



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

**July 20, 2023**

The meeting of the Plan Commission, Village of Tinley Park, Illinois, was held in the Council Chambers located in the Village Hall of Tinley Park, 16250 Oak Park Avenue, Tinley Park, IL on July 20, 2023.

**CALL TO ORDER** –CHAIRMAN GRAY called to order the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission for July 20, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.

Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner, called the roll.

Present and responding to roll call were the following:

Chairman Gray  
James Gaskill  
Terry Hamilton  
Eduardo Mani  
Steve Sepessy  
Kurt Truxal

Absent Plan Commissioners: Donald Bettenhausen  
Angela Gatto  
Andrae Marak

Village Officials and Staff: Jason Engberg, Planning Manager  
Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner

Petitioners: Ramsey Elshafei, RE Development Solutions  
Jim Doyle, RE Development Solutions  
Tim Kirby, Meadowbrook Builders

Members of the Public: None

COMMUNICATIONS –  
No communications by Staff.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - Minutes of the July 6, 2023, Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A motion was made by COMMISSIONER GASKILL, seconded by COMMISSIONER TRUXAL to approve the July 6, 2023, minutes as annotated. CHAIRMAN GRAY asked for a voice vote; all were in favor. He declared the motion carried.

**TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION**  
**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE JULY 6, 2023 REGULAR MEETING**  
**ITEM #1: WORKSHOP – OAK PARK TOWNES, 17822-17828 OAK PARK AVENUE – VARIATIONS, FINAL PLAT, AND SITE PLAN/ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL**

Consider recommending that the Village Board grant Ramsey Elshafei, on behalf of Oak Park by EEP, LLC, (petitioner) two Variations from Section XII.D.9. (Private Lot Standards), Table 2.D.6. of the Zoning Code. The proposed Variations will increase the required interior maximum side yard setback from five feet (5') to a ten and one-tenth feet (10.1'), and increase the private roadway's maximum curb cut width from twenty feet (20') to thirty-one feet (31'). The petitioner is requesting these Variations to permit new construction of a 31-unit townhome development located at 17822-17828 Oak Park Avenue zoned within the NG (Legacy – Neighborhood General) zoning district. Site Plan and Final Plat approvals will also be considered at the meeting.

Present Plan Commissioners: Chairman Gray  
James Gaskill  
Terry Hamilton  
Eduardo Mani  
Steve Sepessy  
Kurt Truxal

Absent Plan Commissioners: Donald Bettenhausen  
Angela Gatto  
Andrae Marak

Village Officials and Staff: Jason Engberg, Planning Manager  
Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner

Petitioners: Ramsey Elshafei, RE Development Solutions  
Jim Doyle, RE Development Solutions  
Tim Kirby, Meadowbrook Builders

Members of the Public: None

Members of the Public: None

CHAIRMAN GRAY introduced Item #1.

Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. She noted that the Petitioner is

present.

The Petitioner, Ramsey Elshafei, introduced himself and his organization. He represents one of the owners for this project. The ownership has a partnership with two different families. This project is part of their opportunity to invest in some residential projects. A lot of their projects have been commercial thus they have a lot of experience in managing and developing real estate. They are investing in the residential market, looking for an opportunity in Tinley Park. He is available to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked the drawings showing the rectangular boxes by the garages for the six-unit building, if they are an error or to represent anything.

Mr. Elshafei confirmed it is not to represent anything currently. He thinks at one point there may have been a past consideration to expand at the garage. It is just a matter of his team taking those lines out.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked about the access road going east-west off Oak Park Avenue will be a private road, as Lot 32. There are two names on the drawings: 178<sup>th</sup> Place and 178<sup>th</sup> Court.

Mr. Elshafei confirmed that some of the drawings had them labeled differently, as he believes the Village had requested a certain naming. He noted it might be an older drawing.

COMMISSIONER MANI asked staff to clarify if the road going into the development has to be 20 feet. The drawings show it as 31 feet. He also asked if the setbacks are in line with the other existing buildings on Oak Park.

Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner, explained this roadway is classified as an alley per Village code and thus they are requesting a variation. She noted that Union Square is to the south.

Jason Engberg, Planning Manager, noted that to the south they are pretty close, hence why they are asking for the vacation to get right on the property line. The Legacy Code calls for buildings to be right up to the line. He wasn't sure about to the north.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted the 31 feet is to allow fire trucks, otherwise it would be too narrow. He knew that the Village Fire Department had asked for signs those north-south alleyways to the driveways to show no parking. That wasn't originally in the plan. He asked if they are going to put it in the plan.

Mr. Elshafei responded that it is part of the submittal. On the alleyways you are only allowed to park on one side. It will be a private road with signage. The driving radius for the fire truck would use the last and most northerly aisle to do the u-turn. They did a fire truck study to show it could do a turn.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted that the main private road 178<sup>th</sup> Court would still have some parking. He asked for clarification.

Jason Engberg, Planning Manager, responded that he believes they could only just park on the north

side for visitors on that roadway. It is also the same for the north-south alleys for cars parking behind garages.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted that was fine, and seems big enough for entrances and wide enough for the fire department.

Mr. Elshafei clarified that when the fifth building starts, that is where the parking cuts off so the fire truck can turnaround. That is identified on the plans.

Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner, noted you can only park on a portion of the north side of the 178<sup>th</sup> Court.

Mr. Elshafei clarified he believes it is a note on the drawings, just not pictorially covered. You wouldn't see it on this submittal.

COMMISSIONER TRUXAL asked if the balconies would be on the front or back. Everything else looks good and it will be a nice addition to the Village.

Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner, noted the balconies were previously considered on the rear. It would have been an opportunity to provide outside space and improve the façade.

COMMISSIONERS HAMILTON & GASKILL had no comments other than it is a good looking, nice plan.

COMMISSIONER SEPESSY asked if the balconies would match the property to the south on 179<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Elshafei clarified per their current submittal, they do not have balconies. He noted reasons for this. If you are on a rear balcony for the six-unit building, you would be staring straight into the master bedroom of the two-story units, which is a privacy issue. Another reason is because they felt this is an urban community within walking distance to the downtown area. They feel that because it is an urban area, there are a lot of other areas to enjoy exterior living. Also, because they have such large variety of what they are looking to market, there are only six units there missing an outdoor living space. The majority of the development's units have outdoor living space. Additionally the three story units have a front area that is landscaped and could possibly have space for a chair to use that lawn space.

Jason Engberg, Planning Manager, noted that overall it was just a comment Staff made earlier to the petitioner. We left it as an open item for the Commission to discuss if they feel it is a very important or not important, to give staff direction to move forward to give direction.

CHAIRMAN GRAY noted that neighbors may not want a view from a balcony staring into their bedroom. Also, it is only six units. He knows that the property off 179<sup>th</sup> has the faux balconies on the front and believes they also have actual balconies on the back. Because of the privacy issue however the question of having balconies would not be a dealbreaker for him. It is up to them whether they use their frontage. He walks by there frequently. Some people like a front porch area, while some prefer a balcony. He figures that if someone wants a balcony, they would get one of

the other units. He also noted he likes the privacy fences. He asked if the reasoning for no balconies was more privacy issue or market feedback as noted in the staff report.

Mr. Elshafei responded that it is a privacy issue to them, but they did talk to three prospective brokers to help on the marketing side to help lease them. Those brokers indicated they didn't feel that it was a huge selling factor nor was it a detriment to being able to rent these out. The Petitioner didn't feel it was necessary to have as part of this development. Based on how the floorplates layout, if you a balcony, you reduce the kitchen significantly, causing you not to have a window to look out where your sink would be. You would be breaking out your space and open floor plan design. To sacrifice this to get 20 square feet of exterior living space by reducing the main living quarters of the kitchen, small dining room, and living room, the Petitioner didn't feel the tradeoff was worth it as a consumer.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked the Commission for a straw poll. No one objected. COMMISSIONER TRUXAL stated he did not see it as a dealbreaker.

COMMISSIONER SEPESSY asked what space is available in the back of the six-units.

Mr. Elshafei responded it would help to look at the landscaping plan. There are trees to break it up for a little more privacy on the ground level, but there is a sidewalk going to the front doors, a small area for air conditioners, driveway, and small landscaping space between them. It is only a little bit of space, and not somewhere one would really spend time there. It would face the front of the other townhomes. However, on the front yard there is some space for an opportunity to be used. It would be private space, not the Village road.

COMMISSIONER TRUXAL asked if the six-story building was three or four stories because of the dormer on top. He asked what is under the dormer of the six-unit building.

Mr. Elshafei responded he believes those are faux windows, and mostly decorative. There are no proposed attics or storage spaces there.

Jason Engberg, Planning Manager, responded that typically dormers like that are just architectural features to add interest.

CHAIRMAN GRAY acknowledged there are trees in instances where bufferyards aren't required. It is nice to have this to at least screen to neighbors to the north. The trees on the south side also help nicely screen to the south. He asked regarding the lighting details, if there are ceiling mounted lights also.

Mr. Elshafei responded this is just documentation that will need to be cleaned up with their architect. Architects and engineers lately have been swamped and it may have been something that was missed. The renderings don't always depict the exact fixture they are going to install. The line details can however. We will have two fixtures on each side of the garage and then one on the back door. There also is a downlight by the front door.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked staff if there were any further recommendations needed for this item, and if staff had what they need.

Lori Kosmatka, Associate Planner, responded no further recommendations were needed.

CHAIRMAN GRAY asked if anyone else wished to speak. Hearing none, he noted there will be a public hearing on August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

## **Good of the Order**

Jason Engberg, Planning Manager, noted the following:

- North Street / Harmony Square Development is moving along. Hopefully it can come here August 3<sup>rd</sup> for the workshop. They have been getting comments in and it is a big project. They will review comments as they come in.
- Lori Kosmatka passed her AICP test a while ago, but now has finished all her other requisites and requirements, and is now an AICP Certified Planner. He is not surprised she passed it on her first try. Every planner here is now certified.

## **Receive Comments from the Public**

There were no comments from the public.

## **Adjournment**

CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a motion to adjourn the meeting.

COMMISSIONER MANI made a motion to adjourn the Meeting. COMMISSIONER GASKILL seconded the motion. CHAIRMAN GRAY requested a voice vote. Hearing no opposition, he declared the Meeting Adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.