



ITEM #6: For the **ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION** on **MONDAY, August 18th @ 7:00 P.M.**

REQUEST: Consideration of a request for a Special Use Permit within the R-2 District to provide for a senior living center with Memory Care and Assisted Living Facilities and specifically the signage, landscaping, lighting, site plan/plat and building elevations proposed for the property on the south side of Route 53, between Mardan Drive and Long Grove Road, submitted by the Long Grove Senior Care LLC.

HISTORY:

The property is located on the south side of Route 53 between Mardan Drive and Long Grove Road. The property in question consists of approximately 10 acres of land area. This property is vacant and presently zoned under the R-2 District Regulations.

At their August 5th regular meeting, particularly with regard to site access, the PCZBA made the following motion;

To recommend approval of (i) a text amendment to the zoning code authorizing parking and floor area variations for nursing homes operating under a SUP in the R-2 District; (ii) finding all the required standards are met for: (a) the issuance of a SUP for a nursing home consisting of a senior living center with memory care and assisted living facilities, (b) a parking variation, and (c) a floor area variation, all in accordance with the plans submitted for property located on the south side of Route 53 between Mardan Drive and Long Grove Road; and (iii) recommending approval of such SUP and zoning variations subject to the following conditions;

1. The petitioner shall comply with the recommendations of the Village Arborist;
2. Engineering plans shall be approved by the Village Engineer;
3. Access must be from the west side of the of the property to the Long Grove traffic signal creating a four way intersection into the property with intersection improvements to be financed by the petitioner.

PROPOSAL:

Petitioners are seeking a Special Use Permit within the R-2 District with zoning relief requested including parking and floor area to provide for development of the property as a senior living center (“nursing home”) with Memory Care and Assisted Living Facilities on the property. As proposed the facility would contain 100 units. The proposed structure is a two story building with 94,323 sq. ft. of floor area. The facility would be divided into 40 memory care (Alzheimer’s/Dementia Care) units and 60 assisted living units. No reclassification of the property is required or requested as “nursing homes” are considered special uses in the residential districts.

STAFF REVIEW:

Portions of the proposal (e.g. landscaping, elevations, lighting, preliminary plan/plat, and signage) require Architectural Commission (AC) review. These are as follows;

Preliminary Elevations

Petitioner has submitted elevations for the proposed structure. As proposed the structure would be one (memory care) and two stories tall with building height of 35 feet or less.

The structure will be constructed largely of 4" hardi-board exterior with stone accents around all four elevations and a fiberglass shingle roof would be used on the majority of the structure with a standing seam metal roof placed principally over entrances to the structure.

A trash enclosure will be located toward the rear of the structure near the service entrance. Trash enclosure elevations have not been submitted.

A small water treatment building, fire pump and gazebo are identified on the site plan. Elevations for these accessory structures have not been submitted.

The zoning code offers these standards for Architectural Review;

1. Similarity Or Dissimilarity:

- (a) Excessive similarity or dissimilarity with nearby buildings should be avoided.
- (b) Buildings should not be dwarfed or obstructed from view by nearby buildings.

3. Elevations:

- (a) The scale and height of the project should be visually compatible with the landscaping and topography of the site and with buildings on the site and in the surrounding area.
- (b) The relationship of solids to voids in the front facade of a project should be visually compatible with buildings, public ways and places to which it is visually related.
- (c) The visual continuity of roofs and their contributing elements (such as parapet walls, coping, and cornices) shall be maintained in building development or redevelopment.
- (d) Monotony should be avoided.
- (e) The project should be designed to meet, if not exceed, the buffer yard requirements of this title to maximum screening and buffering in order to protect neighboring properties from the project.

5. Type, Color And Texture Of Materials:

- (a) Materials should be new and of first rate quality.
- (b) Materials should be selected for both their durability and beauty.
- (c) Colors of the materials for the project should be harmonious with only compatible accents.

(d) A project that is obviously incongruous with its surroundings or unsightly and grotesque should be avoided.

(e) A project whose design or color may be distracting to vehicular traffic so as to cause a safety hazard should be avoided.

The zoning code requires the following for refuse containers;

(F) Refuse Containers; Outdoor Storage:

1. Screening: All refuse containers and all areas of permitted outdoor storage shall be enclosed on at least three (3) sides by an opaque fence, wall, or densely planted evergreen hedge of a height and in a manner sufficient to completely screen such containers or storage areas from view from adjoining properties and public or private streets.

2. Location: No refuse containers or storage areas shall be located between any principal structure and either its front or corner side lot line.

3. Exemptions: The requirements of subsection (F) 1 of this section shall not apply to standard receptacles permitted for use by single-family dwellings. None of the requirements of this subsection (F) shall apply to receptacles placed and maintained for use by the general public to avoid littering.

It is suggested the other accessory structures be of a style and materials compatible with the principal structure and character of the development.

Lighting

Proposed lighting is best classified as “Class 2” Lighting per the Village Code. Lighting of this nature requires AC review and approval.

28 fixtures are proposed for site illumination. 21 of the proposed fixtures would be 15.5’ feet in height with a 12’ pole & base and 3.5’ bollard (Sun Valley – Shorewood). These fixtures are identified as (L3,L4 and L4S on the photometric plan) and would utilize a 150 watt high pressure sodium, light source. 7 fixtures around the southern portion of the site (identified as “B” on the photometric plan) would consist of 36” high cast aluminum bollard fixture (US Architectural Lighting – BDA6). A 70 watt high pressure sodium light source is proposed. LED light sources are proposed as well and require AC consideration. Sodium vapor light sources are not permitted per the “lighting system tests” below, however source wattage as proposed is acceptable. With the exception of the “B” lighting decorative fixtures are proposed for the site. Fixture height is within the established limitation for lighting.

Photometrics for the site have been submitted along with proposed fixtures for the site. Per this plan light does not escape from the site with the exception of the proposed ingress & egress point along Route 53 on north side of the site.

Generally speaking, exterior lighting should be designed to be consistent with the village's dark at night character and shall, at a minimum, comply with the lighting restrictions contained in this title as follows;

TABLE 5-14-A LIGHTING SYSTEM TESTS

Each lighting system must be permitted or have received approval in each test group (1 through 6) before a permit will be issued.

SYMBOLS

P = Permitted	NP = Not permitted	AB = Architectural board approval required
---------------	--------------------	--

TEST 1

Usages Permitted	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Commercial building lighting	AB	AB	AB	—
Commercial parking lot	AB	AB	—	—
Driveway lighting	AB	AB	P	—
Exterior lighting of dwelling	AB	—	P	—
Holiday lighting	P	P	P	—
Intersection or street lighting	AB	AB	AB	AB
Landscape lighting	AB	AB	AB	—
Municipal parking lot	P	—	—	—
Private sign illumination	NP	AB	NP	—
Residential yard/grounds lighting	AB	—	P	—
Roadsign lighting	AB	AB	NP	—
Security lighting	AB	AB	AB	—

TEST 2

Light Sources Permitted	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Halogen	AB	AB	AB	AB
Incandescent (malibu type)	NP	NP	P	—
Incandescent (multicolored Christmas or temporary use)	P	P	P	—
Incandescent (white or clear)	P	P	P	P
Mercury vapor	NP	P	NP	P
Natural gas	P	P	P	P
Sodium vapor	NP	NP	NP	NP
Other	AB	AB	AB	AB

TEST 3

Fixture Styles Permitted	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Fixtures depicting 19th century styles	P	P	P	P
Other	NP	AB	P	P

TEST 4

Fixture Height	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Fixture 15 feet or less	P	P	P	P
Fixture higher than 15 feet	AB	AB	NP	P

TEST 5

Brightness	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Source watts over 200	NP	NP	NP	AB
Source watts under 200	P	P	P	P

TEST 6

Illumination Of Adjacent Lot	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Direct light greater than 2 foot-lamberts from any source reflected off a white surface which is 12 feet from source	NP	NP	NP	-
External lights which glare into traffic and/or adjacent neighboring properties	NP	NP	NP	-
Reflected light from a dwelling, commercial structure, or sign which is greater than 2 foot-lamberts when measured at the structure. Also applies to structure inadvertently lighted	NP	NP	NP	-

The AC is reminded of the following per the Village Code;

Variations: The architectural board may, upon good cause shown, grant a variation to an owner from strict compliance with the standards set forth in this section if, in the determination of the architectural board, the variation is necessary to avoid an undue hardship upon the owner, and provided further that the architectural board determines that the illumination system with the variance requested shall not have any adverse effect upon adjacent properties, and provided further that the illumination system with the variation requested shall not result in light pollution subject to public view. (Ord. 2007-O-04, 4-24-2007)

Landscaping

Petitioner has submitted landscape plan for consideration by the AC. As is practical existing trees on-site will be preserved. This is largely around the perimeter of the site.

The Village Arborist is presently reviewing the tree preservation /landscape plan for the site. Per the conditional of the recommendation of the PCZBA, “The petitioner shall comply with the recommendations of the Village Arborist”. The AC may wish to ratify the recommendation of the PCZBA with regard to this issue. It is anticipated this review will be completed for the August 26th Village Board meeting.

The Village code does offer the following guidance with regard to landscaping;

Landscaping:

- (a) Landscaping plans should be consistent with the natural environment of the site, adjacent properties, and the surrounding area; provided that, when a site is open, suitable landscaping consistent with the wooded nature of the village should be provided.
- (b) Existing natural features should be appropriately preserved and integrated into the project. Under appropriate circumstances, a conservation strip consisting of landscaping and natural growth but excluding lawns and any impervious surface between adjacent properties would promote this objective.

Signage

Preliminary signage indicates one ground sign (double faced) of approximately 22 square feet (3.5' x 6.25') is contemplated for the site. Location is proposed in the "pork chop" identified in the right-in right-out access to the site. Signage will be illuminated by uplighting (3 fixtures per side) of the sign.

The sign will be mounted between 6" x 6" capped decorative posts approximately 7.25' from the existing grade. 6' metal letters in black will be mounted to a white back panel with a black decorative trim.

Fixture specifications for the uplighting have not been submitted; however the illumination source is well landscaped per the submitted landscape plan.

Site lines should be considered with regard to sign placement in the "pork chop" as well as any standards for sign placement from a state right-of-way.

Preliminary Site Plan

The petitioner will comply with the bulk requirement of the R-2 District. Minimum setbacks for the R-2 District will be abided by as well as the maximum height requirement of 35 feet. Relief from the maximum floor area requirement has been requested from the maximum of 13,000 square feet to 94, 323 square feet. It should be noted that the 13,000 square foot maximum is the maximum for a single family dwelling on an individual lot. The impervious surface requirement of 40% will be met with approximately 65% of site remaining pervious.

Of the total property approximately 6.9 acres (299,000 square feet) will be disturbed as part of the construction process. Disturbed area will extend into the setback areas on all sides of the property.

Two areas of wetlands exist on the property on the northwest and northeast sides of the property. These are identified as "Wetland A" and "Wetland B" respectively in the wetland report submitted in the application. Location of the wetlands has been a factor in the placement of the structure on the property. "Wetland A" appears to be under the jurisdiction of Lake County (watershed development ordinance would apply). "Wetland A" is a closed, depressional, wetland containing .33 acre of land area, "Wetland B" is a "Water of the United States" (Army Corps wetland) is a low-lying seasonally flood prone wet area which is an isolated closed depressional area as well. This wetland will be buffered and maintained as part of the development plan.

Per the engineering plans submitted "Wetland A" would be essentially eliminated due to re-grading of that area to accommodate the stormwater detention area. As this appears to be Lake County Wetland Inventory wetlands (as opposed to ADID wetlands) the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance would to apply to wetland A only.

Access to the site has been a major issue with this proposal. The present "pork chop" configuration was proposed to permit right-in/right out access to the site. Acceleration and deceleration lanes into and out of the site on Rt. 53 are also proposed.

This modification is proposed to ease concerns about access to the site, particularly site lines and left hand turns onto the site from Rt. 53 as well as to mitigate headlight glare onto adjacent residential properties to the north and has been conceptually accepted by IDOT.

The PCZBA raise major concerns with access to the site and conditioned their approval as follows;

"Access must be from the west side of the of the property to the Long Grove traffic signal creating a four way intersection into the property with intersection improvements to be financed by the petitioner".

Review standards are offered as follows;

Site Plan:

- (a) The site should be planned to meet, if not exceed, setbacks and to establish, protect, and enhance buffer yards between properties and to minimize disturbance to the natural landscaping on the site. Further, the project should be designed to preserve and enhance natural features on the site, including, without limitation, existing trees, wooded areas, buffer yards, and landscaping.
- (b) Access to the site and circulation thereon should be safe and convenient for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.
- (c) Driveways should be located to maintain adequate space between cuts in the streetscape.
- (d) Driveway and parking areas should be screened to reduce visual intrusions into surrounding properties and to enhance the secluded appearance of the village.
- (e) Screening or fencing should be consistent in design and materials with the principal buildings on the subject and adjacent properties.
- (f) Monotony should be avoided.

At this point the AC may wish to simply acknowledge receipt and review of the site plan. Any comments on this portion of the proposal will be presented directly to the Village Board.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION DECISION:

Elevations should be considered in light of the location of the structure in what is principally a residential area of the Village as well as the overall character of the Village. It is suggested the other accessory structures be of a style and materials compatible with the principal structure and character of the development.

The AB should review the request for lighting in conformance with the attached lighting criteria from the Village Code and make a determination on fixture style, and illumination source (sodium vapor).

Review of the landscape plan should be undertaken with consideration of the residential uses to the on two sides of the property. Petitioner has kept parking near the front building and increased landscaping along the south and east side of the property. ". The AC may wish to ratify the recommendation of the PCZBA with regard to landscaping of the property.

The AC should review and make recommendation on the signage as well. Site lines should be considered with regard to sign placement in the "pork chop" as well as any standards for sign placement from a state right-of-way.

The site plan/plat as submitted by the petitioner has been carefully crafted to work within the R-2 District standards with the exception of floor area. Access to the site has been a major concern. The AC may wish to simply acknowledge receipt and review of the site plan.