



STAFF REPORT

TO: Village of Long Grove Planning Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals
FROM: James M. Hogue, Village Planner
DATE: October 29, 2014
RE: Consideration of the final plat, final engineering and site plans including landscaping, lighting, signage and elevations as part of an application for amendment to the previously approved Special Use Permit and Planned Unit Development known as the Fairfield Village Planned Unit Development and within the R-2 PUD District to provide for a senior living center with memory care and assisted living facilities for the property at 1190 Old McHenry Road, submitted by Harbor Retirement Associates.

Item: PCZBA PETITION 14-05

Status: Preliminary approval granted by the Village Board in July 24, 2014 (Ord. 2014-O-12). Per the Village Code the applicant has two (2) years in which to file final plans and plats. The final submittal is therefore timely.

History: The property is located on the southwest corner of Route 83 and Old McHenry Road. The property in question is comprises Lot 17 of the previously approved Fairfield PUD and consists of 10 acres of land area. This property is presently zoned R-2 PUD.

The property was developed under the approval ordinance for the Fairfield PUD in 1979. Resolution 79-R-15 established the general parameters for the development of this parcel. This has been modified by the approval of Ordinance 2014-O-12.

In 2010 an additional special use permit was granted to T-Mobile to allow a personal wireless services antenna (cell tower) on the property so long as the antenna was wholly enclosed within the existing structure (Bank building) this approval was conditioned most notably as follows;

- E. **Equipment.** The Equipment must be fully enclosed within the Existing Structure and be used exclusively for the operation and maintenance of the Antenna Facilities.
- F. **Term; Review.** The special use permit and other approvals granted in this Ordinance shall be limited to either the term of any lease agreement for the Antenna Facilities on the

Subject Property (including any extension thereof), but in no event for more than 25 years after the passage of this Ordinance. Further, the special use permit and other approvals granted in this Ordinance shall be subject to review by the Board of Trustees, at 10-year intervals, to determine whether changed circumstances exist to require the termination or modification of such special use permit and other approvals. Should the Existing Structure undergo a significant renovation, demolition and rebuild, or substantial change from the plans originally approved by the Village, this special use permit and other approvals granted in this Ordinance shall automatically expire.

This too was modified by Ordinance 2014-O-12 to allow for the temporary placement of the cell tower on-site.

Proposal: Petitioners are seeking an amendment to the previously approved Special Use Permit\PUD approval known as the Fairfield Village Planned Unit Development and with the R-2 PUD District with relief requested including to building height, and parking to provide for redevelopment of the property as a senior living center (“nursing home”) with Memory Care and Assisted Living Facilities on the property and temporary relocation of the existing T-Mobile wireless antenna currently located in the existing building to the northwest corner of the site until March 2015. As proposed the facility would contain 138 units and house 150 patients (beds). Additionally, 90 staff associated (both full and part time) are anticipated to support resident/patient care at the facility. The facility would be divided into 58 memory care (Alzheimer’s/Dementia Care) units and 80 assisted living units. No reclassification of the property is required or requested as “nursing homes” are considered special uses in the residential districts.

In general, the final plans and plats are in substantial compliance with the preliminary submittal.

Land Use, Zoning and Locational Data:

1. Proposed Zoning: No zoning change requested; to the previously approved Special Use Permit\PUD approval known as the Fairfield Village Planned Unit Development and with the R-2 PUD District with relief requested including to building height, and parking to provide for redevelopment of the property as a senior living center (“nursing home”).
2. Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning;

<i>Direction</i>	<i>Existing Use</i>	<i>Land Use Plan Designation/Zoning</i>
NORTH	Office	Office; R-2 PUD
SOUTH	Multi-Family Residential	Village of Buffalo Grove\R-9 MFR District
EAST	Vacant\Agricultural	Commercial\Office; R-2
WEST	Residential (Fairfield Village)	Residential; R-2 PUD

3. Location; The property is located on the west side of the intersection of Route 83 and Route 53 and is presently the site of the Midwest Bank Building (to be razed) – 1190 Old McHenry Road .
4. Acreage; The property (Lot17 - Fairfield Village PUD contains approximately 10 +/- acres of land area.
5. Based upon information available through Lake County GIS, the property is free from FEMA Floodplain, Flood of Record area and/or wetlands (LCWI & ADID). (See Maps).
6. Topography; See attached Map from Lake County GIS.

Zoning Data	Existing	Proposed	Zoning Code (R-2 Standard)	PUD
Lot Area	435,908 sq. ft.	435,908 sq. ft.	2 acres (87,120 sq. ft.)	N/A
Floor Area (Total Floor Area)	17,970 sq.ft. *	125,430 sq. ft.	N/A	85,000 sq. ft.
Lot Coverage (In Square Feet)	UNKNOWN	193,283 sq. ft (45.63%)	40%	N/A
Height	35'	42'***	35'	35'

* Midwest Bank Bldg square footage –building to be razed.

** 42' on cupola feature only; principal structure will be 35 feet tall.

Yard Requirements (set-backs);

	Existing	Proposed**	Zoning Ordinance (R-2 Standards)	P.U.D. *
Front Yard (East/ Rt. 83)	172'	119.35'	75'	125'
Side Yard (North)	502'	190.48'	40'	175'
Front Yard (South Rt. 53)	183'	180.44'	40'	175'
Rear Yard (West)	306'	202.18	40'	200'

- * Setback to building box per approved PUD plat.
- ** All proposed structures to be placed in the building box except a portion of the “At Porte Cochere – East side of structure

Final Plans Review & Analysis

A. Services (See memo for the Village Engineer Gewalt-Hamilton)

Water - The site will be served by Village water from the treatment plant at Sunset Grove. Water has been stubbed to the site. This site was anticipated to be serviced by Village water and capacity has been built into the system to accommodate this use.

Watermain will be looped from a 10” main on the south around the west and north side of the proposed building to the existing watermain on Route 83. A 6’ water service will connect to the building on both the east and west side of the property. This is consistent with the preliminary approval

Sewer – Sanitary Sewer service is proposed on the west side of the building. A 4” PVC line will connect to an existing sanitary line on the west side of the property and continue to travel west along an existing sanitary sewer line. This is consistent with the preliminary approval.

Stormwater - Two additional stormwater detention ponds have been added to the site and not previously shown on the preliminary site & engineering plans. These are located on the north side of the proposed structure.

Stormwater is proposed to flow from generally east to west on the site with stormwater on the east half of the site flowing to the north into the detention facilities located there. Stormwater on the west half of the site will collect in an improved bio-swale located on the western edge of the property and flow into a detention pond on the north end of the site. Eventually stormwater will flow into the existing detention pond in Fairfield Village. Drainage plans for Fairfield Village appear to indicate that stormwater management from this site was to be achieved in this pond. Details on stormwater demand and capacity have been submitted and are being reviewed by the Village Engineer with the final application.

B. Final Plan & Plat

The final plan and plat are consistent with the preliminary approval. Utility easements and a certificates/signatures page need to be added but do not substantially affect the plat as presented.

The final plans denote the temporary location of the existing cell tower on-site as being located to the north and west of principal structure. This is in the general location as identified in the preliminary approval and consistent with that approval.

C. Final Elevations, Lighting, Signage, Landscaping & Plan

Portions of the proposal (e.g. final landscaping, elevations, lighting, and signage) require Architectural Commission (AC) review. These portions of the proposal were considered by the AC at their meeting of October 20th. Their recommendations are as follows;

Final Elevations;

Materials proposed for the final elevations would be similar to those used in the Sunset Grove Development and consist of brick, hardiboard, and stone with an asphalt shingle roof. Mechanical equipment would be placed on the roof of the structure and screened from view. This is consistent with the preliminary approval.

Petitioners indicated they had addressed the “monotony” concerns (noted in the preliminary approval by the AC) by adding dormer features to the east and west sides of the building. This additional feature breaks up the monotony of the structure without reinventing the structure (critical given the site constraints of the PUD) and keeps a symmetrical look to the building.

Petitioners also noted the trash receptacle would be made of brick with wooden gates and located in the recessed area on the west side of the structure (near the delivery entrance) and more or less out of site on the property.

The AC was appreciative of the efforts of the petitioner but noted the monotony issues still remained particularly with regard to the single plane of the roof line. The suggested the following;

- Continuation of the dormer elements along the south elevation of the structure;
- Alteration of the roof lines to break up the single plane of the roof;
- A rendering be presented which illustrates the southeast elevation of the structure (view from 83 & 53).

A motion was made by Commissioner Closson, seconded by Commissioner Styer; to direct the petitioner to resubmit elevations for the proposed structure which continue the dormer elements proposed for the east and west elevations to the south elevation as well as better articulation of the roof lines of the structure to create a more residential look for the east, west and south elevations with a rendering of that portion of the building for further AC consideration. On a voice vote; all aye.

Final Lighting;

The final lighting plans as submitted, particularly the photometric plan and noted no light “escaped” from the property, particularly along the west lot line abutting residential uses. The AC found the requested lighting to be in conformance with the lighting standards for the Village. Staff noted the final lighting plans, including fixtures, fixture placement, height and wattage were consistent with preliminary approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to recommend approval of the proposed final lighting plan as submitted including fixture style, illumination source (LED) and fixture height (18 feet). On a voice vote; all aye.

Final Landscaping (See memo from Village Arborist Todd Sinn);

The landscape architect for the project explained the landscape plan noting existing natural vegetation on-site would be preserved to the greatest extent possible. The goal is to enhance the existing landscaping with native perennials and grasses to the greatest extent possible although the native

species content had not yet been determined. He also noted there were not many significant trees on-site which would require mitigation.

Berms in the scenic corridor would be kept but re-graded to be more undulating in shape. An asphalt pathway (6'-10') would meander through the berm. With the monument sign being located on the berm, specialized plantings would be required to ensure the visibility of the sign and screening of the illumination source. Landscaping along the west property line would be greatly enhanced and screen the existing residences from the proposed structure. A bio-swale would be incorporated along the west property line to help filter runoff from the site and enhance the overall water quality of the existing detention pond in Fairfield Village into which the site would drain. Two additional detention areas (required by LCSMC) are proposed on the north edge for the site.

Final seed mixes for the berm have not yet been determined pending further inventory and analysis of the desirable species on site and the best mix to enhance those species.

The AC had no questions regarding the landscape plan. A motion was made by Commissioner Styer, seconded by Commissioner Closson, to accept the landscape plan as submitted, subject to a final landscaping plans being reviewed and approved by the Village Arborist (w/signage, sign illumination, sign landscaping to be resubmitted for AC consideration). On a voice vote; all aye.

Final Signage;

Final signage information was presented noting the "gateway" status of the property into the community. A monument sign, similar to the Sunset Grove sign, is proposed to be located on the berm on the southeast corner of the development along the southern edge of the scenic corridor. The monument sign as proposed is approximately 84 square feet in area. Up-lighting is proposed for the sign however specifications on lighting and landscaping around the sign were not presented.

Signage would be composed of metal lettering mounted to a stone veneer face. Materials are identical to the stone accents on the façade of the principal structure. No signage would be placed on the building.

Smaller secondary (directional) signs would be placed in two locations in the development. These would be located near the ingress/egress points of the development at Rt. 83 & Robert Parker Coffin Road. The directional signage (two signs; double faced) would be painted wood with raised lettering with a stone base. Materials appear identical to the stone accents on the façade of the principal structure. These signs are proposed to be up-lit (lighting/ landscaping specs not submitted).

A motion was made by Commissioner Tapas, seconded by Commissioner Styer, to accept the signage as presented subject to detailed plans for lighting (cut sheets) and landscaping of lighting being submitted for the monument sign and secondary (directional) signage for further AC review. On a voice vote; all aye.

Plan & Plat (reviewed by the AC regarding the overall design).

The petitioner presented the final site plan and plat. Staff noted alterations to the existing berms are proposed. These include including pathways (6'-10') and regarding of the berms.

Additionally, the existing cell tower is proposed of be located temporarily to the north and west of the principal structure. This is more or less consistent with the general temporary location for the tower as preliminarily

proposed. Staff notes that this location is spelled out in the in the final engineering plans but not the final site plan. Staff suggests this location be consistent on both plans.

The plan and plat as submitted are in “substantial compliance” with the preliminary plat as submitted.

The AC found the plan and plat to be well thought out and substantially compliant with the preliminary plans for the development. The AC had noted the temporary cell tower location should be consisted on all site plans to avoid any future confusion regarding the temporary location

Commissioner Closson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tapas, to accept the preliminary plan and plat as submitted including the temporary location of the cell tower to the north and west of the principal structure. On a voice vote; all aye.

D). Comprehensive Plan Compliance

This property is part of the “Downtown Master Plan” adopted by the Village in 2008. This document anticipates redevelopment of this property as part of the “Illinois Route 53 Sub-District”. Specific land uses are not identified as part of this plan.

However, the proposal has many characteristics which serve to implement general goals and objectives of the Village namely;

- Extension of the pathway system; a proposed a segment would connect the Old McHenry Road pathway to closer to the pathways in the Sunset Grove Development.
- Enhanced site improvements including parking, landscaping and other amenities which improve the “gateway” status of the site.
- The opportunity for enhanced gateway and wayfinding amenities linked to the downtown.

Land use is proposed to change from the anticipated/ approved office use to and institutional/residential use. This use, arguably, is less intense than the office use anticipated for the site, generates less traffic and provides a nice transition between the commercial uses on the east of Route 83 and the residential uses which about the site to the west.

E). Issues\ Conclusions PCZBA Consideration

The following are noted by staff review of the proposal.

In general the final plans and plats as submitted by the petitioner are in substantial compliance with preliminary plans as previously approved.

As indicated by the Village Engineer some technical comments are noted (as well as permitting requirements) but these items are not anticipated to require substantive changes to the proposal. The PCZBA may consider of the approval the engineering subject to the Village Engineer's review and approval as applicable.

The AC review of the proposal indicated additional cosmetic changes to the structure are suggested to further address the monotony issue as initially noted by the AC. Further detail on signage illumination and the treatment of the illumination source was also requested. The PCZBA may consider approval subject to the recommendations of the AC as applicable.

The landscape plan has been reviewed by the Village Arborist in general appears adequate, however further review and refinement are necessary. The applicant remains committed to preserving the existing natural

vegetation on-site to the greatest extent possible. This is in part why seed mixes and plant species have yet been finally determined as the inventory of existing natural vegetation on-site is ongoing. It is suggested the landscape plan be conditionally approved subject to the review and approval of the Village Arborist, the Village Planner, and the CSCC as necessary. Of note, the landscape plan proposed a monument sign on the edge of the scenic corridor at the southeast corner of the site. This look of this sign, as well as sign placement, are consistent with those approved within Sunset Grove and contribute substantially to the “gateway” nature of the site into the village.

The temporary relocation of the existing cell tower should also be noted as well as the duration of the temporary “status” and the ultimate disposition of that tower.

Respectfully Submitted,

James M. Hogue

James M. Hogue
Village Planner



October 16, 2014

Mr. Jim Hogue
Village Planner
Village of Long Grove
3110 RFD
Long Grove, IL 60047-9653

RE: Harbor Chase
Preliminary Site Landscape Plan Review

Dear Jim,

I've reviewed the Preliminary Site Landscape Plan by Daniel Weinbach & Partners, Ltd., last revision date of 10-10-14, for the proposed Harbor Chase development at Illinois Routes 53 and 83. The following are my observations and recommendations.

1. The plan is very preliminary as it does not contain species, quantities or seed mixes.
2. The plans do not show any tree preservation for the existing trees, including tree protection/silt fencing. The engineering plans will need to be reviewed to determine if trees shown as being preserved can actually be preserved. During initial site reviews, there were a few protected trees on this property that would require mitigation if they are damaged or removed. These trees are not identified on this plan.

I don't see anything on this preliminary landscape plan that is completely out of line, but I would need to review a more detailed landscape plan showing species and quantities and an engineering plan before I can make any more recommendations.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
URBAN FOREST MANAGEMENT, INC.

Todd R. Sinn
Senior Forester

October 29, 2014

Mr. David A. Lothspeich, Village Manager
Village of Long Grove
3110 Old McHenry Road
Long Grove, Illinois 60047

Re: Harborage of Long Grove
Northwest Corner of Illinois Route 83 and Illinois Route 53
Plan Review for PCZBA

Dear Mr. Lothspeich:

We are in receipt of the following documents for the proposed development:

- Final Site Development Plans for Harborage of Long Grove (20 Sheets), dated October 10, 2014, prepared by Cemcon, Ltd.
- Final Stormwater Management Analysis and Report for Harborage of Long Grove, dated October 10, 2014, prepared by Cemcon, Ltd.
- ALTA / ACSM Land Title Survey, dated April 17, 2014, prepared by Cemcon, Ltd.
- Final P.U.D. for Harborage of Long Grove, dated October 7, 2014, prepared by Cemcon, Ltd.
- Building Elevations and Site Plan, last revised October 10, 2014, prepared by Solomon Cordwell Buenz
- Preliminary Site Landscape Plan, last revised October 10, 2014, prepared by Solomon Cordwell Buenz
- Site Electrical Plan, last revised October 10, 2014, prepared by Solomon Cordwell Buenz

Our office has made a preliminary review of the documents submitted and reviewed the genesis of this submittal. Based on our review, we offer the following comments for consideration by the Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals:

1. As stated in the letter from the Lake County Division of Transportation (LCDOT), dated May 23, 2014, a Major Site Access permit will not be required. However, a "Work in the Right-of-Way" permit will be needed for the improvements made in the Old McHenry Road right-of-way. Please make sure the Village is copied on all correspondence and offered the opportunity to attend any meetings with LCDOT.
2. A permit will be needed from the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) for the watermain connections in the Illinois Route 83 right-of-way and watermain improvements within the Illinois Route 53 right-of-way. Please make sure the Village is copied on all correspondence and offered the opportunity to attend any meetings with IDOT.

5000.002 Harborage of Long Grove - Plan Review for PCZBA.docx

3. Approval from the adjacent property owner is needed for improvements north of the property. We acknowledge that the proposed improvements are within an existing shared Ingress/Egress Easement.
4. We noted some technical comments during our review of the plans; a full engineering review will be completed upon Final Village Board approval of the project. The technical items are not expected to require substantive changes to the development.
5. The Stormwater Report referenced a Plat of Easement. That document has not been received by our office; we will complete a review of the Plat upon receipt as stormwater and watermain easements will be required.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,
Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc.


Geoffrey Perry, P.E.
Assistant Village Engineer

cc: Mr. Jim Hogue, Village Planner – Village of Long Grove
Mr. Michael T. Shrake, P.E., Village Engineer – GHA