



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Village of Long Grove Planning Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals  
**FROM:** James M. Hogue, Village Planner  
**DATE:** May 28, 2015  
**RE:** Ordinance amendments to the Village Code for the Village of Long Grove, Title 5, Zoning Regulations including modifications to the maximum floor area, impervious surface, coverage limitations, floor area ratio and other regulations within the Village of Long Grove.

### History

At their April 14<sup>th</sup> Village Board meeting the Village Board made the following referral to the PCZBA;

Trustee Marshall moved to refer amendments to the Village Zoning Code regarding Floor Area Ratio (FAR) & Impervious Surface Coverage limitations to the Plan Commission & Zoning Board Of Appeals for consideration; seconded by Trustee Yaeger. ROLL CALL VOTE: Trustee Marshall – aye; Trustee Barry – aye; Trustee Yaeger – aye; Trustee Borys- aye. (Motion carried 4 – 0; 2 absent Trustees).

In 2007 the Village was considering a “major” amendment to the zoning code. During those deliberations the issues of “bulk” loomed large and in particular floor area and lot coverage. Minutes from those meetings (2.6.07 & 10.4.07) are attached for reference by the PCZBA. The concern was the “bulkiness” of structures on the “rural character” of the village.

The results of those deliberations formed the current “bulk” regulations under which the village operates. In general, these regulations have worked well, particularly in dealing with large structures on small lots. The issue presently raised has been the maximum square footage limitation on larger lots (e.g. 5 acres and above). The current village code has a maximum cap of 13,000 square feet (minimum of 3 acres) regardless of how large the lot may be. To achieve the maximum floor area greater setbacks also apply.

### Current Bulk Regulations

Bulk Regulation as currently established by the Village Code are as follows;

**5-3-12: BULK, SPACE, AND YARD REQUIREMENTS:**  

The building height, lot, yard, floor area ratio, coverage, and spacing requirements applicable in the residential districts are set forth in the following table. Footnote references appear at the end of the table.

	R1	R2	R3
Maximum building height (feet) <sup>1</sup>	35	35	35
Minimum lot area <sup>2</sup>	3 acres	2 acres	1 acre
Minimum yards and setbacks <sup>3,4</sup> :			
Front and corner side (feet)	100	75	50
Side (feet)	50	40	30
Rear (feet) <sup>5</sup>	50	40	30
Conservancy area/scenic corridor	See note 4		
Maximum gross floor area <sup>6</sup>	See note 6		
Maximum impervious surface coverage <sup>7</sup>	40%	40%	40%
Minimum spacing between principal and accessory buildings (feet)	20	20	20

**Exceptions And Explanatory Notes:**

1. Height Limitation For Accessory Structures: The maximum building height of any accessory structure shall be 15 feet unless otherwise permitted pursuant to section [5-9-1](#) of this title.
2. Nonconforming Lots: See section [5-10-5](#) of this title for lot requirements with respect to legal nonconforming lots of record.
3. Permitted Obstructions In Required Yards: See section [5-9-8](#) of this title for certain structures and uses that may be located in certain required yards.
4. Special Conservancy Area And Scenic Corridor Setbacks: Special setbacks for conservancy areas and scenic corridor areas established in [title 7](#) of this code shall control over the yard and setback requirements established in this table.
5. Rear Yard Regulations For Certain Accessory Structures And Uses: Accessory structures and uses (except for tennis courts, playing courts, swimming pools, and guesthouses) may be located in required rear yards, provided the accessory structure or use is located not less than 30 feet from any lot line.
6. Maximum Floor Area: The maximum floor area for a lot in any of the residential zoning districts shall be calculated based on the lot area. The calculation of lot area will exclude 50 percent of the wetlands and conservancy district areas on a lot, except in the cases of: a) lots in planned unit developments to which the 50 percent exclusion under subsection [5-11-18\(E\)2\(m\)\(1\)](#) of this title has been applied; b) any lot that had been improved with a single-family detached dwelling prior to February 24, 2009; or c) any lot created as part of a plat of subdivision approved prior to February 24, 2009.

(a) For any lot that meets all of the setback requirements for the underlying zoning district, the maximum floor area is set forth in the following chart:

<u>Lot Area</u>	<u>Calculation For Maximum Floor Area</u>
10,000 square feet to 43,559 square feet	5,500 square feet building size plus 0.098 square foot of floor area for each square foot of lot area over 10,000 square feet
43,560 square feet to 130,679 square feet	8,800 square feet building size plus 0.025 square foot of floor area for each square foot of lot area over 43,560 square feet
130,680 square feet and greater	11,000 square feet building size plus 0.022 square foot of floor area for each square foot of lot area over 130,680 square feet. Where a principal building is 11,000 square feet or greater, for each 1,000 square feet or fraction thereof over 10,000 square feet, the front yard setback shall be increased an additional 50 feet. In no case shall a principal building exceed 13,000 square feet

(b) For any lot in any of the residential zoning districts that does not meet 1 or more of the setback requirements for the underlying zoning district, the maximum floor area is set forth in the following chart:

<u>Lot Area</u>	<u>Calculation For Maximum Floor Area</u>
33,000 square feet to 43,559 square feet	3,500 square feet building size plus 0.134 square foot of floor area for each square foot of lot area over 10,000 square feet
43,560 square feet to 130,679 square feet	8,000 square feet building size plus 0.034 square foot of floor area for each square foot of lot area over 43,560 square feet
130,680 square feet and greater	11,000 square feet building size plus 0.022 square foot of floor area for each square foot of lot area over 130,680 square feet. Where a principal building is 11,000 square feet or greater, for each 1,000 square feet or fraction thereof over 11,000 square feet, the front yard setback shall be increased an additional 50 feet. In no case shall a principal building exceed 13,000 square feet

The maximum floor area restrictions contained in this paragraph (b) do not apply to any lot that either: 1) is developed with a single-family dwelling unit as of February 24, 2009; 2) is part of an approved planned unit development or subdivision as of February 24, 2009; or 3) is part of an approved planned unit development within a woodland conservancy area for which specific building boxes are prescribed on the plat for purposes of preserving the wooded character of the development. These lots will be subject to the maximum floor area restrictions contained in the chart set forth in paragraph (a) of this note.

(c) No variance or other relief shall be granted from this note 6 except as permitted in an approved planned unit development pursuant to section [5-11-18](#) of this title.

7. Public Safety Uses: In the R1 and R2 districts only, a local governmental use designed to provide public safety services directly to the residents of the village, limited to a fire station, police station, or similar

municipal use, may exceed the maximum impervious surface coverage restriction pursuant to a special use permit; provided that the owner must demonstrate that the proposed increase in the maximum impervious surface coverage will: a) satisfy all of the standards for a special use permit set forth in section 5-11-17 of this title; b) enhance the capability of the local governmental unit to serve the village and its residents; and c) not adversely impact stormwater drainage for the lot subject to the special use permit, any adjacent lot, or existing stormwater management facilities.

(Ord. 2009-O-07, 3-10-2009)

### **Bulk Regulations in other Communities ( i.e. Kildeer & Hawthorne Woods)**

Attached is a synopsis of the regulations from Kildeer (2 residential zoning districts) & Hawthorne Woods (2 single family districts & 1 multifamily district). An analysis of these regulations in contrast to the Long Grove regulations is also included. Kildeer and Hawthorne Woods were chosen for comparison as they are more similar to Long Grove than other surrounding communities.

Due to the differences in regulations an “apples to apples” comparison is not possible. For example, Kildeer has a FAR (Floor Area Ratio & Lot Coverage) and a minimum floor area but no maximum. Hawthorne Woods utilizes a only a maximum lot coverage calculation. In the analysis provided, page 2 of the April 9<sup>th</sup> memo is likely the most useful for comparison purposes. The comparisons have been generalized to apply the regulations of each village in a like manner in this table.

### **Conclusions**

Historically the “bulk” discussions have focused on the large house - small lot scenario. The concern is the impact of this “bulkiness” on the “rural character” of the village and the openness associated with that character.

The 2007 revisions to the code have addressed this issue well. Little concern was given to the large house on large lot scenario as the character concerns are not apparent under this scenario.

One option for consideration therefore is the maintenance of “status quo” and not recommending any changes to the “bulk” regulations as listed above.

As noted above during the 2007 ordinance update the “bulk” issue under consideration was the large house on a small lot scenario. As a second option, consideration could be given to creating additional categories to the lot area floor\floor area tables listed above. Additional categories such as three to five acres, five to seven acres, 10 acres and above, etc, could be established to allow larger houses on larger lots in a manner similar to what presently exists in the code. A cap on maximum square footage for a residence would presumably exist under this scenario.

Finally, the simplest solution is to remove the 13,000 square foot cap from the current code but keep all other “bulk” regulations (including the greater setbacks for large structures). A minimum lot size, for example, of five (5) acres or greater, should be considered. Under this scenario lot coverage (.40) would be the limiting factor in house size on lot of 5 acres or more.



Hawthorne Woods Bulk Regulations		R1 (Art. "A")	R2 (Art. "B")	R3 (Art. "C")
Maximum building height (feet)		35	35	35
Minimum lot area*		40,000 Sq. Ft	20,000 Sq. Ft.	20,000 Sq. Ft.
Lot Width		130'	100'	100'
Lot Width (Cul-de-Sac)		90'	60'	-
Minimum yards and setbacks:				
	Front and corner side (feet)	30'	30'	30'
	Side (feet)	20'	15'	15'
	Rear (feet)	50'	40'	40'
	Cul-de Sac (Front Yard)	50'	50'	50'
Maximum impervious surface coverage		15%	25%	45%

\* Sanitary Sewer Connection Required

Zoning District	Calculation For <i>Mimumum</i> Floor Area
R-1 (Art. "A") Ground Floor	1 Story; 1700 sq. ft. Greater that 1 Story; 2200 sq. ft.
R-2 (Art. "B") Ground Floor	1 Story; 1500 sq. ft. Greater that 1 Story; 1800 sq. ft.
R-3 (Art. "C") Ground Floor	No standard Identified; this is a multi-family dwelling district.

Kildeer Bulk Regulations		R1	R2
Maximum building height (feet)		35	35
Minimum lot area		1 acre	1 acres
Lot Width		150'	150'
Lot Depth		175'	175'
Minimum yards and setbacks:			
	Front and corner side (feet)	75'	75
	Side (feet)	35'	35'
	Rear (feet)	50'	50'
Maximum impervious surface coverage		35%	35%
F.A.R.		.30	.30

Zoning District	Calculation For <i>Minimum</i> Floor Area
R-1 (Ground Flr).	1 story structure; 2500 sq. ft. Greater than 1 story; 1500 sq. ft.
R-2 (Ground Flr).	1 Story Structure; 2000 sq. ft. Greater than 1 story; 1500 sq. ft.



MEMORANDUM

TO: David Lothspeich; Village Manager

FROM: James M. Hogue, Village Planner

DATE: April 9, 2015

RE: Review of Maximum Dwelling Unit Size

Per your request I have reviewed the bulk regulations for Hawthorne Woods, Long Grove and Kildeer as they relate to maximum dwelling unit size. My findings are as follows;

**BACKGROUND**

Attached are table which identify the applicable bulk regulations as they pertain to maximum dwelling unit size for each of the three communities reviewed. Of the only Long Grove establishes a “maximum” dwelling unit size but no minimums. The other communities establish minimums but no maximum for dwelling units. Maximum dwelling unit size is calculated on a combination of the “bulk” regulations on a given piece of property. Of the three communities only Kildeer has an FAR as part of their zoning regulations.

**ANALYSIS**

Making an “apples to apples” comparison of the various community regulations is difficult. Principally this analysis looks at lot coverage and floor area restrictions as applicable. Included below are generalizations regarding maximum dwelling unit sizes for the three communities based upon 1, 3 & 5 acre lots.

Lot Coverage (in Sq. Ft.)		HW				LG		KD	
		R1	R2	R3					
Lot Area									
1 Acre – 43,560 Sq. Ft.		6,534	10,980	19,602		17,424		15,246	
3 Acres – 130,680 Sq. Ft.		19,602	32,670	58,806		52,727		45,738	
5 Acres – 217,800 Sq. Ft.		32,670	54,450	98,010		87,120		76,230	

FAR & Lot Size (Kildeer Only)						
Lot Area x FAR (.30) = Max Structure Size			Minus Max. Lot Coverage			Equals Available Lot Coverage
1 Acre – 43,560 Sq. Ft. x .30	=	13,608	- 15,246		=	2,178
3 Acres – 130,680 Sq. Ft. x .30	=	39,204	- 45,738		=	6,534
5 Acres – 217,800 Sq. Ft. x .30	=	65,340	- 76,230		=	10,890

Maximum Structure Size Long Grove Only			
Lot Area		Max. Structure Size (in Sq. Ft.)	
1 Acre – 43,560 Sq. Ft.		5,500 + 3,298 = 8789	
3 Acres – 130,680 Sq. Ft.		8,800 + 2,178 = 10,978	
5 Acres – 217,800 Sq. Ft.		11,000 + 1917 = 12,917*	

\*Greater Setbacks apply to achieve a structure size over 11,000 sq. ft.

Maximum Lot Coverage Hawthorne Woods Only	R-1	R-2	R-3	
Max. Lot Coverage	.15	.25	.45	
Lot Area x Max Coverage				
1 Acre – 43,560 Sq. Ft.	6,534	10,890	19,602	
3 Acres – 130,680 Sq. Ft.	19,602	32,670	58,806	
5 Acres – 217,800 Sq. Ft.	32,670	54,450	98,010	

# Long Grove Plan Commission

## September 4, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Kazmer, Wendy Parr, Shelly Rubin, Tobin Fraley, Charles Cohn

Chairman present: Fred Phillips

Also present: Village Planner James Hogue, Planning Commission Secretary Terri Taylor, Village Attorney Julie Tappendorf

Also present in the audience: Village President Maria Rodriguez, Village Trustee Ed Acuna and two members of the public.

1. **Call to Order:** Chariman Phillips called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.
2. **Public Hearing:** Consideration of a proposal for various amendments to the Village Code for the Village of Long Grove, Title 5, Zoning Regulations including without limitation modifications to the maximum floor area, building height and other regulations within the Village of Long Grove, Illinois.

Four audience members were sworn in.

Attorney Julie Tappendorf began the discussion by reviewing the Zoning Code Issues memorandum (dated July 12, 2007) that summarizes the issues at hand and presents recommendations for further modifications to the Zoning Code.

First topic reviewed in the memo was "Maximum Floor Area." The issue of "too big, too close" was described as when larger homes on smaller lots are clustered together. The first recommendation for controlling this in the future is the "Consideration off Two Separate Formulae for Calculating Maximum Floor Area." A current formula exists, but a second stricter formula could be added that would apply to any lot within a PUD that does not meet one or more of the setback requirements.

Discussion of topic ensued with clarification of the "lots under 1 acre" reference.

Attorney Tappendorf presented the second recommendation for control of "Maximum Floor Area". The Village could "Consider Establishing Minimum Setbacks in PUDs". By setting minimums, the village could only allow modifications presented by builders that would fall within an "absolute" setback minimum or other limitation.

A third recommendation was presented for control of "Maximum Floor Area". The Village could "Consider Establishing Minimum Lot Area for Lots in PUDs". Establishing this would prevent developers from requesting modifications that fell below the minimum area requirement.

Commissioner Fraley looked to confirm that this concept would, in fact keep development in Long Grove rather than pushing away potential developments to other communities.

Discussion moved on to the second topic of concern which is “Large Homes on Any Lot” and how modifications could be made to control the bulk of large homes in general. Areas for recommendation include: 1. Basements with Exposed Lower Levels, 2. Habitable Attic Space, and 3. Exclusion of a Portion of Wetlands and Conservancy Areas.

Attorney Tappendorf reviewed each topic as outlined in the memorandum.

Recommendations to change how various definitions of basements are distinguished was presented. A new formula using the amount of exposed lower level would be used.

A definition of “habitable attic space” was also presented due to a lack of prior definition. A specific height would trigger the home to contain “habitable attic space”.

Tom Macintosh (2562 RFD) brought up his concern over potential attic remodels after a home met zoning codes when it was originally built.

A third recommendation regarding “Large homes on Any Lot” covered the “Exclusion of a Portion of Wetlands and Conservancy Areas” when determining the maximum floor area of a proposed home was discussed. The new formula used would result in smaller homes with more non-buildable areas.

Trustee Acuna was concerned over the language regarding density bonuses in the memo. Discussion with board ensued. He also had a question regarding the amount of space being considered for the exposed basement.

Chairman Phillips points out that an ultimate goal of all the recommendations is not to penalize PUDs with too many restrictions.

A final topic was presented by Attorney Tappendorf regarding the Public Assembly Regulations and the possibility of an institution parceling out it’s facilities among multiple adjoining lots. An amendment could be made to require a minimum distance between public assembly uses on a block.

Many questions and concerns over teardowns and remodels were brought up by board members and clarifications by Attorney Tappendorf were made throughout the presentation. Examples of how other suburban communities have handled the issues were shared by her as well.

Many members felt that it was important to consider how many existing homes would be affected by all of these changes and that a review of existing setbacks, FAR’s and so forth would be necessary to be able to determine the appropriate new zoning code

recommendations. Village President Maria Rodriguez indicated that continued discussion over these issues was necessary and a new ordinance covering this topic would be brought to the Village Board to discuss further and possibly refer back to the PCZBA for additional consideration.

It was also suggested that due to significant discussion over the amendment language anticipated regarding the issues identified in the zoning code-memorandum, that additional amendments would be necessary before the new recommendations could be approved. Commissioner Rubin asked that a committee be formed with PCZBA and Village Trustees to discuss issues and amending language further before bringing back to the PCZBA for a vote. All members approved the request.

Commissioner Parr volunteered to serve on the committee. All Commissioners recommended that Commissioner DiIorio also serve on the committee.

Chairman Phillips made a motion; seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ to continue the public hearing regarding the topics until the next meeting of the Planning Commission and Board of Appeals on October 2, 2007. On a voice vote; all aye.

**3. Approval of Minutes for June 5, 2007 and August 7, 2007**

Commissioner Parr made a motion; seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ to approve the minutes from both meetings. On a voice vote; all aye.

**4. Adjournment**

Commissioner Parr made a motion to adjourn; seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ to adjourn the meeting. All ayes no nays. Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

**5. Other Business**

Chairman Phillips indicated that he would not be present at the next scheduled meeting. He suggested that a Commissioner who had not yet served as a "Chairman Pro-Tem" consider serving in his absence.

**6. Next Scheduled meeting – October 2, 2007**

Respectfully Submitted,

*Terri Taylor*

Secretary,  
Long Grove PCZBA



**LONG GROVE PLAN COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 6, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioners Present: Eduardo L. Acuna, Charles Cohn, Joe Di Iorio, Tobin Fraley, Robert Jenkins, and Wendy Parr.

Commissioners Absent: Shelly Rubin

Chairman Present: Fred Phillips

Also Present: Village Superintendent Bob Block, Village Planner James Hogue, Plan Commission Secretary Jeff Kazmer, and Village Attorney Julie Tappendorf

1. **Call to Order:** Chairman Phillips called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING; CONTINUATION – Consideration of Comprehensive Amendments to the Village of Long Grove Zoning Code.** *Discussion by full PCZBA.*

Chairman Phillips opened the Public Hearing Continuance by informing the audience that the Commission will continue where they left off. He also informed the audience that the Plan Commission was a recommending body, and that the Village Board would have final approval on the proposed Zoning Code. He then informed the audience that anyone in attendance that was sworn in at the last hearing is still under oath. He then swore in any new attendants that wished to give testimony to provide honesty.

Attorney Tappendorf stated that the Commission received a new letter from the LGBCP, which raised some new issues. She said that these issues could take some time to discuss and recommended saving them for later. She said that the Commission would start where they left off, with the open issues in Village Planner Hogue's memo.

1. The Commission would refer to the Village Board whether or not the Village Board wanted to review events, or if they should be reviewed by staff.
2. The Commission proposes no Architectural Board review of single family homes. The Village will wait for the Illinois Legislature to make a ruling on the subject.

Commissioner Acuna asked whether PUDs would get Architectural Board review.

Attorney Tappendorf replied that they would if it is a condition of the PUD.

3. Swimming pools are covered in the Building Code. The language should be the same in the Zoning Code.
4. Concerning the regulations for O and OR, the regulations were crafted to fit the two existing properties in those districts to put them in compliance.

5 & 6. Height and floor area are the two biggest issues. Included in the memo are samples of current and proposed regulations, as well as regulations of nearby towns.

Commissioner Dvorak asked if there was a formula that the towns used to base their regulations on.

Attorney Tappendorf replied that she was not familiar with these particular formulas.

Superintendent Block said that he would give a brief history of the thirty five foot height regulation as he remembers it. In the sixties, fire departments were required to carry a thirty-five foot ladder. Many communities adopted the thirty-five foot height regulation so fire departments could reach the roofs of homes and ventilate them in the event of a fire.

There was some discussion by the Commission. It was noted that Long Grove measures height from the lowest point of the structure.

Commissioner Acuna stated that the intent of the Commission was to reduce bulk in sub-acre lots. He then asked if there were any lots in Long Grove less than 10,000 square feet.

Superintendent Block replied that he believes the only smaller lots were in the Indian Creek subdivision, but they have Lake County sewer and water.

Commissioner Acuna said he believes that any empty lots not governed by PUD regulations must conform to any new height requirements in the proposed Zoning Code.

Superintendent Block stated that there are approximately 240 unbuilt lots in Long Grove. In a PUD, the Village can regulate lot and home size. The Ravenna subdivision was a court ordered judgment as to the number of lots and home size. He then gave a summary of home size and setback requirements in the Ravenna subdivision. He said he believes a thirty-one foot mean roof height would not allow a home with a walkout basement to be built. He said he believes that if the terrain of a lot supports a walkout, then it should be allowed to be built.

Commissioner Acuna stated that he agrees that the proposed Zoning Code should allow an exception for roof height for a walkout.

Commissioner Cohn also agreed to an exception for roof height for a walkout.

Commissioner Dvorak said he agrees with the proposed approach to walkouts.

Commissioner DiIorio said that other surrounding suburbs have relatively flat land that does not support walkout lower levels.

There was some discussion among the Commission.

Commissioner Di Iorio said that he agrees with the exception for walkouts.

Dave Korshak, of 3878 Woods End, a resident and a builder, said he likes high roof lines and thinks the Village would be lowering home values by adopting the proposed height regulations.

Mark from Reese Classic Homes, said that Barrington adopted similar restrictions some years ago. All the homes then began to look alike, with the same gutter lines. He said that the restriction ruined the architecture. Roof height dictates the architecture and limiting it limits creativity.

Susan Coveny, of ReMax Prestige Realty, said that this is a bad market with high taxes. These new regulations will drive customers away. She stated that if the Village passes these new regulations, it will ruin the market in Long Grove.

Peter Di Iorio, a builder, said the competition is in Barrington, Kildeer, and Deer Park. Customers won't want to build here with the new restrictions. It is unfair to change the rules mid-stream. Long Grove already penalizes for garages and two story spaces. Builders around the country are building houses with ten foot ceilings. This cannot be done with a thirty-one foot height restriction.

Commissioner Fraley read an excerpt from the Long Grove Comprehensive Plan, describing the Village's uniqueness, rural charm, open space, and its occurrence through thoughtful planning. He stated that we were trying to create something different and special. Long Grove is not one of those other communities.

Commissioner Acuna said that the changes to height are on sub-acre lots. The Commission is discussing possible walk-out/lookout exceptions. The purpose of these proposed regulations is to control the sense of scale on lots which are relatively small.

Attorney Tappendorf said that language could be drafted to exempt PUDs that have already been approved.

Commissioner Acuna asked if we make exemptions for one subdivision, do we have to make an exemption for all.

There was some discussion.

Dee McLaughlin, of 4560 RFD, said that she appreciates beautiful architecture, but we are talking about lots of less than one acre. She said that she supports the proposal in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan and scale.

Lee Stein, 4459 RFD, in Royal Melbourne, said that everything should be to scale. The builders are right about scale, and the Village shouldn't be driving customers away.

Carolyn Denaro, 3327 RFD, said that she moved here from California, where many people built huge homes on postage stamp size lots to maximum land use. She thinks the Plan Commission should encourage larger lot size.

Mike DeMar, 7222 RFD, a resident and developer, thanked the Plan Commission for their work. He stated that he called twenty-two recent homebuyers in Long Grove. Eighteen answered the phone. Of them, two had no opinion, and sixteen were happy with the way things were. He said that in Revenna, none of the homes are taller than thirty-four feet to roof peak.

Commissioner Di Iorio said that the majority of subdivisions consist of lots less than one acre. Builders are not coming here with all the current restrictions Long Grove has.

Resident Brad Williams asked what was the catalyst that made the Village look at these new proposals.

Chairman Phillips stated that homes were looking out of scale. For the last year, the Plan Commission has held open meetings to discuss these issues.

Attorney Tappendorf said that the Comprehensive Plan states that there should be a balance between the housing market and the character of the Village. Consistency with the Plan is important as to why the Plan Commission is looking at the entire Zoning Code.

Commissioner Dvorak said that the Village thought that it might be straying from the Comprehensive Plan, and it was time to take a step back and look at the Zoning Code.

Mark from Reese Classic Builders said that the Village was penalizing builders after projects have started. He said that the projects that the Board approved should remain as is. The restrictions should be on new developments.

Commissioner Dvorak stated that this was not a knee-jerk reaction. A lot of time has been spent discussing these issues.

Commissioner Acuna stated that he has been on the Plan Commission for approximately five years. Bulk has always been an issue, but it has been hard to

define and change. The Village does not want to unduly prohibit builders and homeowners, but it must protect the character of the Village. He stated that he believes that the character of the Village has changed over the last ten to fifteen years, but the Plan Commission has a responsibility to follow the Comprehensive Plan.

Mike DeMar asked about sub-acre lots automatically being part of a PUD, and if so, cannot the Village regulate them anyway.

Commissioner Acuna said that the proposal is that only a percentage of the non-build able land would be counted when determining the build able area.

Don Silich, a custom home builder, said that the Village should keep the thirty-five foot roof height regulation. He said it was not about money for the builders, but about creativity.

Commissioner Cohn said that the new proposals are comparable to surrounding communities.

Chairman Phillips asked the Commissioners if they would like to take a vote.

There was some discussion about walkouts, lookouts, and bulk. Exposed lower levels with more than two feet above grade should be counted in the floor area ratio. Any side exposed more than two feet would add twenty-five percent of that level's floor area to the total, assuming a four sided structure.

Chairman Phillips asked the Commissioners for their recommendations.

The recommendations were a thirty-one foot mean roof height. An exception should be made for homes with a walkout or a lookout to have a thirty-five foot mean roof height. Any lower level with more than two feet exposed above grade would add twenty-five percent to the floor area for each side exposed, assuming a four sided structure. Definitions will be added for these regulations.

*All on the Commission were in favor of the proposal. None opposed.*

Attorney Tappendorf said that the next subject for consideration was floor area.

Commissioner Acuna said that changing the maximum floor area of homes on sub-acre lots would bring them closer to the regulations used in neighboring communities, but the main reason for changing them is to more closely follow the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Di Iorio said that he was concerned about the ten thousand square foot lots. He said he believes that the proposed floor area for those lots is too small.

There was some discussion. There are very few unbuilt lots of ten thousand square feet or less in the Village.

Superintendent Block said that the Village prefers having a minimum of thirty-three thousand square foot lots in new PUDs.

Mike DeMar said that on a thirty-five hundred square foot house, when you subtract for a walkout, a two-story space, and a garage, you are left with only nineteen hundred square feet of living space. He said on a thirty thousand square foot lots, it works out to sixty one eighty, and when you subtract the above mentioned items, you are left with only thirty-two hundred square feet of living area. He asked if this is what the Commission wanted to do. He said that lots are very expensive.

Chairman Phillips asked the Commissioners if they are in agreement with the proposed floor area regulations.

*All were in favor except for Commissioner Di Iorio.*

Commissioner Di Iorio said that he wants four thousand, fifty-five hundred, and seven thousand square feet of floor area for the ten, twenty, and thirty thousand square foot lots respectively.

The majority of the Commissioners agreed on the original proposal.

Superintendent Block said these new regulations may block some home additions because of the maximum floor area ratio.

There was some discussion, and it was asked if a variation could be applied for.

Attorney Tappendorf said that only some variations are allowed for in the Code, including yards and signs, but not floor area ratio.

Commissioner Di Iorio said he wants covered, un-enclosed porches excluded from the floor area calculation if they are on the front side of the house.

There was some discussion on the architectural merits of front porches and their use as a gathering place.

Superintendent Block said that the most recent remodels included sunrooms, master bedrooms, bathrooms, extra garages, and kitchens.

Chairman Phillips asked the Commission for a vote on the proposed floor area regulations.

*All were in favor except for Commissioner Di Iorio.*

Commissioner Di Iorio said that he was against the square footage regulations and wanted to exclude front porches from the calculations.

Attorney Tappendorf explained the parking proposal. She noted that there was a study done by BDI concerning parking requirements in another town. She suggested that the Village defer decreasing the parking requirements until a similar study is done in the Village.

Chairman Phillips asked the Commission for a vote on the parking proposal.

*All Commissioners were in favor of the parking proposal.*

The question of affordable housing parking requirements was scratched.

The next topic for discussion was signage.

Commissioner Fraley said the he believes that signage quality is more important than the overall size of the signs for the downtown area, and could enhance the character and feel of the downtown.

The topic of signs was tabled for later.

The next topic for discussion was fences.

Superintendent Block said that subdivisions and single lots with no subdivision relate to the new regulations for fencing differently. The site determines whether something makes sense or not. He said that under the current building codes, a fence can be erected anywhere except in a scenic corridor or along a State Highway. The Village does not regulate most fences.

*The Commission unanimously agreed to leave the current fencing regulation as is.*

Superintendent Block explained yard setbacks. He recommended that Section 5-11-18 (E) 2. (j) Yards (2) (PAGE 153) be completely removed from the Code as unnecessary.

Attorney Tappendorf said that Long Grove must comply with State Law for variation procedures. She said the LGBCP would like to streamline the process for hardship for signs. Since Long Grove is not a Home Rule community, it must comply with State Law.

Superintendent Block said there needs to be some changes to the definitions in the proposed Code on page 180 concerning floor area gross and floor area net. For Floor Area Gross, commercial basements must be added to the floor area ratio. For Floor Area Net, commercial basements must also be added.

The proposed changes were noted.

*Commissioner Fraley made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to the February 20, 2007 Special Meeting.*

*Second by Commissioner Cohn.*

*All ayes, no nays. Motion carried.*

**3. Approval of Minutes; December 5, 2006 & January 16, 2007**

*Commissioner Dvorak made a motion to postpone the approval of the meeting minutes in question to the next meeting.*

*Second by Commissioner Jenkins.*

*All ayes, no nays. Motion carried.*

**4. Other Business;**

Village Planner Hogue stated that at the March 6, 2007 regular meeting of the Plan Commission, there could be two Public Hearings on the agenda. The first being a revision to Sanctuary Creek, and the second being a redevelopment of the Midwest Bank property.

There was no other business.

**5. Adjournment;**

*Commissioner Fraley made a motion to adjourn the meeting.*

*Second by Commissioner Parr.*

*All ayes, with Commissioner Jenkins abstaining. No nays. Motion carried.*

Meeting adjourned at 11:17 p.m.

**6. Next Special Meeting – February 20, 2007 at 8:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff Kazmer  
Long Grove PCZBA Secretary

