

VILLAGE OF ORLAND PARK

*14700 Ravinia Avenue
Orland Park, IL 60462
www.orland-park.il.us*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 24, 2015

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Louis Stephens, Chairman

*Commissioners: Judith Jacobs, Paul Aubin, Steve Dzierwa,
Nick Parisi, John J. Paul and Laura Murphy*

CALLED TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by the Plan Commission Chairman, Mr. Lou Stephens, at 7:00 p.m.

Present: 5 - Chairman Stephens; Member Aubin; Member Parisi; Member Paul, Member Murphy

Absent: 2 - Member Jacobs, Member Dzierwa

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2015-0067 Minutes of the December 8, 2015 Plan Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Aubin, seconded by Commissioner Paul; to approve the minutes of the November 10, 2015 Plan Commission with the following changes:

Under Macon’s testimony on Page 6, change the “decorations” to “declarations”.

Under Pittos’ testimony on Page 10, add “enters the site” to the end of the statement.

I move to continue the minutes of the December 8, 2015 Plan Commission Meeting to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

APPROVED

Aye: 5 - Chairman Stephens, Member Aubin, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Member Jacobs and Member Dzierwa

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2015-0516 Townhomes at Colette Highlands - Planned Unit Development

PITTOS: Staff presentation made in accordance with written staff report dated November 10, 2015.

STEPHENS: Thank you Mr. Pittos.

SCHIESS: John Schiess, representing the applicant. Presentation made in addition to staff’s report.

STEPHENS: Thank you. We will see if anyone in the audience cares to make any comments.

MCLAUGHLIN: Pat McLaughlin, president of the association of the Park Station Boulevard Condominiums. My first question would be what is the process for

these changes? I am getting this for the first time like 15 minutes ago. I thought I was coming here tonight to see elevation changes. I was never notified of site changes. I am seeing this for the very first time. I haven't had a lot of time to digest this but that slide shows homes 60, 40, 47 and 34 now have 3 car garages. I'm not sure that the entire complex has the advantage of those 4 parking spaces especially if they are going to be used for snow. We had 15 parking spaces before and technically there are 15 now but 4 of those are located in such a place, I am not sure if they are servicing the community for parking as the others were. From Building C, to the front of our building, how many feet are we talking about? You are showing 32' from the front of the building to the property line. I am just curious what it would be from there to the front of my building. I say that Commissioner because this is our front yard. This is what we're looking at.

STEPHENS: You would be looking at the front elevations.

MCLAUGHLIN: Yes. I understand that. I just want to know how close they are going to be. Before, we had a parking lot there and a drive. That Building C was pushed much further back north.

STEPHENS: The prior drive aisles had 14' drive aisles. That is why that has been done.

MCLAUGHLIN: I understand. I am digesting this while this meeting is happening.

SCHIESS: It is an estimate because I am looking at the engineer's drawings. He shows a 42' setback from the property line to the face of the condominium building to the south.

MCLAUGHLIN: That can't be correct. The property line is 7' back from the wheel stops on the parking which leaves another 12', and then you have a 15' drive aisle and then the sidewalk.

STEPHENS: So it is 74' from face of building to face of building?

INAUDIBLE

MCLAUGHLIN: I think a tape measure is in order. What is the process with the Village? I have been here for all of the meetings and I was not notified that there was a change made to all of this. Is there a procedure?

PITTOS: The procedure is once you are in public hearing; it is an active project in terms of the public participation on that project. The developer got marching orders directly from the plan commission at the last meeting. The public was essentially informed at the meeting that these revisions needed to be met.

MCLAUGHLIN: Those were elevation changes.

PITTOS: And site plan changes.

MCLAUGHLIN: No there were no site plan changes made from this board. It was strictly the elevations. Mr. Stephens was not happy with the vanilla look of the building. I am here on my own tonight, no attorney and no homeowners. I do not necessarily think this is a terrible thing but I would like to look at this. This is a surprise attack here and I am not real thrilled about that.

PITTOS: In terms of the site plan, there were not any recommendations made by the Plan Commission because it was continued but there were marching orders given and I do recall conversations between the commission and the development team regarding the parking and that south parking field and how to approach distributing the parking throughout the site so that it is not all one sided on one end and affect the quality of life for the residents in Building C but then also providing the necessary amount of parking at the south end that you wouldn't have the potential for people parking in the condo lot.

MCLAUGHLIN: I think you are citing conversations you might have had with the architect. That is not what took place at this meeting two or three weeks ago. I can tell you that for a fact. I left this meeting with the site plan 4. Everybody was in agreement. It looked good. I submitted a letter that our attorney drafted in cahoots with John in his office with his people. I was asking for 9 items of interest for protecting our property. Everybody agreed that the plan looked good. Mr. Stephens made it a point that you weren't happy with the vanilla look of it. I guess not having had a chance to look at this or my attorneys look at this, not having been notified of anything, it is really disappointing. I don't know who is in charge of that...

STEPHENS: I don't think anyone is in charge of giving any further notifications. The notifications were met with regards to the code. The requirements are publication for this petition, then we had the meeting and at that meeting we continued it. It doesn't matter what it was based upon. It was a continued meeting for further discussion, whether it was just elevations or site plan or whatever.

MCLAUGHLIN: Ok then, you've answered my question. I thought something like this with a dramatic change, that I would have been notified. But who am I, anyhow? I live there and I'm trying to protect the best interests of the people there.

STEPHENS: You live there and we want to listen to what you have to say.

MCLAUGHLIN: Looking at this now, I think you're losing 4 parking spaces but they're going to put the fence up and I'm going to be segregated from the property. My big concern is how close Building C is from the property. You're saying approximately 70'. That is pretty close and definitely closer than what plan 4 was.

STEPHENS: I understand your point but we made a point as well. I don't know that it was discussed at that meeting but it was discussed later. I went to the staff and discussed it after the meeting. The point was that the 18' long driveways and the 14' drive aisles are just not in compliance. So the only way to make that change and bring them into compliance was to push the buildings over to where the parking was. What was done on this site plan was they kept the same number of additional parking spaces which was 15 from the original plan that you were aware of. The only thing that has been done since then was we created the bigger drive aisles. We took the length of the driveways and increased them. We then redistributed the 15 parking stalls throughout the site and they are closer to all of the other buildings.

MCLAUGHLIN: I don't think that was bad judgement on anyone's part. I also question whether 60 units is the number of units in here too. If you took out Building G completely, you can move all of these buildings back. The last project we had, we tried to get 72 townhomes in and then we dropped it down to 24 ranch style but they couldn't make the financials work. Now we are hung up on this number 60. We actually started out at 59 and by removing the road, they increased it to 60. Who says 60 is the number? It just seems like we're trying to find every square inch. You have those nice homes, that beautiful park and now we're going to cram 60 units in there. Is that the number? Why 60?

STEPHENS: So if I understand your comment, you're thinking it's too many units?

MCLAUGHLIN: They are trying to make money. I appreciate John and his roll and the developer. They are going to build these townhomes and then take their money and go back home. You and I live here and this is something we have to contend with now forever. Rather than pull the trigger on something that we're trying to figure out a way to somehow get those 60 townhomes in, maybe we don't need 60 townhomes in there. Maybe there is too many. I have no idea but if you take Building G out, you can move all of these buildings back. You have another woman that is going to come up here and holler about how close these buildings are to her back yard. Commissioner, I have never done this before and I've gotten myself into a job here by moving into this building. In hind sight I never would have moved if I had known. It is a learning process. I don't know all of the legal ramifications.

AUBIN: Are you saying leave it up to the professionals?

MCLAUGHLIN: Sure but sometimes professionals make mistakes too. We are trying to figure out a way to get 60 townhomes on here, why?

SCHIESS: Before I address that. It seems like we have walked back a bit. I consider Patrick a friend throughout this process. We had support at 60 last time with the previous site plan. The change is that it has shifted over. I will tell you that it is a shortfall. Who dropped the ball in this process? As you mentioned the Village

does not have a process to warn people to the changes but I made it my job to reach out to the folks and I assumed that Patrick knew about this site plan. I don't like people to see things 15 minutes before the meeting and I can understand Patrick trying to visualize and take in the impact of that building coming closer. If we had a conversation over a cup of coffee, I would tell him that yes the building moved closer, however the parking lot which is what he would have seen from his building and he now gets to see green space and a nicely designed façade. I would rather see that and hopefully he agrees. There is already a parking lot there.

MCLAUGHLIN: We were already going to see that façade but it was going to be back 25'-30'. These are tall buildings.

SCHIESS: I understand. I take responsibility for that shortfall in the process at that point for not reaching out to Patrick and having that conversation with him over coffee and reaching out to the single family folks as well. Somehow I thought the benefits that I saw would be clear to Patrick and the other folks.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

MCLAUGHLIN: Where do we go from here? Will this continue on? Do I need to get my attorney involved? I would like him to see this.

AUBIN: You have a couple of options. If this indeed goes forward from here it will go to the Committee, which is 3 trustees and then if they approve it, it will go to the Village Board who makes the final approval.

MCLAUGHLIN: So you make the recommendation to the 3 trustees and they go through a process similar to this. If they all agree, then it goes on.

STEPHENS: They have a meeting before the Board meeting and they make a determination. Right now we can either continue this or move it forward. If we move it forward, it goes to the Committee, which meets an hour before the Board meeting and that meeting is December 21, 2015. It will go to that Committee, a 3 member committee of 3 of the Village Trustees. From there, it can go to the Village Board.

MCLAUGHLIN: So what happens with these plans? Can it change again and again and again? When does it stop?

STEPHENS: It could change based on what the Committee says. We are going to make a recommendation tonight to continue or move it on. Then the Committee can make another recommendation to change it. If they don't make any changes and don't require an additional public hearing, then it can go to the Board. The Board has the final say.

MCLAUGHLIN: John is a good guy. I think maybe it is an oversight on his part. I

am a little bit put out by this. I am usually much better prepared and having been blind sided with this and not really having a chance to look it over, I guess the general dynamics are ok. It doesn't look entirely different from what the other site plan looked like. In all honesty it makes more sense than having all of the parking located on the south side. It does because now the people on the north side can utilize that as well. My only concern is when I looked at that is how close it is to my front window.

SCHIESS: I think I have something that can add clarity. If you look at site plan 4, the distance between the building and the property line is 59'. The difference is 27' so the building was moved 27'.

MCLAUGHLIN: Ok. I am satisfied with this. I have taken up enough of your time.

STEPHENS: Are you aware that some of those conditions we could not put in our motion?

MCLAUGHLIN: I am aware of that. We will have to handle that in a civil matter. He has given us written confirmation that he has agreed to all of the conditions of our request. I appreciate it, thank you.

STEPHENS: Anyone else?

AUBIN: Swore in Melissa Canellis, 15601 Julies Way, Orland Park.

CANELLIS: Usually you get my husband and if the city were not about to explode, tonight he would be here. I have been to 2 of the 3 planning meetings with John and this wasn't the last plan. Again, we were involved up to a certain point. The last request we made as homeowner's was to move the end units. Why do you need 60 row homes back here? You want to call them townhomes but we have townhomes in our neighborhood. These are 3 stories, almost 42' high buildings. What we asked them to remove those end units for the very same reason. On the plan before this, the end of those units they are 29' from the back of our property, now with the additional parking that you decided to put back there, how much more space does that take up? It's no longer 29' to the back of our property.

PARISI: The building is.

CANELLIS: Not the parking though. It changes the aesthetic of what we were told. No fence and no road. Now we have asphalt and we have aspects of the townhome that reach further back closer to our property. 29' is really close because it does not look at the back of another house. It is looking at a building that is 42' high.

PARISI: So you are objecting to the building and not the parking. The parking is sheltered by the all the planting. You are not going to see the parking but you will

see the building.

CANELLIS: You are going to see the parking. How much more room does that eat up into the 29'?

SCHIESS: Specifically how close is the parking? It is an additional 11' beyond the face of the townhome only in 4 spots.

CANELLIS: That is the other thing that we had asked for repeatedly. Can we get a site plan map? It is the clearest shot but we cannot plot our houses back there to figure out what our view would be. I think that is totally fair especially because in 18', that is what we are going to see. It really changes the aesthetic. I'm sorry but that is directly in our back yard and I am interested to hear that 18' is acceptable?

STEPHENS: You had a drive aisle there before where people would race back and forth. That has been totally eliminated. What is better: to leave the drive aisle there and have the cars going back or forth or to put 29' of landscaping back there and no more drive aisle? What is better?

CANELLIS: I don't mind any of this undeveloped back there.

PARISI: The only way that is going to happen is if the people that own the homes, buy the property.

STEPHENS: You need to buy the property then.

CANELLIS: You asked me what is better, that is what's better.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Do you have any other comments to make?

CANELLIS: I do. Now the 29' of landscaping in some parts is cut down to 18'. I would love to know if our backyard, which we are set the farthest back of any of our neighbors, we are the closest. This is a lot of units right in our backyard.

STEPHENS: It was approved for 96 condominiums.

CANELLIS: I understand that and we have talked about that a lot and the way that they were spaced, there was going to be a lot of green space between those buildings. You could still have a clear sight line all the way to the hills.

PARISI: Depending on where your house sat. So you could have had a clear view and someone else could have been looking at a condo building.

STEPHENS: We are not going to debate this. What are your questions so we can get them answered and move on?

CANELLIS: I would like the Commission to give us time to talk about this new plan. Again, we were involved up until a certain point and then this was just presented tonight and I don't even think anybody knew or you would have more people here which that is ok but it has been great to have that communication up until this standpoint. Then we came tonight and this is the plan that is up on the board. I would not like it approved. I would like to know if 60 has to be the number of townhomes that goes in this spot. I would like to see that number reduced. I would like to get the site plan that was to be provided to the homeowners. Wasn't that mentioned?

PITTOS: What was mentioned was that the single family homeowners requested perspective drawings showing the relationship between where the single family homes sat and the elevations of the townhomes which is one of the exhibits that the architect spoke to. That was provided.

CANELLIS: We have asked you for that to be able to see what the back of our homes, what we will be up against.

SCHIESS: We did provide that to the homeowner's association. We did meet with representatives of the association. It is one voice speaking at the microphone but it is in my notes that say it is not the only voice. I would like some time to share my notes with you.

CANELLIS: That's fine. I am one voice and I am here because I received an email stating that there was a new site plan today. Please keep that in mind. Thank you.

STEPHENS: Thank you.

SCHIESS: Yes, on the 27th of October, we met with 5 representatives of the single family homes. In addition to those 5 members, there was a woman who spoke for the management company. The consensus was what would you rather have? And it came from their members asking themselves the question. A road back there 5' away from the property line of people who you just don't know who they are or the plan that we are presenting at the time? Again, mea culpa, I didn't share the plan with the single family homeowners as well so I can understand that Mrs. Canellis needs some time to look over that. But I think at the end of the day, the benefits of this plan far outweigh previous site plans that we have submitted and certainly outweigh 3 condominiums that are over 60' tall. I should have done a graphic to represent where that would be in relationship to the single family homes. The comment is absolutely right. Some homes would look directly into the condominiums while others would have a relief. Here it is a little more democratic: lower in height, more chances of site channels. That is my input. I still take responsibility for not sending out this latest site plan to the single family homeowners as well.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Anyone else?

AUBIN: Swore in Earl Bybee, 15630 Park Station Boulevard, Orland Park.

BYBEE: This is kind of deceiving. They show 29' but that isn't accurate because they are adding the 11' for the parking, which nobody wants to see. I think he mentioned something about parking along Park Station? I don't think you can park there.

STEPHENS: You can park on Jillian Road.

BYBEE: If you had a car on each side, no one could get by. It's not wide enough. It's 2 lane traffic.

PITTOS: It is the typical residential street width. You would have to navigate like you would on any other residential street. The width of Park Station Boulevard, it has been mislabeled on some site plans as Jillian Road, is a typical residential street 60' right of way. So you could park in the street but just like on any residential street, if you have two cars parked on either side, you would have to navigate and wave the other guy through. One person at a time would have to pass.

STEPHENS: So it is a typical width street as compared to all of the other streets in the community.

PARISI: The point of bringing that up is to demonstrate that if people have guests, there is the potential there for additional parking. It is not to suggest that it will be used for both sides all of the time.

STEPHENS: It is just for guest parking.

BYBEE: I just wanted to bring it up because it's not like you can park there and the cars could still go through. You kind of have to...whatever. And where will they push the snow?

SCHIESS: Demonstrates where snow will be pushed. It will be pushed to the back behind the single family homes. But whoever pushes the snow will work for the association so it will be done so as not to damage any property.

STEPHENS: Does anyone have any additional comments to make?

PITTOS: There were a few questions that were posed that staff's perspective might help answer. On the issue of sharing the site plan, I just want to set the record straight on what the Village's role is. In terms of the site plan, this site plan was revised last week. The first reiteration was seen on Wednesday last week and by Friday we had come to this version shown on the overhead. Once we landed on that version, it was shared with the Plan Commission Chairman and it

was also shared by request with the single family home owner's president: Carrie Fotopolous. She was emailed the same information that the plan commission received in addition to the revised site plan that came in shortly after the plan commission packet went out by request. It is a point of continuous engagement of the single family home owner's and the Village's willingness to provide the documents when requested. That site plan was pushed out to the single family home owner's. I can't push it out to everybody because I don't have everyone's emails but at least the representative received it on Friday fresh off the press. There hadn't been much time between the revision and when Plan Commission received it to share it to everybody to begin with. But when we were able to do it, we did. As it relates to the west property line and the distances between the single family home backyards and the townhouses, with every project and proposal that has come through regarding this subject site, it has always been the Village's position to maintain the west buffer yard according to the original 2005 master plan for Colette Highlands, which has always been 10'-15'. The actual buffer yard width is about 11' today which meets buffer yard standards and requirements per code. Our position was to never encroach on that west buffer yard and to maintain it at all times. This is the one site plan that has demonstrated the ability to increase that buffer yard from the minimum requirement to the 28'. Even with the addition of parking spaces at the west end, these are still farther away from the property line than the existing drive aisle. It also maintains a more robust west buffer yard along that edge which we had conveyed to the development team that the west buffer yard is going to be under great scrutiny from our landscape plan review process to make sure that we have the necessary screening. What we see here today is a conceptual idealization. On the question of the number of units proposed, I am not going to defend the density here other than by saying that we should look at the bulk requirements because this site plan unlike previous site plans has the least amount of modifications associated to the bulk requirements. Effectively 60 units fit within the bulk requirement envelopes established by the Land Development Code. The only modification to the bulk requirement is to reduce the front setback from 20' to 18'. That only happens along Building H. The reason why this is 18' is essentially to establish a 22' main access drive consistently through the site. The other modifications: the reduction of the south buffer yard from 10' to 4', with Building C moving closer to the south property line, this buffer yard has now increased in size. The modification remains due to the encroachment of the turnaround circle which is about 4'. As far as the lot coverage, no site plan ever demonstrated the ability for this site to meet 45% lot coverage. What we have seen here however is 66% lot coverage. At the end of the day, all site plans for this site have always exceeded lot coverage. This happens to meet and is closer in conformity to the plan that is not a condo project. I hope that provides some perspective as to how 60 units can fit on the property and not necessarily why but at least we know how.

MCLAUGHLIN: We show a break there in the median for the parkway. Has that been approved?

PITTOS: Yes from an engineering perspective a full access driveway has been approved.

STEPHENS: Thank you. Hearing no other comments at this time, we will go to our Commissioners and see where we are going to go with this.

MURPHY: I have a couple of comments. I do sympathize with the residents but all things considered, this site plan and elevations have gotten better as they have gone along. In the end this will be a beautiful development. I am in favor.

PARISI: I too understand people's concerns and I appreciate that they take the time to show up to these meetings. I agree with Commissioner Murphy, this makes a lot more sense. Initially, as far as the setbacks, 29' to the houses, that exceeds what they could have done. There is no drive through aisle there and I would think that these are rather attractive townhomes. I would much rather be looking at them then at the back of three tall condo buildings. Even the condo building that exists right now, they would be looking at another condo building next to them. This is a continuation of a previous meeting. Perhaps it would have been nice if everyone had received the plan but this is a better plan. We are not asking for a whole slew of modifications. This is the highest and best use of this property to date. That is the right of the person who owns the property, to develop this to its highest and best potential within the guidelines established by the Village. I would be inclined to go with this.

AUBIN: I agree with my fellow commissioners. If we had this type of cooperation from petitioners that have come before this Commission a lot more things would get done. The petitioner has met the demands of the public, the codes and requirements by the Village of Orland Park. If someone owns it, wants to develop it and follows the codes, I say full speed ahead.

PAUL: I want to commend the petitioner as well for reaching out to the folks in the single family homes and the condos as well to try to make this work. I realize you can't do something like this and make everybody happy but I think you have done a good job trying to appease the majority. A question came up about 60 being the magic number; well there is a point where this economically has to make sense too. This is a step in the process. This meets the parameters that we are looking at. This goes through another couple of steps and things can change or happen there. But from where I sit, I have no problems and I am inclined to go with it.

STEPHENS: I echo the same sentiments. I agree that the site plan is much more improved in my opinion. It is a much better site plan. You have eliminated the street back there. When all of the homeowner's bought the homes, they were made aware of the 11' buffer yard that is back there with a street. Now with this site plan, you are getting a 29' buffer yard. It is much more improved. In addition to that, the prior site plan that we looked at had all of the additional guest parking pushed over to the south end. This redistributes the parking further throughout the

complex so it makes more sense for the individuals to park in areas close to them rather than parking on the street or all the way on the south end or the Metra lot. I think the site plan is much better. With regards to your building elevations, the second, fifth and eighth unit, we would like to see brick up to at least the 8' required code. With regards to your push pull, you are only using a 1' bump out, can you use a 2' bump out? A 1' bump out really doesn't make much of a difference.

SCHIESS: Inaudible. This we can certainly make 2' between units. If we do that and push the bay, it makes a wider building.

STEPHENS: Just the push pull.

SCHIESS: Yes, I can accept that.

STEPHENS: Thank you. And the brick?

SCHIESS: Yes.

STEPHENS: We are trying to get something to be built on a piece of property that is a distressed piece of property. It looks horrible the longer it sits out there. I think you would all agree with that. We have seen other plans. We made have made a mistake passing the last plan with the number of units it had but this plan is under the allowable density. The lot coverage is less than what we have seen. I think this is a much better land plan. You have come a long way with the architecture and I am in favor of this moving forward. Those are all of my comments and the chair will entertain a motion.

AUBIN:

I move to accept as findings of fact of this Plan Commission the findings of fact set forth in this staff report, dated November 24, 2015,

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the preliminary site plan titled "Townhomes at Colette Highlands" prepared by John Conrad Shieess Architect, sheet SK1.0f 7A, dated last revised November 24, 2015, subject to the following conditions:

1. Add a sidewalk connection leading from the walkways between Buildings F and G to the northeast corner of the subject site.
2. Extend sidewalk connections east to Centennial Park West across Park Station Boulevard where the raised median is opened to provide full access.
3. Make necessary site adjustments to mitigate lot coverage to accommodate necessary driveway widths.

4. Submit a final landscape plan for separate review and approval within 60 days of final engineering approval.
5. Meet all final engineering and building code related items.
6. Relocate sidewalk, irrigation and lighting infrastructure as well as existing trees along the south property line belonging to the Condo building to an appropriate location on the Condo property.
7. Install a black iron ornamental metal fence along the south property line to separate the Condo property from the townhouse development.
8. Remove the wooden fence on the west property line (shown on the previous site plan) between the single family homes and the subject property from the site plan.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Elevations titled "Townhomes at Colette Highlands" prepared by John Conrad Schiess Architect, dated November 24, 2015, sheet number SK2.1f revised as concept for the other buildings subject to the same conditions outlined in the Preliminary Site Plan motion and the following conditions:

1. Screen all mechanical equipment either at grade level with landscaping or hidden behind the roofline.
2. Submit elevation drawings for the other facades of the buildings prior to attending Committee. These should be reflective of the design patterns shown on the sample elevation plans at the November 24, 2015 Plan Commission meeting.
3. Modify all units that have all frame front elevations to now include decorative face brick to a height of at least 8' creating a brick frame look on all of the frame front and rear elevations.
4. Offset the foundations and building facades 2'.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board to approve the nine (9) lot subdivision for Townhomes at Colette Highlands subject to the following condition:

1. Submit a Record Plat of Subdivision to the Village for review, approval and recording prior to the Board of Trustees meeting.

And

I move to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Special Use Permit for the Townhomes at Colette Highlands, a 60 unit single family attached development, subject to the same conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Site Plan motion. Modifications to the Special Use permit include:

1. Reduce the front setback from 20 feet to 18 feet;
2. Increase the building height from 30 feet to 41 feet;
4. Reduce the south bufferyard Type A from 10 feet to 4 feet; and
5. Increase the lot coverage from 45% to a maximum 70%.

All changes must be made prior to the Board meeting.

PARISI: Second.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Aye: 5 - Chairman Stephens, Member Aubin, Member Parisi, Member Paul and Member Murphy

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Member Jacobs and Member Dzierwa

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

2015-0040 Memo: New Petitions & Appearance Review

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Plan Commission, the Chairman adjourned the meeting.

STEPHENS: This meeting is adjourned at 8:36 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zorena
Recording Secretary