



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

**JULY 20, 2017**

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on July 20, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

Plan Commissioners: Peter Kroner  
Tim Stanton  
Lucas Engel  
Eduardo Mani  
Angela Gatto  
Bill LeMonnier  
Ken Shaw, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): John Curran  
Garrett Gray

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN SHAW called to order the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission for July 20, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the June 28, 2017 Special Meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER STANTON, seconded by COMMISSIONER LEMMONIER, to approve the Minutes.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked for corrections.

- On page 4, second to last paragraph add: "MR. GREGORY offered to delete the dog park and replace the dog park with a kid's park."

- On page 8, paragraph number 4 the Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER rather than COMMISSIONER JANOWSKI, seconded by COMMISSIONER MOYLAN.
- On page 8, paragraph 5/6 add: “COMMISSIONER KRONER also announced that 5 of the 8 current Plan Commissioners would be replaced after this meeting. Staff has also put in a lot of time and I would like to thank the Commissioners leaving, for their service to the town and residents of Tinley Park.”

The Motion was approved unanimously by voice call to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2017 Special Meeting of the Plan Commission as amended. CHAIRMAN SHAW 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 JULY 20, 2017 REGULAR MEETING**

**WORKSHOP: INNOVATIVE DECKS – 6926 183<sup>RD</sup> STREET – SIGN VARIATIONS**

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, Ken Zomparelli on behalf of Innovative Decks, the following Variations for a ground sign at 6926 183<sup>rd</sup> Street in the NF (Neighborhood Flex) Zoning District:

1. A two foot (2') Variation from Section XII.4.E. of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a twelve foot (12') tall ground sign where ten feet (10') is the maximum allowable height;
2. A ten foot (10') Variation from Section XII.4.E. of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a ground sign where the required setback for a ground sign is ten feet (10') from the property line; and
3. A ten foot (10') Variation from Section XII.4.E. of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a ground sign where the required setback for a ground sign is ten feet (10') from the access drive.

The sign was altered without a permit and these Variations would allow the Petitioner to keep the sign as it was installed. The sign is twelve feet (12') tall, has a sign face area of 30.5 square feet, is located three feet, six inches (3'6") into the public right-of-way, and contains a manual changeable copy sign (which is prohibited).

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Peter Kroner  
Tim Stanton  
Lucas Engel  
Eduardo Mani  
Angela Gatto  
Bill LeMonnier  
Ken Shaw, Chairman

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): John Curran  
Garrett Gray

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

Petitioner: Ken Zomparelli, Innovative Decks

STEPHANIE KISLER, Planner I, presented a PowerPoint and stated Petitioner, KEN ZOMPARELLI, has requested Variances for the sign that is already erected on the site. The Petitioner is requesting a 2' Variation for the height because it is 12' rather than the maximum of 10'. There are also two (2) other Variations requested for the location of the sign. It is required to be set back 10' from the property line and also 10' from the access drive. The location of the sign does not meet the Village requirements as it is within the access drive and it is not 10' back from the property line.

MS. KISLER stated the Petitioner's property is zoned Neighborhood Flex within the Legacy District. In the Legacy Code there are different sign types that are allowed vs. prohibited. MS. KISLER stated that a "Monument Ground Sign" is permitted with a maximum height of 10' with a set back of 10' from the property line and a set back of 10' from the access drive. In addition it shall not interfere with any line-of-sight.

MS. KISLER noted the Petitioner has already erected the sign and changes were made to the sign without permits. Staff would like to make sure that the sign becomes properly permitted and the sign meets regulations or becomes legal by the granting of a variation.

MS. KISLER review the history of this property and the sign:

- 1994: Ordinance 94-O-017 annexed the property. A Sign Permit was denied due to the location being within a State right-of-way.
- 1998: Ordinance 98-O-091 rezoned the property from R-1 to B-3, granted a Variation from the required front yard setback to allow a gazebo in the front yard, and granted a Special Use Permit for a residential dwelling.
- 2008: Sign Permit was issued; however, Staff notes that the sign plan does not match what existed on-site. A message board was added which is prohibited sign type. The Petitioner is aware of this and the message board must be taken off. It would be possible to have a message on the sign, but it has to be a certain percentage of the sign and it would have to be reworked to meet the requirements.
- 2009: Received Site Plan Approval from the Plan Commission for a 1,750 square foot detached garage.
- 2016: Image taken in May 2016 when Staff discovered the changes to the sign. The base has now changed from a circular base to a rectangular base, there is new lighting at the top and the sign is taller. The copy on the actual sign face area has changed. There is a lattice near the base and overall does not meet current codes for height and location.
- 2017: Village Staff notes that the sign was altered without a permit.

MS. KISLER added the sign is 12' tall and has a sign face area of 30.5 sq. ft. It encroaches 2'6" into the public right-of-way and contains a manual changeable copy sign. If the sign was to remain in this location the Petitioner would have to get a right-of-way encroachment waiver from the Village. She noted that with the granting of this waiver the Village has the right to remove the sign if necessary for roadway work and would not be responsible for its replacement.

MS. KISLER also presented several photos of the sign over time for comparison.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked what the difference would be between someone in the Legacy District and someone not in the Legacy District. MS. KISLER replied the requirements are almost the same regarding the maximum height for a sign and the newly adopted setback requirement that applies to all freestanding signs outside the Legacy District. CHAIRMAN SHAW asked what the building set back is. MS KISLER replied the code calls for 5-15' setback.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked for comments from the Petitioner.

KEN ZOMPARELLI, Innovative Decks, stated he has been in business since 1990 and he has never moved the posts of the sign in 28 years. He noted last winter he hit the circular brick base of the sign with his snow plow and it was destroyed. At that time he spoke to Staff regarding rebuilding the sign to allow for more parking spaces for his staff. His staff parks in front of his building and in front of the sign. Village Staff explained what he would have to have the sign comply with the regulations within the Legacy Code if the sign was altered. He decided to fix the base and keep the sign as it was. MR. ZOMPARELLI stated he kept the same posts and did not change the post heights and only covered them with vinyl. He added a 2 x 10 board on top to mount the light on. The message board on the previous sign was always there. He would like the Commission to consider the fact that the new sign is the same as the previous sign.

COMMISSIONER KRONER noted the posts appear to be taller than on the previous sign. They don't appear to be the same on the top. It looks like there have been caps added. MR. ZOMPARELLI replied that the posts have not been altered and he only put the 2 x 10 board on the top but did put caps on the top of the posts. COMMISSIONER KRONER noted sympathy for the fact that the property is on 183<sup>rd</sup> Street which is a busy street and it is hard to see the sign. The manual changeable message board area must be removed because it is prohibited. It will also be necessary to get the location within the right-of-way approved from the Village.

CHAIRMAN SHAW noted that the additional caps and the 2 x 10 board have added approximately 8-9" to the height of the sign. It would be difficult to move the sign, but you could eliminate the message board portion of the sign and reduce the height and it would eliminate the need for a Variance for the sign height. MR. ZOMPARELLI replied he would like to keep the height and continue to request the Variance.

COMMISSIONER GATTO asked if he could remove the light on the top and move it down. MR. ZOMPARELLI replied that it would not illuminate the sign. He noted that the previous sign face is underneath the current sign face panel.

MS. KISLER stated there should have been a permit issued for any alterations to the sign.

COMMISSIONER MANI stated the sign is in the right-of-way and time is being spent on something that should not be there.

MS. KISLER noted that there also is a requirement in Section 9 for landscaping at the base of the sign. This is something that should also be considered. In regard to the parking by the sign, there could be other opportunities for the employees to park in a different area so as not to block the sign. Then customers could park temporarily near the sign if needed and they would not be there all day blocking the sign.

MR. ZOMPARELLI asked for any consideration the Commission could give to grant the Variations.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked if the landscaping could be a Variance or is it required. MS. KISLER replied it could be a Variance. COMMISSIONER KRONER asked if the Petitioner could put landscaping around his gazebo rather than the sign as a trade off. He also asked if the Petitioner could put planters or potted plants around the base of the sign. MS. KISLER replied that is a potential fix. CHAIRMAN SHAW noted that is a fair point, but as a community there is a reason why there are ordinances and codes. It is the Commission's role to insure that people adhere to these rules. We are doing our best to be reasonable and understand the plight. Any hardship that the Petitioner has to endure appears to be self

imposed. Staff will go through the Standards that must be considered for the Variances. The Village has to enforce its own codes. MR. ZOMPARELLI asked if the landscaping has to be built-in. MS. KISLER noted planters are a possibility at the base of the sign.

MS. KISLER stated the Standards for Variations are:

1. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in the district in which it is located.
2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.
3. The Variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

MS. KISLER noted the remaining standards are provided in the Staff Report to help the Plan Commission further analyze the request. Staff will prepare draft responses for Findings of Fact at the next meeting. She noted that Staff also provided considerations for the Plan Commission, including:

- Consider the best location for the sign on the property.
- Consider if the sign should be allowed to be within the public right-of-way.
- Consider if the sign should be allowed to be taller than 10'.
- Consider if landscaping should be added to the base of the sign.

CHAIRMAN SHAW noted he appreciates the Petitioner's time and noted that he should highly stress the Standards in the presentation at the Public Hearing.

## **GOOD OF THE ORDER**

CHAIRMAN SHAW had a discussion with TRUSTEE GLOTZ and Staff and would like to ask the Commissioners if they would agree to move the meeting time to 7:00 p.m. rather than 7:30 p.m. All Commissioners agreed that the time change was acceptable.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, stated there are several projects in the works.

1. A productive meeting with the developers of Residences of Brookside Glen and some of the homeowner's of Brookside Glen Townhouses and the Brookside Glen Homeowner's Association. There was a plan proposed that had 4 buildings and retained the luxury amenities. The consensus of the homeowners was positive and they will take it back to the group. In the future we will be doing this type of meeting with adjacent homeowners if any negativity is expected.
2. Woodman's - will start their survey.
3. Halleran's – 17801 Oak Park Avenue – Townhome/Row House proposal
4. Boulevard on South Street is under review.
5. WoodSpring Suites Hotel - going well and under construction.
6. Tinley Park Distribution Center - 300,000 sq. ft. spec building - plans in for permit.
7. MBlock – 18801 Oak Park Avenue – looking for security improvements for the site.
8. Cell Tower on 6775 Properi Drive moving forward to Village Board in early August
9. Banging Gavel – Met with them and reviewing plans for the exterior site improvements
10. Union Square – Under construction, moving forward inside.
11. A lot of inquiries on hotels in the Village
12. Multi-family inquiry on 183<sup>rd</sup> Street near La Grange
13. 171<sup>st</sup> and Harlem – Demo – Developer has purchased and showed preliminary plans for a retail center.
14. Sports Station – Purchased and looking for a new commercial façade.

15. MACK – New property owner – Special Use for a residential unit was approved only for that property owner and does not transfer to a new owner
16. Orlan Creek Apts. – Renovations – new property owner, new pool, new sign and is now known as The Residences at 159
17. United Athletics – Took down the wall blocking the windows and is moving forward
18. Freedom Pond – Moving forward.

CHAIRMAN SHAW stated he liked the idea of a Community Meeting of the Brookside Glen Residents. He asked who was it that initiated it. MS. WALLRICH replied that it was from a discussion with the developers.

CHAIRMAN SHAW stated after reading the public comment from the sign ordinance meeting, it is important that awareness of the Codes and the Ordinances be given to the residents. Staff needs to make sure notice gets out the residents. He asked how else can we communicate with residents and businesses. It is good to try to avoid the public blow-ups. It is important to communicate. Ms. Wallrich stated that there has been some discussion regarding placing signs on properties subject to public hearings for zoning approvals.

#### **RECEIVE COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were none.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, a Motion was made by COMMISSIONER STANTON, seconded by COMMISSIONER MANI, to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of June 20, 2017 at 8:52 p.m. The Motion was unanimously approved by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the meeting adjourned.