage of doing 2 buildings rather than 9 buildings. Regarding the Standards to what extent other configurations were considered not to be detrimental to the property values of the neighborhood. He noted that the change from 9 buildings to 2 buildings is what the public is concerned with. There are other alternatives. Have you done an analysis to these alternatives?

MR. SHALVIS stated they did look at other alternatives but wanted to maximize the amount of green space.

MR. SHAW stated that the report emphasizes the open space and deemphasizes the 2 large buildings that are not in keeping with the character of the rest of the neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated we are trying to come up with the best plan visually that is not going to be a detriment to anyone's property values. Is there something better than this?

COMMISSIONER SHAW stated regarding the findings what the roadway improvements are expected. Special Use should contribute to the economic development. This does not support Special Use.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK stated with no further comment he asked for testimony from the public.

Resident #1 – Resident of Brookside Glen. Everyone is talking about the original concept. The Ordinance is as clear as you can get regarding R-5 to R-6. R-5 is low density. R-6 has a whole paragraph. The two are different in regards to ownership. The Orland Property is a totally different area. There are other locations that are probably better for this.

Resident #2 – Resident of Brookside Glen. The impact of 300 cars, guest, fire department, police and schools. Where are we R-5 or R-6. This does not fit into this community.

Resident #3 – VP of Townhouse Association. Request to continue this PH so other residents can attend due to the graduation. Market Research – highest rent in area is \$1300.00. These are not 2 like properties. PUD – look over I-80 you will see condos and townhouse and now 2 massive hotels – doesn't fit into neighborhood. Has anyone done a traffic study? Where are the samples of the HVAC as promised at the Workshop? Is there a Bond or Escrow to guarantee finishing the project? The amenities you are talking about don't make sense. Can the parking decks be put on the inside of the building rather than the outside of the building to eliminate noise? Can you move the dog park?

Resident #4 – Lives across street from the nearest townhouse. This is a glowing report – but it leaves out – doesn't fit in neighborhood.

Resident #5 – Zoning – condos, townhomes, single family. This should cease. Pre-fab stuff – where are you coming from? Fair Market Study – what is this based on? People who rent don't care about walking path.

Resident #6 – Who commissioned the report? I would rather not have a dormitory in my neighborhood.

Resident #7 – Live behind the dog park. PUD – a community, this is an oasis, no one else has access to these features they are proposing. Will there be another hearing if they want to put in the banked parking spaces? Will these parking spaces fit there? Cars will shine lights in our windows? Are there any other PUD's in Tinley Park?

Resident #8 – Brookside Glen – 20 years. This project does not belong in the community. Petition submitted. 2 Ginormous "Hotels" doesn't belong in this area. Don't welcome this. The renters have no stake in the game. Horrible looking. The submitted Petition mentions the opposition of the Residences of Brookside Glen development on both height and site plan. There are more than 500 signatures opposing the development on this Petition.

Resident #9 – House behind Pumping Station. What will residents see in back yard? Power Lines, Viability of the project consider the Gun Range and the dogs are loud.

Resident #10 – Resident near the proposed units. I am dismayed with the Market Study being an Executive Summary. Will there be someone available to answer questions from those that did the Market study?

Resident #11 – Live in Brookside Glen on the Lancaster side – Who will monitor the security cameras?

288 parking spaces for 144 apartments. Where will visitors park? Least expensive cost of building unit is \$104,000. 3 ½ years to recoup money. Can they guarantee rental for 10 years. Like Commission to consider all the people who came out tonight. Need to delay this until the complete study comes out.

Resident #12 – Site Plan Approval and Special Use – Nothing on vehicular ingress and egress. Congestion will occur. Many things need to take into consideration.

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER SHAW, seconded by COMMISSIONER KRONER to continue the Public Hearing on THE RESIDENCE AT BROOKSIDE GLEN – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MAGNUSON LANE AND 191ST STREET – SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT to the next regular Plan Commission Meeting on June 15, 2017. The Motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK asked for further comments from the Commission.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked Staff to check on the turning lane on intersection of 171st and LaGrange Road.

COMMISSIONER BERTHOLD asked about the position of the entrance to the Dog Park and parking areas. He noted that the developer would have to address these issues. There is a noise impact related to the position of the patios. This is related to the Site Plan. If you don't address this I will not approve it.

MS. CROWLEY asked for specifics that need to be addressed.

MR. BERGTHOLD replied the position of the banked parking spaces, the dog park issues and the patio positions.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a Motion was made by COMMISSIONER BERGTHOLD, seconded by COMMISSIONER SHAW, to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of June 1, 2017 at 10:54 p.m. The Motion was unanimously approved by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN MATUSHEK declared the meeting adjourned.