



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

OCTOBER 19, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on October 19, 2017 at 7:00p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

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

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
Chuck Augustyniak

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Malmborg, Planner I
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney (arrived at 7:26)
Michael Glotz, Trustee
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN SHAW called to order the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission for October 19, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

COMMISSIONER KRONER recognized Ben Anderson, the camera operator at the meeting for being "Student of the Week" at his high school.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the October 5, 2017 Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER STANTON, seconded by COMMISSIONER CURRAN, to approve the Minutes. The Motion was approved by voice call. CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN SHAW stated due to the large agenda this evening. He requested the audience and Commission to respect meeting protocols by making sure they are recognized by the chair prior to speaking. He requested that comments should be on point and concise. He would ask that everyone this evening maintain order and show respect for folks when they are speaking.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 19, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

**ITEM #1 PUBLIC HEARING: BANGING GAVEL – 6811 HICKORY STREET
CONSIDERATION FOR APPROVAL: SITE PLAN
CONSIDERATION FOR RECOMMENDATION: PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AND
VARIANCES**

Consider granting the Petitioner, James Richert of Banging Gavel, Site Plan Approval for an outdoor seating area and related landscape improvements and recommending that the Village Board grant approval for the following:

1. The Final Plat of Subdivision;
2. A three foot, four inch (3'4") variance from Section XII.4.E. (Table 4.E.1.) of the Zoning Ordinance where the maximum height for a freestanding frame sign is four feet (4'). This variance would allow a seven foot, four inch (7'4") tall freestanding frame sign.
3. A nine foot (9') variance from Section XII.4.E. (Table 4.E.1.) of the Zoning Ordinance where a freestanding frame must be set back ten feet (10') from the property line. This variance would allow the freestanding frame sign to be set back one foot (1') from the north property line.
4. A thirteen foot (13') variance from Section XII.2.A.9. (Table 2.A.6.) of the Zoning Ordinance where an accessory structure is required to be set back twenty feet (20') from a primary street. This variance would allow a pergola at a seven foot (7') setback from the east property line.

Present were the following:

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

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
Chuck Augustyniak

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Interim Community Development Director
Stephanie Malmborg, Planner I
Patrick Connelly, Village Attorney (arrived at 7:26 p.m.)
Michael Glotz, Trustee

Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

Guests: James Richert, Petitioner
Joe Bandza, Trinity Construction

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER MANI, to open the Public Hearing for Banging Gavel on consideration for approval of requested variations. The Motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the Motion approved.

The Commission will also consider the proposed Site Plan for approval and the Plat of Subdivision for recommendation to the Village Board.

CHAIRMAN SHAW 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 SHAW 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 MALMBORG, Planner I, stated the open items from the workshop were:

1. A variance is required for the proposed pergola.
 - The Plan Commission discussed concerns about sight lines around the pergola. Staff identified measurements between the pergola and Oak Park Avenue in a graphic found on page 5 of the Staff Report.
 - The Plan Commission requested a rendering of what the pergola will look like from Oak Park Avenue. The requested rendering was presented to the Commissioners.
2. Variances are required for the proposed freestanding frame sign.
 - The Plan Commission discussed the variance request and had no follow up questions about the sign.
3. Approval of the Landscape Plan.
 - The Village's Landscape Architect completed review of the Landscape Plan and has one outstanding comment regarding landscaping in the public frontage along Oak Park Avenue.

MS. MALMBORG presented photos of the existing site. She explained the zoning and the history of the building. The proposed beer garden area includes approximately 150 seats and is surrounded by a 4 foot tall ornamental fence. MS. MALMBORG displayed a rendering of the pergola, which will promote the Village's music brand and provide entertainment for patrons at the beer garden. It will provide an outdoor stage area for musicians and entertainers. The pergola is approximately 7 feet from the east property line and there is approximately 12 feet from the east property line to the curb on Oak Park Avenue. There is 40 feet from the south corner of the pergola to the curb, thus mitigating any line-of-sight issues.

MS. MALMBORG noted the Petitioner has submitted a revised Landscape Plan, which will require another Staff review to ensure that all outstanding comments are addressed.

MS. MALMBORG explained the sign plan, noting that it does not meet all aspects of the sign regulations within the Legacy Code, including the maximum height and required setback. The Petitioner states that they will not be using a wall sign due to the historic nature of the building and the regulations per the National Register.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked for comments from the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER MANI asked if the seating area was elevated and also asked if the seating was ADA accessible. JAMES RICHERT, Petitioner, replied that it was not elevated and he will adjust according to ADA requirements.

COMMISSIONER KRONER noted it was a pleasure working with these Petitioners.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked if anyone from the public would like to speak during the Public Hearing. There were none.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER STANTON, to close the Public Hearing. Vote by voice. CHARIMAN SHAW declared the Motion carried.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER CURRAN, to grant the Petitioner, James Richert of Banging Gavel, Site Plan Approval for an outdoor seating area and related landscape improvements and recommend that the Village Board grant approval for the Final Plat of Subdivision and the following variances for the property at 6811 Hickory Street in the DC (Downtown Core) Zoning District:

1. A three foot (3') variance from Section XII.4.E. (Table 4.E.1.) of the Zoning Ordinance where the maximum height for a freestanding frame sign is four feet (4'). This variance will allow for a seven foot (7') tall freestanding frame sign.
2. A nine foot (9') variance from Section XII.4.E. (Table 4.E.1.) of the Zoning Ordinance where a freestanding frame must be set back ten feet (10') from the property line. This variance will allow for the freestanding frame sign to be set back one foot (1') from the north property line.
3. A thirteen foot (13') variance from Section XII.2.A.9. (Table 2.A.6.) of the Zoning Ordinance where an accessory structure is required to be set back twenty feet (20') from a primary street. This variance will allow a pergola at a seven foot (7') setback from the east property line.

...with the following conditions:

1. That the Landscape Plan be revised to indicate additional plant material (per the recommendation of the Village's Landscape Architect) in the public frontage between the east property line and the sidewalk.

AYES: PLAN COMMISSIONERS KRONER, STANTON, CURRAN, ENGEL, MANI, GATTO, and CHAIRMAN SHAW

NAYS: NONE

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 OCTOBER 19, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #2 PUBLIC HEARING: ALDI – 16000 HARLEM AVENUE
CONSIDERATION FOR RECOMMENDATION: SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, Doyle Signs, Inc. on behalf of Aldi, a Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation from the Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development to allow for an increase in the size and number of signs allowed for Aldi at 16000 Harlem Avenue and within the B-3 PD (General Business and Commercial, Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The proposed Substantial Deviation would allow a total of four (4) wall signs, a total sign face area of 211 square feet, and the main sign would be a maximum height of fifteen feet (15').

Present were the following:

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

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
Chuck Augustyniak

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

Guests: Scott Kator, Aldi
John Streetz, Doyle Sign
Tom Bertram, Aldi

A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER MANI, seconded by COMMISSIONER GATTO, to open the Public Hearing on a Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation from the Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development to allow for an increase in the size and number of signs allowed for Aldi at 16000 Harlem Avenue and within the B-3 PD (General Business and Commercial, Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The Motion was approved unanimously by voice call. CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the Motion approved.

CHAIRMAN SHAW 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 SHAW 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 MALBORG, Planner I, stated the Petitioner is looking for a larger sign as well as more wall signs than the Village's Sign Regulations allow. Staff notes that this request is a Substantial Deviation from the PUD rather than a variance. At the workshop, the Plan Commission requested a visual comparison of the proposed sign compared to an Aldi sign that meets the Village's regulations. MS. MALMBORG presented the requested renderings as follows:

1. Proposed wall sign: 15 feet tall, 189.375 SF
2. Wall sign that meets code: 7 feet tall, 41.27 SF
3. Wall sign near the maximum square footage: 12 feet tall, 120.69 SF

MS. MALMBORG also displayed a photo that the Petitioner supplied that displays a 5' x 7' plywood board on the Aldi façade to represent the size of a sign that would meet Village code.

MS. MALMBORG noted the Petitioner is also seeking three (3) additional signs (small symbols of the products they sell) to be mounted on the lower portion of the façade to the right of the main wall sign.

MS. MALMBORG explained the zoning and nearby land uses. She noted that the previous tenant, Eurofresh, had a large primary wall sign over the main entrance along with four secondary signs to the left of the storefront. Cub Foods, another previous tenant) also had a sign that exceeded the Village code. Staff could not locate a variance or special approval allowing these signs.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked for the total frontage of the Aldi store. The Petitioner replied it is 114'. MS. MALMBORG noted they would therefore be allowed 114 SF of sign face area (or one square foot for every foot of tenant frontage).

MS. MALMBORG noted the existing Aldi site has a clear view from Harlem Avenue despite the distance of around 575' to Harlem Avenue; however, the new Aldi site will have the Chipotle/Mattress Firm outlet building partially blocking the view from Harlem Avenue to the storefront. The Plan Commission also requested information about the Sam's Club sign. A photo was presented. The Sam's club sign is 10' x 10' and is a total of 100 square feet of sign face area. The sign height is 14'-1 ¾" tall since it was rotated 45 degrees. The length of their store front is 357'. Staff notes that this sign is also nonconforming to the maximum allowable height since it is taller than 7' but noted the sign face area meets code. There was discussion regarding the Tinley Park Plaza PUD on the east side of Harlem Avenue, which allows larger signs as part of their PUD. Tenants within this shopping center are allowed 1.5 SF of signage for every 1 foot of store frontage with no maximum size limitation; however, the maximum height for a wall sign is also 7' tall.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked how far back the Tinley Park Plaza building is located. MS MALMBORG replied Planet Fitness is about 320' east of Harlem Avenue and meets current regulations. Planet Fitness is about 220' closer to Harlem than the proposed Aldi sign.

COMMISSIONER KRONER stated Sam's sign is 100 SF with 357' frontage and Aldi is asking for 190 SF with 114' storefront. He stated that the Village needs to be fair to everyone on that side of the road. He stated he understood the need for a bigger sign but felt the sign they are proposing is way too big. He stated that a sign similar in size to Sam's Club's sign would be fair.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked for opinions of the other Commissioners.

COMMISSIONERS STANTON and GATTO agreed with COMMISSIONER KRONER's comments.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked the Petitioner, JOHN STREETZ of Doyle Signs, to make a presentation.

MR. STREETZ stated this is a large capital investment. Aldi is in the process of remodeling and improving the former Eurofresh and Cub Foods space. Part of this improvement is to provide reasonable and effective identification on the storefront. This building is located approximately 540' from Harlem Avenue frontage. The previous business had 555' of signage above the entrance and 187' additional SF of secondary signage. There is no record of anyone in Tinley Park complaining about that large sign. The current code restricts wall sign area by zoning district, gross tenant space, and frontage. This restriction provides no relief for business that are set back long distances from the property line. This permits a business that is near the property line to have the same size sign as one set back over 500'. This restriction is unreasonable and inappropriate. This sign is reasonable in relationship to the size and set back of the storefront. We do not agree that the sign appears too big.

CHAIRMAN SHAW appreciates the comparisons of the three signs and asked for comments from the Commissioners. He questioned whether the middle sized sign would still requires a height deviation. MS. MALMBORG replied there would still be a deviation because it is over the 7' maximum height.

COMMISSIONER KRONER noted Sam's Club is further back and has more tenant frontage. He is open to considering a larger sign for Aldi, but not as large was what was requested by the Petitioner.

COMMISSIONER ENGEL stated we should be pro-business. He noted they have already purchased the sign proposed sign.

COMMISSIONER KRONER stated we have to be fair to all the businesses in town and that he felt it unfair to give special dispensation to one just because they bought it ahead of approval. He stated that was their error and Staff had warned them that they needed a sign permit. He noted Staff had informed them they needed approval prior to erecting the sign and they chose not to obtain the permit before purchasing the sign. He stated that Aldi is a major corporation and they should know what they are doing.

CHAIRMAN SHAW stated he felt it was a good faith error.

COMMISSIONER CURRAN stated there were two businesses there with larger signs. The larger sign fits more appropriately.

CHAIRMAN SHAW stated, per the Staff Report, the previous signs did not receive variances and are clearly nonconforming. MS. MALMBORG replied there are permit records, but there is no record of a variance approval.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked if anyone from the public would like to speak during the Public Hearing.

TOM BERTRAM, Aldi, stated he also lives in Tinley Park. He feels that the investment Aldi is making in the community is outstanding and more than just taking over the building. Aldi is completely gutting the building and updated everything per code. It is like a brand new store for Aldi. This will be the most modern grocery store in Tinley Park. We appreciate your consideration.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER STANTON, to close the Public Hearing. Vote by voice. CHARIMAN SHAW declared the Motion carried.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked for the Finding of Facts. MS. MALMBORG read them as follows:

- The proposed signage will meet applicable Village Building Codes and Electrical Codes.
- The proposed signage is visually in scale with the new façade.
- The proposed signage will create a more readable sign from Harlem Avenue and assist customers in locating the shopping center without impeding traffic flow.
- The proposed signage is will not negatively affect other adjacent properties within the Park Center Plaza shopping center because it will attract customers to the shopping center.
- The proposed signage will not negatively affect improvements within the Park Center Plaza shopping center or surrounding properties.
- This request will not set a precedent for signage in other areas of Tinley Park since Aldi is part of the Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development (PUD) and PUDs have flexibility with zoning regulations to fit the unique needs of the development.
- This is not a variance request – it is a deviation from the original PUD to allow for changes to the allowable signage for this tenant space.
- The site, Park Center Plaza, has existing utilities, roads, drainage, and necessary facilities.
- The proposed signage will provide increased visibility toward Harlem Avenue, which is a distance of approximately 540' from the façade. A sign meeting Village regulations would not be readable at this distance when driving the speed limit on Harlem Avenue.
- The proposed signage will conform to all other applicable regulations.
- The proposed signage contributes to the economic development of the community by allowing a new business to competitively advertise to customers on major thoroughfares.
- Aldi will attract customers to the Park Center Plaza shopping center and to the Tinley Park Area.

COMMISSIONER KRONER questioned whether there was consensus on the deviation for the number of signs to allow for the three (3) secondary signs. The COMMISSIONERS indicated no issue with the secondary signs.

CHAIRMAN SHAW stated he would like separate motions for the deviation on number of signs and size.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER GATTO, to recommend that the Village Board grant a Special Use Permit to the Petitioner, Doyle Signs, Inc. on behalf of Aldi, for a Substantial Deviation from the Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development to allow for an increase in the number of signs allowed for Aldi at 16000 Harlem Avenue and within the B-3 PD (General Business and Commercial, Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The proposed Substantial Deviation will allow a total of four (4) wall signs.

AYES: PLAN COMMISSIONERS KRONER, STANTON, CURRAN, ENGEL, MANI, GATTO, and CHAIRMAN SHAW

NAYS: NONE

CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the Motion approved.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER ENGEL, seconded by COMMISSIONER CURRAN, to recommend that the Village Board grant a Special Use Permit to the Petitioner, Doyle Signs, Inc. on behalf of Aldi, for a Substantial Deviation from the Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development to allow for an increase in the size of signs allowed for Aldi at 16000 Harlem Avenue and within the B-3 PD (General Business and Commercial, Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The proposed Substantial Deviation will allow a total sign face area of 253 square feet, and the main sign would be a maximum height of fifteen feet (15').

AYES: PLAN COMMISSIONERS CURRAN and ENGEL

NAYS: PLAN COMMISSIONERS KRONER, STANTON, MANI, GATTO, and CHAIRMAN SHAW

CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the Motion failed.

Motion was made by COMMISSIONER KRONER, seconded by COMMISSIONER STANTON, to recommend that the Village Board grant a Special Use Permit to the Petitioner, Doyle Signs, Inc. on behalf of Aldi, for a Substantial Deviation from the Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development to allow for an increase in the size of signs allowed for Aldi at 16000 Harlem Avenue and within the B-3 PD (General Business and Commercial, Park Center Plaza Planned Unit Development) Zoning District. The proposed Substantial Deviation will allow a total sign face area of 184 square feet, with a maximum height of twelve feet (12') as reflected in Option 3 with the Staff Report.

AYES: PLAN COMMISSIONERS GATTO, MANI, ENGEL, STANTON, KRONER, and CHAIRMAN SHAW.

NAYS: PLAN COMMISSIONER CURRAN

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 OCTOBER 19, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

ITEM #3 STUDIO Q – 17708 OAK PARK AVENUE WORKSHOP: SPECIAL USE PERMIT
Consider recommending that the Village Board grant the Petitioner, Qiana Grant of Studio Q, a Special Use Permit to allow a recreational business use (including group fitness classes) at 17708 Oak Park Avenue in the NG (Neighborhood General) Zoning District.

Present were the following:

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

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
Chuck Augustyniak

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

Guests: Qiana Grant, Studio Q

STEPHANIE MALMBORG, Planner I, stated the Petitioner Qiana Grant of Studio Q, is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a recreational business use at 17708 Oak Park Avenue in the Neighborhood General Zoning District. In the Staff Report the open items are noted as:

1. Consider conditions related to sound. Music is generally played and it is important to be good neighbors to the adjacent tenants.
2. The Petitioner is required to install a bike rack to provide parking for at least two (2) bikes. Per the Legacy Code bike racks are required to be more pedestrian and bike friendly.

MS. MALMBORG displayed a photo of the existing site. She noted the total number of employees would be four (4) and the business would provide group dance and fitness classes such as Zumba, hip hop, yoga, and cycling. The proposed hours of operation are:

- o Monday – Thursday: 9:00am to 11:00am, 6:00pm to 8:00pm
- o Friday: 6:00pm to 8:00pm
- o Saturday: 9:00am to 11:00am
- o Sunday: Closed

MS. MALMBORG noted the total maximum number of participants in fitness classes at one time is 30. The number of parking spaces allotted to the business is 45. Staff did not feel parking was an issue as there is over 170 parking spaces in the commercial center.

MS. MALMBORG stated the zoning is Neighborhood General and the property is within the Legacy District. Nearby land uses include single-family residential and commercial properties. Some tenants in Tinley Center include Cuzin's, Gateway Learning Center, Farmers Insurance, and Tinley Park Tax Center.

COMMISSIONER STANTON asked about the sound from the bar which would be noisy at night for the tutoring next door.

COMMISSIONER CURRAN asked if the bar had sound requirements. MS. MALMBORG replied just the regulations for sound per the Village's municipal code related to nuisances.

QIANA GRANT, Studio Q, stated she went next door to the tutoring business to discuss noise. Studio Q will not be open at all during the times when the tutoring business is open, so sound should not be an issue. She stated she is providing a place where people have a passion for dance and fitness. She has been a dance instructor since 2006. The instructors that will be working there also have a lot of experience.

CHARIMAN SHAW asked if there were currently any security cameras at the location. MS. GRANT replied that she is currently working with ADT for the interior security.

MS. MALMBORG asked if it was necessary to draft conditions regarding the sound. CHAIRMAN SHAW replied the same sound conditions as required for Mile 1 Fitness would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN SHAW asked if there were any other questions. There were none. He stated the Public Hearing will be on November 2, 2017.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 19, 2017 REGULAR MEETING

Item #4 THE RESIDENCE OF BROOKSIDE GLEN – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF 191ST STREET AND MAGNUSON LANE
WORKSHOP: 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 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 Residence of Brookside Glen) at the properties generally located west of Magnuson Lane and John Michael Drive in the southwest corner of 191st Street and Magnuson Lane.

Present were the following:

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

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
Chuck Augustyniak

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

Guests: Karli Mayher, Developer
Scott Shalvis, Architect
Andrea Crowley, Attorney
Steve Gregory, Eriksson Engineering Assoc.

CHAIRMAN SHAW requested the audience and the Commission to recognize meeting protocols and make sure they are recognized by the chair prior to speaking. Comments should be on point and concise. He would ask that everyone this evening maintain order and show respect for folks when they are speaking.

CHAIRMAN SHAW noted that COMMISSIONER STANTON has previously and continues to recuse himself from discussion on this project.

STEPHANIE MALMBORG, Planner I, stated the request is for Site Plan Approval and a Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation from the Brookside Glen Planned Unit Development with two (2) Exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance for front yard setback and building height.

The open items are as follows:

1. Consider an Exception for the front yard setback to allow the structures to be set back about 18' to 27' from the east property line.
2. Consider an Exception for the building height to allow the structures at a maximum building height of 65'.
3. Minor revisions are required on the Landscape Plan.
4. Information is needed about the plans for security and management of the property.
5. Lighting is required near all entrances/exits to the structures. The Petitioner must submit plans showing adequate lighting provided by fixtures complimentary to the architectural style of the structures.
6. Revise elevations to include reddish brown brick accents on the club house.
7. Provide material sample for the foundation of the building. Material samples have been provided and they are on the table to view.

MS. MALMBORG presented a rendering of the proposed development. She noted there are four (4) four-story multi-family residential buildings with a club house located in the center. She noted the road fronting the project curves and the buildings are aligned along the curve. Previously, the Plan Commission reviewed a proposal from the Petitioner for two (2) residential buildings and a club house with each building having 72 units. This previous proposal did not receive approval from the Plan Commission or the Village Board. The current proposal provides four (4) residential buildings with 36 units per building. The Petitioner has retained all of the luxury amenities offered with the previous plan. The Petitioner has met with Staff, elected officials, and a group of residents from the Brookside Glen development to work through issues related to the first proposal. The four (4) building proposal was found to be the preferred option since they can maintain the amenities for the development. The other option would be going back to the approved plan in 2000 which was a nine (9) building proposal without any luxury amenities. She noted that only the center part of the residential buildings are a full four (4) stories. This creates an architectural design that breaks up the bulk of the building.

MS. MALMBORG noted the zoning in the area is B-3 at the intersection and the other zoning is R-5 and R-2. It is noted that the zoning has been a topic of discussion in prior meetings. The Village originally annexed the property in 1990 and one of the exhibits from the 1990 documents which illustrates the various boundaries for the zoning districts is missing. However, the documents that were approved on the same night clearly identify the subject parcel and the area where the existing Brookside Place development is located as R-6. The Village's Official Zoning Map identifies these parcels as R-5, which is considered a mapping error.

MS. MALMBORG discussed the open items as follows:

Open Item #1 – Setback Requirements. There are two different regulations which are the minimum setback requirement for R-6 multi-family and an overlay district or the Urban Design for properties south of 179th Street. The requested exceptions for R-6 front yard setback would be 25' minimum and the UD-1 front yard setback would be 20' maximum. It is not possible to meet both requirements. The proposed setback is 18' to 27', which meets the intent of both regulations.

Open Item #2 – Building Height. The number of stories is the same as Brookside Place. The proposed difference of mean roof height is a 9'- 6.5". The Zoning Ordinance regulation for

building height in the R-6 Zoning District is 40' and the previous Substantial Deviation in 2000 allows a building height of 56'. The maximum overall height for the proposed project is about 72' and about 62' for Brookside Place, which is a difference of about 10'. The garage floor elevation or elevation of the land is about a 10' difference with Brookside Place being about 10' higher than the subject site. Thus, the proposed buildings will appear to be the same height when viewed from afar. Staff also discussed how the proposed buildings are the same number of stories as Brookside Place but provide 14' tall ceilings as an amenity for some of the units.

Open Item #3 – Landscaping. As noted in the Staff Report the Landscape Architect said there should be more groupings, relocating some plant material to provide shade in the parking areas and removing some mulch and replacing with plants. Additionally, Staff would like to see plans for landscaping on the front part of the terrace.

Staff also noted there are 171 garage spaces, 125 exterior spaces, 64 land-banked spaces with a total of 360 parking spaces. There will be 2.5 parking spaces per unit. The land-banked spaces will not be developed until it is determined they are needed by the developer or the Village.

Additionally, there is approximately 200' from the existing townhomes structure near the south end of the site.

Open Item #4 – Security and Management. The Staff Report notes the Petitioner's research done on comparable multi-family residential developments. The tenants will access their building and the club house via a key card. The tenant cannot access other residential buildings with their key card. Security cameras will be provided at entrances/exits.

Open Item #5 – Lighting. The Petitioner plans lighting throughout the private parking lot and drive aisles. There will be lighting near the entrance/exit doors on each building. The Petitioner provided updated plans displaying additional lighting.

Open Item #6 – Club house. The Petitioner provided updated plans and renderings showing the club house with matching red brick.

Open Item #7 – Foundation Materials. The Petitioner provided a material sample for the foundation material.

MS. MALMBORG noted the Petitioner proposes various amenities for the development, including:

1. Semi-underground garage parking (1.18 garage spaces per unit)
2. A 5,320± square foot club house
 - a. Fitness center
 - b. Locker rooms
 - c. Billiard room
 - d. Lounge
 - e. Office
 - f. Party room
 - g. Free Wi-Fi
3. Outdoor pool
 - a. Cabanas
 - b. Fire pit
 - c. Seating areas
4. Outdoor terraces

- a. Grilling stations with sink
 - b. Seating areas
 - c. Pergola
 - d. Green roofs
5. Outdoor gaming areas
 6. Bike storage
 7. Electric car charging stations
 8. Disk golf baskets
 9. Outdoor exercise circuits
 10. Fire pits
 11. Open space
 12. Dog park

MS. MALMBORG noted the Dog Park has been relocated to the north end of the development per the discussion within the small group meetings over the last few months.

MS. MALMBORG reviewed the proposed signage and stated the proposed freestanding signs meet applicable codes.

PAULA WALLRICH, Interim Community Development Director, noted that the Commission should be cognizant of the process where meetings were held with the residents of Brookside Glen, Staff, the developer, and elected officials.

KARLI MAYHER, Developer, stated the changes were made as a result of the meetings with the residents, elected officials, and Staff. The changes include a new plan for four (4) buildings, and a further distance from the existing townhouses. They are excited to return to the Plan Commission with the new plans.

STEVE GREGORY, Eriksson Engineering Assoc., stated they worked very hard with Staff and the community to make changes to reach common ground. He added they provided plans that everyone can agree upon. They want to create value for the structures and provide amenities to insure long term viability. They are putting a lot of money into this development and would not be here if they did not think it was valuable. They want to create an additional housing opportunity for the residents of Tinley Park. They had a market study done and saw there was a need and demand for this type of housing. This will also have a positive economic impact to the Village by bringing more people to Tinley Park.

MR. GREGORY presented renderings of the proposed development. There will be one elevator in each building and there will be garage doors on the end of the north and south buildings to enter and exit the garages. There will be cameras at the entrances and key fobs to enter the buildings and the garages. There will be on-site management with hours of operation on Monday through Friday from 9am-5pm, Saturday 10am-5pm, and Sunday 12pm-5pm. There will also be a 24/7 on-call emergency phone number. There will be a minimum of one year leases. The development will meet Tinley Park's noise ordinance regarding the dog park. They are very excited to work with everyone to bring the best plan on the site.

COMMISSIONER CURRAN asked about what determines the land-banked parking. MR. GREGORY replied it would depend on the need determined by the developer and the Village.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked what is under the terraces. He also asked who will be responsible to clean up after the dogs and asked if one elevator is enough in each building. He asked if they would consider changing the color of the foundation stone. The Petitioner replied that they would consider but did not commit to changing. He then asked to change the color of the foundation stone to a color scheme

similar to the photo submitted in the staff report (page 15 of 33) He asked for clarification on if these were apartments. MR. GREGORY replied there are garages under the terraces with entrances and exits on each end of the north and south buildings. Parking will be assigned. The outdoor grills will be on the roof terrace. The residents will be responsible to clean up after their own pets and the management will oversee any problems. A study was done regarding having one elevator per building and it is adequate. They would commit to coloring the foundation stone similar to the photo that was submitted in the Staff Report (page 15 of 33). They would require one year leases.

CHAIRMAN SHAW noted he lived in a building with 36 units and one elevator, which was adequate. Where the other dog park was located on previous plans is now green space and land-banked parking. He asked if there has there been any consideration of using solar energy. He asked if the club house is for residents only. He asked if the key fob was only restricted to your own building. He also asked about the composite of the ceilings in the units. MR. GREGORY replied there has been no consideration of solar energy. The club house is strictly for the residents. The key fob will open your own building and the garage. The ceilings will be gypsum.

COMMISSIONER GATTO asked if there will be specific buildings that are pet friendly. MR. GREGORY noted there would probably be specific floors designated to pet owners.

COMMISSIONER KRONER asked about cameras at the end of the building and would there be any on the terraces and the amenities. MS. MAYHER replied the cameras will only be at the club house, terraces, and entrances – not on the fire pit areas.

COMMISSIONER SHAW asked about the traffic study. MS. MALMBORG replied Staff has consulted the Village Engineer. Greenway Boulevard/Magnuson Lane will connect north to 191st Street and it will be easier to exit and enter the development. This will be completed as part of this project. The Village Engineer did a daily trip analysis and it is designed for this may dwelling units. There are improvements planned to the I-80 bridge over 80th Avenue and improvements planned at the intersection of 191st and 80th Avenue that include adding with turn lanes.

PATRICK CONNELLY, Village Attorney, stated there was a previous meeting with elected officials and residents of the Brookside Glen subdivision. At that meeting there were planning issues brought up, including run off issues on the south end of the building. Some of the residents were concerned about this and the lighting in the area. The traffic was also questioned. MR. GREGORY replied this will not be an issue as there will be a retention area at the north end of the property. They will have to do some grading and this will be addressed with engineering review during the building permit stage. Regarding the lighting issues they will have lights that point down and will not point at the existing townhouses. Lighting will meet Village codes.

CHAIRMAN SHAW noted the foundation material should be addressed prior to the Public Hearing.

MR. CONNELLY stated that the debate between ownership in the case of condo vs. apartments is something that should not be discussed as part of the review. This subject is not appropriate for this Commission to consider.

COMMISSIONER KRONER would like to hear from the residents.

MR. CONNELLY noted the amount of time the residents, developers, and Staff have put in to bring up the concerns has really helped this process. Kudos to all.

(This was not a Public Hearing; however, the Commission requested that the public give comments related to the project. Please reference the Public Comment section of the minutes.)

GOOD OF THE ORDER

None at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(Also see attached Addendum with a list of comments supplied by one of the residents.)

Resident #1 - Comment attached.

Resident #2 – Live in Brookside Glen West. I am impressed with the group that is here. There should be more electric car charging stalls to charge more cars. Gas cars will eventually be banned.

Resident #3 – The traffic study gets done by the county. They look at ground study to see if the ground can handle this traffic. We don't want anything taller. What is this costing? The roads cannot take this traffic.

Resident #4 – Comment attached.

Resident #5 – Comment attached.

Resident #6 – There will be problems with carbon monoxide fumes in the area with the additional traffic in the area.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a Motion was made by COMMISSIONER CURRAN, seconded by COMMISSIONER MANI, to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of October 19, 2017 at 9:47 p.m. The Motion was unanimously approved by voice call. PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN SHAW declared the meeting adjourned.