

Item #17:
Village Planner Report



MEMORANDUM

TO: Village President and Village Board
FROM: James M. Hogue, Village Planner
DATE: August 17, 2010
RE: Board & Commissions Report for 8/24/10

This memo is intended to update the Village Board as to the status of projects and activities of the Long Grove Plan Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA), Conservancy & Scenic Corridor Committee (CSCC) and the Architectural Commission (AC).

PCZBA; 8.3.10 – One Action Item

Consideration of a petition for a Special Use Permit and/or additional relief necessary and/or appropriate under the zoning code including modification of the existing PUD as required to allow a wireless telecommunications facility and related equipment to be located within the existing structure at 1190 Old McHenry Road and within the R-2 PUD District submitted by Mr. Mark Layne on behalf of T-Mobile Central LLC.

The petitioner proposes a wireless telecommunications facility (up to 9 panel antennas) to be installed within the existing cupola of the on the roof of the bank. Antennas will be installed at an elevation of 54.5 feet behind the louvers inside of the octagonal cupola above the clock. Antennas are proposed to be invisible from the external elevation of the building. Equipment cabinets will be housed in the basement of the building and likewise be invisible from public view.

Mr. Mark Layne, petitioners' representative, further explained the request noting that there was a "hole" in the coverage in this area. The existing cell tower to the south and east of this property is at capacity and cannot accommodate any more antennas. With the bank being the next tallest structure which would provide the needed coverage, the petitioner opted to place antennas within the cupola of this building. Antennas will be placed behind the louvers in cupola and the equipment cabinets will be placed in the basement. All elements of the request will be completely hidden from public view. Only one carrier will utilize these antennas. No members of the public outside of the petitioner were present.

The Village Attorney noted the Village Code provision that all such antennas be situated 500' from the nearest single family residence. It was noted that this requirement, as well as the "Personal Wireless Communication Regulations adopted by the Village, were largely targeted for antennas mounted on monopole towers. The zoning code does however specifically mention antennas and not just antennas mounted on towers with regard to the 500' requirement. It was suggested that a condition be placed on any recommendation for approval of the request. The petitioner should submit evidence of the distance of the antennas from all residences and that a waiver of the 500' requirement (per 5-9-6 (c) "Special Standards") of the zoning code be considered if any residences fail to meet this standard. Given the unique set of circumstances regarding the location of the antennas, and that they will be totally screened from public view, support consideration of this action.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kazmer, seconded by Commissioner Dvorak, to recommend approval of the request as submitted, subject to the conditions and recommendations as outlined by the Village Attorney. On a voice vote; all aye.

AC; 8.16.10 – Three Action Items

1. Consideration of a request for window treatments for the CVS Pharmacy Building, 4186 Route 83 within the Sunset Grove Development and zoned HR-1 PUD District, submitted by Sure Light Signs.

Planner Hogue indicated that he had contacted the petitioner regarding the deadline for submittal items for this meeting as well as forwarding the direction offered by the AC to the petitioner. He had received nothing with regard to this contact. Planner Hogue suggested this item be tabled until such time as petitioner submits materials for AC consideration.

Commissioner Calas indicated she had contacted the petitioner as well in response to her offer to assist the petitioner in identifying photos suitable for the window treatments and received no response as well.

Commissioner Calas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Plunkett to table this request until such time as petitioner submits items for review per the previous direction of the Commission. On a voice vote; all aye.

2. Consideration of a request for signage for the Long Grove Performing Arts Academy, 344 Old McHenry Road, within the B-1 Historic District, submitted by Signs Now on behalf of Sara Pardo.

Ms. Pardo presented her request to the AC indicating the proposed signage is nearly identical to the temporary hanging sign which is in place in front of the building. The “rider” on the bottom of the temporary sign is not proposed for the permanent sign.

Planner Hogue noted that the signage as proposed is approvable per the Village Code.

The AC liked the look of the hanging sign and had suggestions for the wall sign which included;

- Be modified to add the logo from the hanging sign (dropping “Long Grove”) from the sign if necessary.
- Modify the shape of the sign to more closely match the shape of the façade of the entranceway.

A motion was made by Commissioner Calas, seconded by Commissioner Plunkett, to recommend approval of the signage subject to the modification as suggested. On a voice vote; all aye.

(Note: petitioner has submitted revisions to the proposed wall sign. These are in conformance with modifications suggested by the AC. Total signage increases to 11.2 square feet which is permissible as 12 square feet of signage is allowable at this location).

3. Consideration of a request for modification of plans for “Building B”; 4196 Route 83 and within the Sunset Grove Development, including the site plan, signage, elevations, landscaping plans and zoned HR-1 PUD District, submitted by Mr. Kurt Wandrey, Lakewood Real Estate Solutions LLC .

Planner Hogue indicated that modification of the previous PUD approval as it principally relates to “Building B” is being requested. Building “B” as previously approved is to be located on Lot 1 of the Sunset Grove PUD.

Located at the corner of Aptakasic Road and Route 83, "Building B" was approved to contain a bank and mixed retail uses including two drive-up facilities.

The bank now wishes to have a free standing building instead of being a part of the single Building "B" as previously approved. As such an amendment to the previously approved PUD is required. The Village Attorney has opined that this may be considered a minor amendment to the PUD if no further subdivision of the property is requested and the amendment does not increase any of the height, lot coverage or other bulk requirements as previously approved. As these parameters have been met (see bulk requirements below) this may be considered a minor amendment to the PUD and further consideration (and public hearing) by the PCZBA would not be required. However, reconsideration of the site, plans, landscape plan, elevations and signage by the AC are required per the Village Code. Two structures, a free standing Chase Bank Building, and the remainder of Building "B" (as slightly modified), are now proposed to be situated on Lot 1 of the Sunset Grove PUD.

Zoning Data

	Existing	Proposed	Zoning Code (HR-1 Standard)*	Final Sunset PUD Approval
Lot Area (Lot 1)	1.92 Acres	No Change	20,000 sq. ft.	1.92 Acres
Floor Area	N/A	14,500 (2 buildings)	No Standard Identified	14,800 (1 Building)
Lot Coverage (Entire Development)	N/A	71.4%	.60 (lot coverage)	71.8% (75% Standard Identified in approval ordinance)
F.A.R. (Lot 1)	N/A	17.3%	16%	17.6% (28.5 Standard Identified in Approval Ordinance)
Height	N/A	39.4' Tower Bldg "B" 26.0 Bldg "B" Height 26.5' (Chase Bank Bldg.)	35 feet	Bldg. "B" (30' Building Height 41' tower Height identified in Approval Ordinance)

*Standards may be modified by individual PUD approvals

The AC considered the proposed changes and made the following recommendations:

Elevations :

Building "B"

The AC noted the minor changes to the elevations of Building "B" and reaffirmed that the building materials, colors and overall character of the modified structure are acceptable and moved to accept "Building B" as now modified per the elevation drawings submitted by OKW architects and dated July 30th 2010 (labeled Exhibits 13 & 14) and including the materials schedule.

Chase Bank

The petitioner presented a proposed “Option B” elevation which AC found to be within the character of the development. The AC recommended approval of this elevations subject to the following conditions;

- Materials including but not limited to the stone base, shingles, hardi-board siding, shingles, roof elements and other materials be consistent with the materials used in “Building B” as modified.
- The roof on the entrance way to the to the building be changed to 3.5 or 4.5 to 12 pitch.

Landscaping & Site Plan

Kurt Wandrey, Lakewood Real Estate, explained that perimeter landscaping will not change. He noted the power lines, originally intended to be buried, will not be as it is cost prohibitive. Some perimeter trees will need to be moved back slightly but with correction should not interfere with the power lines even at maturity. Over story tress will be honey locust, dogwood will be used between the between buildings. A new coneflower species will be substituted for the original as the original species is not longer available.

The AC had no objections to the landscape plan as proposed. Overall the AC noted the changes to the site plan were positive and served to enhance the development.

The AC recommended approval of the site plan dated July 30, 2010 as prepared by OKW Architects (labeled Exhibit #2) and the landscape plan prepared by OKW Architects July 30, 2010 (Exhibit 17) & working sheets 103 & 104.

Signage

“Building B”

As the tenant mix for “Building B” is not known at this time the AC looked at general signage placement. The AC found this to be consistent with the original approval and recommend approval of the “designated zones for signs and graphics” as prepared by OKW Architects, July 9, 2010 and labeled Exhibit 15.

Chase Bank

The AC reviewed the sign package as submitted August 10, 2010 for the Chase Bank Building. The recommended approval of the building signage as submitted with the following conditions:

- AC requested that the Chase Sign on the south elevation of the structure be removed.
- LED backlighting of the signage (as does for CVS) is acceptable.

Perimeter Monument Signage

The petitioner presented a request to eliminate one the “Type A” monument signs along RT 83 and allow two smaller monument signs (one for CVS & one for Chase Bank) along Route 83. As previously approved 4 type A signs (3 on Route 83 & 1 on Aptakisic Rd) and one type B sign on the corner of Aptakisic & Route 83 were approved. A total of 5 monument signs would be permitted, if approved as requested, but one Type A sign would essentially be split into two smaller monument signs exclusively for CVS and Chase.

The AC had concern with the number, size and in particular the look of the Chase sign as proposed. The AC took no action on this request and instructed the petitioner to reconfigure the Chase sign in the fashion of the CVS signs and submit the same for consideration at the September meeting.

Lighting

The reconfiguration of “Building B” and additions of the Chase Bank Building did not result in any changes to the previously approved lighting plans. As such, no amendments to the approved lighting plan were requested or considered by the AC.

CSCC: Next Meeting 9.1.10

28" high x 34" wide





