

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE MAY 18, 2017 REGULAR MEETING
ITEM #3: WORKSHOP: THE RESIDENCE AT BROOKSIDE GLEN – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MAGNUSON LANE AND 191ST STREET – SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT

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

Present were the following

Plan Commissioners:

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

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): None

Village Officials and Staff:

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

Guest (s):

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

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

May 18, 2017

To: Plan Commission of The Village of Tinley Park

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

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

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

Respectfully,

Jacob C. Vandenberg
Mayor

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

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

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

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

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