

**Long Grove Plan Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA)  
Regular Meeting Minutes --- May 2, 2017**

Present: Commissioners Jeff Kazmer, Shelly Rubin, Magdalena Dworak, Charles Cohn, Helen Wilson, and Bill Peltin. Chairman Fred Phillips arrived late

Absent; None

Also Present: James Hogue, Village Planner, Betsy Gates-Alford, Village Attorney, and members of the public.

**1. Appointment of Chairman *pro tem*.** Commissioner Cohn nominates Commissioner Rubin as Chairman *pro tem* for purposes of this PCZBA meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Peltin. On a voice vote, all ayes.

**2. Call to Order:** Chairman *pro tem* Rubin called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

**3. Visitors Business:**

Chairman *pro tem* Rubin asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to address the Commission on a non-agenda item. Ms. Carrie Perricone, 5229 Hilltop Road, expressed her objections to the proposed update to the Village Comprehensive Plan as it related to Route 83 and Aptakisic Road. Her objections was to high density residential development and commercial development adjacent to the Briarcrest Subdivision. She presented a signed petition from residents objecting to the changes as well.

The PCZBA accepted the objection and noted at this point in the process this objection would be considered at the public hearing regarding the adoption of the proposed plan.

**4. Old Business:**

Consideration of a request for a Zoning Map Amendment to the R-3 District and a Special Use Permit to allow a 31 lot Planned Unit Development/ subdivision (density bonus requested) to be known as the Deer Trail Subdivision including; 1) lot sizes of less than 33,000 sq. ft; 2) setback relief from the underlying R-3 District regulations in excess of the 20% maximum provided for in the Village Code; 3) text amendments to the Village Code to allow the Planned Unit Development as proposed (w/lot sizes and setback relief) and/or additional relief necessary and/or appropriate under the village code to allow the development of property zoned under the R-3 PUD district classification as proposed upon annexation to the Village of Long Grove per a proposed annexation agreement as submitted by Swanson Development L.L.C.

Chairman *pro tem* Rubin read the request into the record and swore in the witnesses to testify. He then asked the Petitioner to give a brief overview of the proposal.

Mr. Rick Swanson, Swanson Development, 1930 Amberley Court, Lake Forest, Illinois introduced himself, and gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the proposal for the "Deer Trail of Long Grove" development.

He noted three points of order from the public hearing at the April meeting; these being traffic, water, and allowable density through Lake County (as the property is currently not annexed to the village).

He explained conservation design and cluster developments noting he has been successfully using this development technique for the last 15 years. He encouraged PCZBA members to visit his "Everett Farms" development in Lake Forest. This proposal is very similar to that development.

He then reviewed the proposed site plan, and engineering noting that the development would be serviced with sanitary sewer (to be extended from the south via the Karen's Corner Development). He is requesting lot sizes of 11,000 to 16,000 that are in conflict with both the PUD and subdivision regulations, which require a minimum of 33,000 sq. ft. of land area per lot. Additionally, setbacks of 30 feet on the front and rear yards and 12 feet on the side yards are also requested. The PUD regulations allow a reduction in setbacks not to exceed 20% of the requirement for the underlying zoning district (i.e. front yards of 40 feet and side yards of 24 feet). As proposed front and side yard setback reductions exceed this amount. He is seeking relief from these requirements as well.

All engineering concerns noted by the village engineer can be addressed. Roads would be private and additional setback in addition to the 100' scenic corridor would be added for the total of 130' of setback from Old Hicks Road. A roadway connection is identified for property to the south (Karen's Corner) per the urging of village staff and for better coordination of both developments. He indicated a preference for individual wells as opposed to a private water system based upon the opinion of his well driller Joseph H. Huemann & Sons. He also noted the traffic study for the development prepared by KLOA Consultants. Results of this study indicate there would be little impact to the existing roadway system with this development and no roadway improvement are required with this proposal.

He presented revised traffic study figures indicating no improvements were necessary to Old Hicks Road as a result of this development but that traffic issues at the intersection of Route 53 and Old Hicks Road were identified. Intersection improvement at this location, and in particular on Route 53, could help with the traffic situation.

He reiterated the benefits of Conservation Design and presents a concept of development in this area could occur (including the Karen's Corner Property) as a conservation design development with the same density as currently proposed. He also spoke to typical lot layout, architecture, trails and wetland protections to be maintained on-site.

Chairman *pro tem* Rubin then asked for comments from the public.

Ms. Dina Krueger, 2343 RFD, indicates she is a 30 year resident of the Village and noted her concerns with traffic and water wells with this development as well as the Karen's Corner Development. She asked if the intersection improvements at Old Hicks and 53 were a reality or merely a suggestion.

Mr. Swanson responded that the intersection improvement were a suggestion at this time; as IDOT would be involved he was not sure how this improvements would be implemented. He would however work proactively to assist in resolution of the traffic issues at this intersection.

Ms. Krueger suggested improvements to Dorothy Lane to provide alternative ingress and egress to the development and Route 53.

Mr. Swanson replied they had contacted the property owners to the west of the development, along the Dorothy Lane right-of-way and there was no interest in from them. He also cautioned about additional access to Route 53 from Old Hicks and unintended consequences such as increased traffic volumes from cut through traffic.

Mr. Bill Woodward, Senior Consultant, KLOA Consulting, he had prepared the traffic study for the proposal. Traffic is heaviest at peak morning and evening hours. Old Hicks Road can easily accommodate the traffic from this development per his findings. No improvements are required to Old Hicks Road from this development proposal.

He explained traffic at Old Hicks & Route 53 is problematic and acknowledged the difficulties at this intersection, which to a large degree presently exist. A traffic signal is not warranted at this location. Right turn lanes are not a good option. Left turn lanes from Route 53 onto Old Hicks Road offer the best solution for this problem (which is off-site from the proposed development).

Ms. Lisa Phillips, 3316 RFD, reiterate the problems with the Old Hicks and Route 53 intersection. She notes traffic volume and the speed of traffic as issues. This issue is particularly bad for westbound traffic looking to make a left turn onto Old Hicks Road. A left turn lane off of Route 53 would remove this hazard.

Mr. Swanson concurred with this statement, however he noted this is not on his property and he is not sure how to implement such an improvement. As there is benefit to his development from such an improvement (as well as resolution of the existing traffic situation), he would be willing to work proactively to address this issue.

Mr. Woodward indicated next steps would be to examine the existing right-of-way and begin discussions with IDOT. This could be a very lengthy process in dealing with IDOT.

Ms. Phillips complemented the overall design of the project but noted the differences between the lot sizes in this proposal and "typical" lots and houses in the Village. She noted that existing residents are having difficulty selling property and the smaller lot sizes as proposed may be more attractive to buyers thereby undermining the ability of existing residents to sell their property.

Mr. Swanson responded that the proposed dwellings would be of a very high quality with high quality materials used in construction. The "large house/large lot issues was the same in his Lake Forest developments. His experience has been that the market trend is away from the "large house/large lot scenario. Smaller houses with high quality amenities are more desirable in today's market place.

Ms. Phillips reiterated that the "standard" in Long Grove has been large lot development. She questioned the effect of smaller lots and houses on the character of the community, property values and the existing housing stock.

Mr. Swanson responded that his proposal will not decrease property values and his houses will not sell for less than the existing housing stock in this market.

Mr. Steven Peck, 5253 RFD, stated that the smaller houses and lots will depreciate property values. The larger lots have more space and therefore are taxed at a high rate. Smaller lots will pay less in taxes and therefore subsidized by the large lots. He also raised issues with proposed lot sizes of 3,600 to 4,000 sq. ft. and the 12 foot side yard setback between houses. He questioned the proposed

cost of the houses as well.

Mr. Swanson responded that a similar development he had done in Vernon Hills had prices in the \$800,000 range. He anticipated the Long Grove market to meet or exceed this figure. His developments are not designed to decrease property values. His developments are based on "conservation design principals" which have been in existence for a number of years and in fact are supported by the current comprehensive plan for the village. He cited the Fields of Long Grove as being an existing example of a cluster development in the Village.

Mr. Peck as raised the issue of the availability of private well to adequately service the development with smaller lot sized and proximity of wellheads to one another.

Mr. Jeff Huemann, of Huemann Well Drillers of Johnsburg, Illinois, indicated he is the well driller for the project. He explained how aquifers function and that the ability of an aquifer to service a development is not based on the surface area of the lot.

Ms. Camy Gould, Fidelity Wes Builders, indicated she was a former resident of the Village and a Plan Commission member as well. She felt there are areas of the Village where cluster developments could work but that these should be located on the periphery of the village and not in established areas. She also noted that the Karen's Corner development (proposed by Fidelity Wes) is of a different style than proposed by Mr. Swanson thereby making the connection between the two subdivisions not feasible. She noted this is an inappropriate place for this type of development.

Mr. George Yeager, 1503 RFD, resident and former Village Board Member, noted that large lots were part of the openness and spaciousness of the Village. The large lots contribute to groundwater (aquifer) recharge that benefits the village as a whole. There is value in maintaining the larger (1 acre minimum) lot sizes.

Mr. Mike Demar, Fidelity Wes Builders, asked if any written comments had been received regarding this proposal.

Planner Hogue indicated that all written comments received prior to 6:30 P.M. have been copied and distributed to the individual PCZBA members at their seats before the meeting. He noted most comments were in objection to the proposal based on lot size. Other issues were raised as well however.

Mr. Demar noted this is not the right place for this development. He objected to the conservation design concept and the inclusion of his property in the example provided.

Ms. Marsha Marshall, 4512 RFD, noted it was premature to be considering this proposal ahead of the updated comprehensive plan. Cluster housing has different meaning in various communities. She would hate to see "exceptions" change the character of Long Grove.

Mr. Ed Acuna, 5223 RFD, noted the comprehensive plan should be followed in this instance. If cluster developments are ecologically good; why would this not also work on one acre lots.

Hearing nothing further from the public, Chairman *pro tem* Rubin then asked for comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Kazmer noted that many people move to this area for large lot developments (1 acre +). He indicated this not the place for this type of development and the traffic and water issues have not been adequately resolved.

Mr. Jeff Huemann, Huemann Well Drillers, noted he would not be in support of a cluster development at this location if he felt it would damage the aquifer. He has reviewed well logs for the area and does not believe this development would damage the aquifer. He noted most wells in the area tap into the sand a gravel aquifer. A shallower aquifer is available but not used; most wells are drilled 200 to 350 feet deep. Based on his research, water from individual wells should not be an issue for existing and proposed development in the area.

Commissioner Peltin indicated that additional homes will have an impact on the aquifer; he is sensitive to impacts on existing wells in the area.

Mr. Heumann responded that a hydrogeologist could give better testimony regarding aquifers and groundwater movement but even a hydrogeologist cannot guarantee that development will not affect existing wells.

Commissioner Dworak was concerned with traffic. She realizes that the Route 53/Old Hicks intersection is not necessarily the petitioners' issue, but she has been stuck in traffic at that intersection in peak times. Traffic getting out of the village can be problematic and this proposal will be adding traffic to the area; especially accessing Lake-Cook Road. The traffic issues for this development needs resolved.

Mr. Swanson responded that it is important to him to resolve these issues as well; it is his problem too with homeowners trying to access the development. If IDOT is willing to work to resolve this issue and all parties with an interest in the situation come to the table to resolve the issue then he will work proactively as well toward addressing the traffic issues.

Commissioner Peltin asked if the petition were denied would he seek to develop in the county?

Mr. Swanson responded that he was not sure at this point in time He would need to be in touch with the property sellers to discuss next moves. If denied he would need to respect the character of the community; perhaps clustering is not right at this time should that be the case.

Commissioner Peltin indicated it was probably better for the Village to address the development concerns than the county. He was not opposed to cluster housing but noted some of the big impacts of the development (such as water) have not been adequately addressed. He indicates that the large house/large lot scenario is obsolete; the big impacts of the development do need to be addressed.

Mr. Swanson noted there may be other options for water such a deep community well.

Commissioner Wilson indicated traffic is a big concern. While Old Hicks Road can handle the traffic from 60 homes; what is the impact on the overall transportation system and the criteria for signal warrants?

Mr. Woodward responded Old Hicks Road would function fine; future development will impact the Old Hicks Route 53 intersection however. A signal for that intersection is not warranted so that does not appear to be an option at this location. Traffic congestion and delays are not part of the warrant criteria. Peak hour traffic is used to justify warrants.

Commissioner Wilson then commented on the impact of the development on the “feel” of the community and the large amount of relief requested on setbacks. She visited the other developments suggested as models by the petitioner and noted the proximity of houses to one another in the Amberly and Conway Farms developments as being very close. Most houses were front loaded as well. The proximity of houses to one another in the Everett Farms and Mill Fork Developments were even closer. Forty (40) foot setbacks would be better and more in character with the community.

Mr. Swanson responded that as part of conservation design the reduction of setbacks is necessary to achieve clustering. Unbuildable areas are left as open space and enhanced. Larger lots (and setbacks) could be achieved but common open space is lost. This could be a “conventional” subdivision however common open space is lost and from a philosophical perspective he does not agree with “large lot” subdivision concept. He has been successful with the conservation design approach and defended those principals.

It was noted that the Everett Farms development had lot sizes of 18,000 to 22,000 sq. ft. and these lot sizes may be more appropriate and serve to reduce the issue of the proximity of structures to one another.

Commissioner Cohn indicated the petitioner has not adequately addressed the traffic issues. Who would be responsible for the Route 53/Old Hicks intersection improvements? He also noted the proposed lot sizes of 1/3 to ¼ acre were acceptable in other communities but were outside the character of Long Grove as were the reduction in setbacks. He also noted that some of the land proposed for “conservancy” was not developable to begin with and not useable. He also questioned approving a development of this nature on the cusp of having an updated comprehensive plan. A development of the nature needs the consensus of the community and based on the evidence presented no one has indicated they are comfortable with the proposal.

Chairman *pro tem* Rubin noted that with 31 houses architecture and design would need to be in conformance with the Village anti-montony code and not use the same façade twice. He also asked if the proposed updates to the Comprehensive Plan would provide any guidance for developments of this nature?

Mr. Mike Sarlitto, Village Trustee and Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Member, indicates there has been much consideration and debate about future residential development in the Village. Residential development provides no long term benefit to the village as the village does not levy a property tax.

Chairman *pro tem* Rubin then asked for a motion on the request and announced that whatever the outcome of this hearing the PCZBA is a recommending body. The recommendations of the PCZBA will be presented to the Village Board on May 9<sup>th</sup> for consideration. The Village Board holds the authority to approve or deny such a request.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wilson, seconded by Commissioner Cohn to recommend denial of the application for text amendments, rezoning, planned development approval and other relief submitted by the Swanson Development, LLC. Discussion of the motion followed.

Commissioner Peltin questioned if the motion should be for denial or to continue the request until the approval of the Comprehensive Plan Update?

Commissioner Kazmer indicated a preference for this property to develop within the Village rather than the county.

Mr. Swanson interjected that he has had the property under contract for over year and has been waiting for the outcome of the plan update process. Pressure from the seller precipitated the application; he had decided not to develop in the County.

Ms. Wilson commented that the petitioner has indicated there is little room for negotiation on lot sizes. Lot size is the biggest concern and the development is out of character with the community as proposed.

Chairman pro tem Rubin commented that the residents do not appear to want this type of housing product as well.

It was noted that a “yes” is a vote for denial of the application per the stated motion.

On a roll call vote;

Commissioner Cohn; yes, Commissioner Wilson; yes; Commissioner Peltin; no; Commissioner Kazmer; no, Commissioner Dworak; no, Chairman pro tem Rubin; yes (Note; Chairman Phillips arrived at 9:00 PM and abstained from the vote). Motion goes to the Village Board with “No Recommendation”.

#### **4. New Business**

**a. Consideration of a petition for a zoning map amendment, and a Special Use Permit\ Preliminary PUD approval (including a 15% Density Bonus and setback relief per the Village PUD District Regulations) for property within the R-2 PUD District and unincorporated property to be zoned R-3 PUD District upon annexation to the Village of Long Grove (per an Annexation Agreement) as submitted by the KC1 INC. to allow for amendment of the previous preliminary PUD approval from an 18 unit R-2 single family detached residential PUD to a 29 unit R-3 PUD to develop as Phases I & II (17 & 11 lots respectively with requested relief) to be known as the Karen’s Corner Subdivision on property commonly known as the Iverson Property.**

Chairman Phillips assumed control of the meeting, read the request into the record and swore in the witnesses to give testimony.

Planner Hogue gave an overview of the request based on his staff report to the PCBZA as follows:

Petitioners are proposing an annexation agreement for the portion of the property currently in unincorporated Lake County. The 18 lots Single Family Detached Residential development previously proposed for the site remains largely intact. An additional 11 lots are now proposed for the southwest corner of the property that was previously to be left as open space and includes the area for the potential extension of Route 53. The petitioners are requesting R-3 PUD zoning and setback relief on the property per the proposed annexation agreement.

Gross developable lot sizes in portion of the development range from 79,068 to 33,012 square feet in size. Open space and pathway connectivity is greatly reduced from the approved original proposal.

The development is proposed to be served with sanitary sewer service from Lake County. Sanitary sewer service is available via the sanitary sewer line installed along Checker Road as part of the Menards development and has a recapture agreement associated with it. Private wells will provide domestic water service to the development.

Stormwater management will be accomplished via a detention ponds located on the property. Lake County Stormwater management regulations will need to be complied with.

Principal access to the development will be off Old Hicks Road. A low volume of traffic is associated with the proposal and should not have a significant impact on area roadways. No roadway or traffic control improvements are recommended or needed because of this proposal.

As the property abuts vacant undeveloped property to the north (anticipated as the Deer Trail development) staff recommends these two developments be interconnected to provide better access and overall traffic movement into the both developments. Furthermore, coordination of this development with the proposed development to the north (Deer Trail) should be encouraged to the greatest extent possible thereby creating an overall better designed and higher quality development pattern for this area of the village.

Ms. Camy Gould, representing Fidelity Wes Builders; 201 Robert Parker Coffin Road, explained the request noting that their goal was to maintain the look and feel of the area. The anticipated change in the comprehensive plan designation (from 2 acre to 1 acre development) is the impetus for the request. Phase I (18 lots previously approved) remains largely intact. Phase II as proposed would consist of an additional 11 lots to be placed to the south and west of Phase I.

The landscaping plan for the project does not change. Street trees, as required by the subdivision ordinance would be provided in Phase II in the same manner as Phase I. Existing trees would be left along Old Hicks Road.

Wetlands on the property would be maintained and improved.

The "Menards" Sanitary Sewer line would be extend north to the property line along Old Hicks Road. Water would be proved via individual wells. According to their well driller, this should not influence existing wells.

Traffic impacts should be minimal based upon the correspondence submitted from their traffic expert. No improvement to Old Hicks Road is required for this development. Pathways have been modified from the previous submittal are included in this proposal and connect to the pathway located on village property known as the "Soccer Fields".

The petitioners are not in favor of connectivity to the north as 1) the two developments are different in nature and 2) re-engineering of the project would be required.

Commissioner Kazmer clarified that the property would be developed in two distinct phases; Phase I & Phase II.



Commissioner Peltin clarified that under this proposal Phase II would place residences in the potential right-of-way for Route 53. Ms. Gould responded this was correct.

Commissioner Peltin asked what would happen if Route 53 were extended and homes were in the path of that roadway; will home buyers be made aware of this situation ?

Ms. Lisa Phillips, 3316 RFD, inquired about the Long Grove Country School and the purchase of the that land with open space funds for park purposes and impacts on the Route 53 expansion.

Attorney Gates-Alford noted that Park District land could be condemned by the Toll Authority for roadway purposes and would not stop the extension of Route 53.

Commissioner Kazmer noted farm animals were kept on the Country School property (presently unincorporated) and was concerned about homeowners complaints about noise and odor from these animals.

Mr. Mike Demar, Fidelity Wes Builders, 201 Robert Parker Coffin Road, indicated potential homebuyers would be made aware of the Route 53 situation as well as the Country School property.

Mr. Ed Acuna, 5223 RFD suggested that a roadway connection be made to the traffic signal at Menards to route traffic off Old Hicks Road and through the Menards Development.

Mr. Demar responded that that access was private and he did not believe Menard has had any interest in making that sort of connection.

Chairman Phillips then asked for comments from the Commissioner on the proposal.

Commissioner Cohn had no comments but was concerned with the Route 53 expansion and the proposed development. Phase I appears more desirable than Phase II.

Mr. Demar noted that no right-of-way or easement for Route 53 exists across the property; a centerline was platted and recorded however.

Ms. Gould commented that the State of Illinois had been notified of the plans for Phase II of the development and impacts to the Route 53 expansion.

Commissioner Wilson commented the lot sizes in Phase I are substantially the same as those proposed in Phase II.

Attorney Gates-Alford explained the significance of the platted centerline and options for land acquisition for right-of-way. She clarified that a zoning change from R-2 to R-3 is required for the project to move forward. The density bonus is not needed. Area previously anticipated as open space has been removed to accommodate the increase in density.

Commissioner Peltin asked how impacts to traffic and the aquifer are being addressed.

Mr. Demar responded the larger lots would allow wells to be placed farther apart reducing stress on the aquifer; wetlands are being protected to provide opportunity for groundwater recharge.

Chairman Phillips asked if wells could be guaranteed ?

Mr. Jeff Huemann, of Huemann Well Drillers of Johnsbury, Illinois, notes that he will guarantee a well he drills for 25 years. He reiterated his opinion that the aquifer in the area was sufficient for this development.

Ms. Camy Gould spoke to the traffic issue noting Old Hicks was not the issue but intersection Route 53 and Old Hicks was. She was not sure an additional turning lane would solve the problem and could potentially be more dangerous. Cars should not be allowed to pass on the shoulder at this intersection. She reiterates the concerns with the intersection noting a solution was needed for the existing traffic as well as future traffic generated by development.

Commissioner Rubin suggested intersection improvements on Old Hicks. It was noted any improvements to the intersection would require IDOT involvement and approval.

Commissioner Kazmer noted that there was more open space with the previous plan but the comprehensive plan update potentially allows for greater density. Traffic issues remain unresolved; a cooperative effort between stakeholders will be required for resolution of some of these issues.

A motion was made by Commissioner Cohn, seconded by Commissioner Wilson, to recommend approval of rezoning to the R-3 District and an amendment to the preliminary PUD plat and plans for a 29 unit residential development, including departures from the standards zoning district regulations as described in the KC1 LLC application. On a voice vote, all aye. Motion carries.

**b. Consideration amendment to the Village Code for the Village of Long Grove, Title 5, Zoning Regulations, including without limitation modifications to Chapter 3, Residential Districts, and Chapter 11, Zoning Administration and enforcement to allow for the creation of a new zoning district and/or special use and planned unit development standards and procedures to provide for conservation oriented, cluster type residential developments and modification of other regulations as required to accommodate such developments within the Village of Long Grove, Illinois.**

Chairman Phillips read the request into the record and swore in the witnesses to give testimony.

Planner Hogue gave an overview of the principals of conservation design developments noting the current adopted comprehensive plan for the Village offers the following with regard to future residential development in the village;

*“Planning Guidelines for the Future*

*The Village of Long Grove has much to preserve and protect in terms of its existing character, heritage, and rural country life orientation. Growth has not been rapid, but gradual and incremental, until recent years. The emphasis has been on quality, low density residential estate development as the prevailing land use pattern for the community.*

*The planning emphasis, therefore, may need to change from dispersed single-family residences to clustered housing and hamlets which preserve open space and the ecology.”*

A trend of smaller homes on smaller lots with high quality amenities as opposed to large house/ large lot developments that has long been the “status quo” for residential

developments in the Village of Long Grove appears to be developing. Conservation Design or Cluster Developments may be a way to address this emerging market trend while serving to protect and enhance the “rural character” of the village.

Redevelopment of the CF Industries Property ( to be known as the Herons Creek Reserve) is the catalyst for creation of Conservation Design/ Cluster Development Regulations, regulations of this type may be valuable for developments in other areas of the village as well by preserving community character and adding diversity to the existing housing stock. If regulations of this type are approved there would be three options for residential developments in the village; “straight subdivisions” Planned Unit Development (PUD’s) or Conservation Design/ Cluster Development Regulations each with their own standards for development.

Conservation Design regulations typically reduce the minimum lot size that would be required for each home in a conventional subdivision. A primary goal of these regulations is to achieve a balance between well-designed residential development, meaningful open space conservation, and natural resource protection in the village. Ultimately, a higher standard of development than offered in “straight” or PUD subdivisions is a very desirable outcome of these regulations.

Chairman Phillips then explained the history of cluster developments in the village focusing on “The Fields of Long Grove”.

Village Attorney Gates-Alford explained how the process would work and noted exceptions and explained options for how the conservation design process could work.

Commissioner Cohn noted due to the meeting running long and associated time constraints, he suggested the petitioners make a presentation.

Mr. Curtis Davidson, Asset Ventures, LTD of Austin, Texas, explained Asset Ventures was the owner of 36.9 acres of property that was the former CF Industries Headquarters. He indicated they had owned the property since 2011 and were not able to find a suitable tenant or buyer for the property. This is attributed to the high cost of building renovations associated with making the building functional to current day standards.

The property is a unique property in the Village and carries the “O” Office District Zoning (14.9 acres) and R-1 Residential District zoning classifications (22 Acres). A portion of the property contains an existing 150,000 sq. ft. structure that was the former headquarters for CF Industries.

The property is located approximately ¾ of mile south of Illinois Route 22 and is near the Glenstone (zoned R-2 PUD) and Salem on the Lake (zoned R-1) Subdivisions. The property abuts Forest Preserve District Property (Heron Creek) on the south and east sides as well as Salem Lake, which is also part of the Reed Turner Woodland. The property also has access to Cuba Road. LCWI wetlands are also present on the property. CF Industries

moved from the site about 2007/2008 and the property has remained vacant since that time.

The existing 150,000 sq. office building is proposed to be razed. A 65 unit “conservation design” subdivision is now proposed for the site. The development (Herons Creek Reserve) would cluster homes together with development clusters being separated by common open space. Open space (22 acres total or 65% of the site) will be incorporated into and surround the development, and in particular, the western edge of Salem Lake will remain as open space. Two “pocket parks” would also be incorporated into the development as well as pathways integrated into the Herons Creek Forest Preserve.

Homes will range in size from 2,200 to 3,600 sq. ft. w/ 2 or 3 car garages. The development is designed to target the “age in place” buyer, that is, a buyer desiring to remain in the village without the responsibilities of a large house and/or lot. A minimum lot size of 5,800 sq. ft. will be established. Building footprints will average 42' x 36' (2,352 sq. ft.) with an overall site density of 1.8 dwelling units per net acre (approximately ½ acre per unit). Setbacks are also proposed as 20' front yards (w/18' foot corner side yards), 16' side yards and 15' rear yards abutting open space. Minimum spaces between structures would be 55' rear to rear and 40' rear to side. Larger setbacks would be required for structures abutting the OS and R Districts (50' & 80' respectively).

Mr. Davidson agreed with Mr. Swanson (from the previous public hearing) that conservation design is the way to develop property.

He noted they had met to discuss this proposal with residents in the area and site density was not an issue. He reported the neighbors are happy with the development proposal they have created.

Mr. Joe Maschek, Land Planner with BSB Design Consultants, noted that when averaging the overall site density a lot size of 18,000 sq. ft. is achieved. He noted the current 150,000 sq. ft. office building has lots of lawn and runoff from the site goes directly into Salem Lake. Given the underlying zoning classification, the proposed use is a much less intense land use.

The development is targeted as an “age in place” development appealing to current residents who want to reside in the village without a large lot/large house to care for. The proposed site plan preserves the views of Salem Lake and optimizes native plantings. He would consider this request a “downzoning” of the property.

Impervious surfaces are reduced with this request and buffer zones are proposed to manage and improve stormwater runoff from the site. Traffic to the site would be reduced and improved. Integrated trail connections into Herons Creek and to Cuba Road would be provided. Sanitary sewer service is available and water, possibly through Aqua Illinois may be available to the site. A public water supply is preferable for this development.

Mr. Davidson referenced work done for the project by Mr. Tracy Cross. Per the market analysis done by his company there is a very strong market for an “age in place” housing product that is being proposed.

Village Attorney Gates-Alford then queried the PCZBA regarding options for how to proceed with a text amendment for the proposal and specifically if the Commission was interested in something site specific or something broader in scope.

The Commission was only interested in text amendments as they relate to this site.

Chairman Phillips then asked for comments from the public on the proposal.

Ms. Carrie Perricone, 5229 RFD, object to development with lot sizes as small as those being proposed. She is not necessarily opposed to cluster developments; but they should not be allowed village wide.

Commissioner Wilson noted that a discussion of a text amendment is not appropriate in lieu of the plan update. She suggested this matter be tabled until the plan update is complete.

Commissioner Rubin agrees with Commissioner Wilson.

Village Attorney Gates-Alford recommended against tabling the matter; she suggested the matter be continued instead.

Mr. Ed Acuna, 5223 RFD, noted that different sub-areas of the village have different concerns; what is appropriate in one area may not be so in another.

Ms. Camy Gould, Fidelity Wes Builders, questioned why this proposal could not be done under the existing PUD regulations?

Village Attorney Gates-Alford indicated the amount of relief required was too great for consideration under the existing PUD regulations. A text amendment must be approved for the proposal to move forward as presented.

It was suggested that Village Board input be sought on this proposal for the continuation.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kazmer, seconded by Commissioner Peltin to continue this matter to the June 6<sup>th</sup> regular meeting date and staff prepare a text amendment for this proposal. On a voice vote; all aye

#### **Update – Proposed amendments to the Village of Long Grove Comprehensive Plan**

No report.

**Approval of Minutes; April 4th Regular Meeting ;**

Commissioner Kazmer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Rubin, to accept the draft meeting minutes subject to typographical corrections as submitted. On a voice vote; all aye.

**Adjournment**

Commissioner Kazmer made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Peltin. On a voice vote, all ayes. Meeting was adjourned at 11:12 pm.

**Next Regular Meeting: June 6, 2017**

Respectfully Submitted,

*James M. Hogue,*

Village Planner