

**CONSERVANCY & SCENIC CORRIDOR COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**  
**VILLAGE HALL**  
February 3, 2016

**CALL TO ORDER:** Meeting called to order at 7:02 p.m.

Members present: Kelley Smith Chairman, Warren Schmitt, Kathy Wiberg and Helen Wilson.

Members absent; None

Also present: Jim Hogue, Village Planner, Camy Gould, Mike DeMar, Dan Rudnick, Sharon Dal Campo.

**MEETING MINUTES – November 4, 2015:**

Commissioner Wiberg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Wilson, to accept the November 4<sup>th</sup> Draft Meeting minutes as presented. On a voice vote all aye.

**VISITOR BUSINESS;** None

**APPLICATIONS:**

**CSCC 16-01;** Consideration of a request to construct a berm & plantings within a Scenic Corridor, located at 5314 Heather Knoll Ct. within the R-2 PUD District, Submitted by Mr. Ernie Vole.

Mr. Dan Rufnicki, Rufflo Landscape Contractors, explained the request to the CSCC on behalf of the petitioner. He submitted a revised site plan to the CSCC showing the south 240 feet of the berm being removed due to floodplain on that portion of the property. Compliance with LCSMC regulations regarding the floodplain would have been very difficult to accomplish on this site with the berm in that location.

He then explained the plant materials to be used on the berm and that most of the plant species were from the approved village list. Planting will be done, at a minimum, per village standards. The berm height would be eight (8) feet above original grade and evergreens are proposed to be placed on the top of the berm. The berm would be compliant with the subdivision regulations for berms in Scenic Corridors as well. He noted the property immediately north of this property (across Heather Knoll) has a berm situated in the scenic corridor as well.

Commissioner Wilson reviewed the application for the CSC Committee. She noted the plant mix chosen by the petitioner was acceptable as submitted. On the site visit it was noted the conservancy district signs are missing from the property and should be replaced by the property owner.

The CSCC asked if any of the berm would be located only in the conservancy district on the property. The petitioner responded that it would not. The berm would be located in only in the scenic corridor and would be sufficiently planted to avoid erosion into the floodplain area of property to the south of the berm.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wilson, seconded by Commissioner Wiberg to recommend approval of the request as submitted, including the plant species list, to allow a berm to be located within a scenic corridor located at 5314 Heather Knoll Court, within the R-2 PUD District Submitted by Mr. Ernie Vole.

On a voice vote; All aye.

**CSCC 16-02;** Consideration of the preliminary plat of subdivision of property to be known as the “Karen’s Corner” PUD and within the R-2 Residential District, including the location of Conservancy District Boundaries & detention areas within Scenic Corridors and pathways on property commonly known as “The Iverson Property” at Old Hicks & Checker Roads submitted by Fidelity Wes Designers & Builders.

Camy Gould, Fidelity Wes Builders, gave an overall explanation of the proposal. She emphasized the location of the detention areas in the scenic corridor, the location of conservancy areas, pathways, screening and other plantings to be done per village code including the scenic corridor plantings. Pathways which provide more connectivity and looping were suggested by staff for integration into the development. They may be located in the scenic corridors as well if feasible. It was suggested that pathways in the conservancy areas be considered from a passive recreation perspective. While the CSCC was receptive to the concept the petitioner noted that such a disturbance would not be allowed in the wetlands area of the conservancy. The CSCC indicated the use of asphalt pathways within the scenic corridors, or along the edges of the conservancy areas would be acceptable.

A question was raised as to the plantings in the bottoms of the detention basins. It was noted that a wet tolerant grass was anticipated for the bottom of the basin. Commissioner Wilson believed that LCSMC had a list of native plants which grow well in detention basins. Some of these species also flower. She urged the petitioner to research these various plant species for inclusion in the plant mix for the detention basins.

It was noted that sanitary sewer service as well as the detention basins would require removal of the existing plant species in the scenic corridor area. Petitioner noted a walk through with the Village Arborist revealed there was no significant vegetation existing within the proposed corridor area to be protected. All other areas, such as the conservancy areas would remain natural or utilize natural plant species from the approved plant species list. Wetlands and detention areas would be placed in easements and be the responsibility of the HOA.

Discussion then took place regarding the encroachment of the conservancy areas into the platted lot and building boxes. It was noted that presently the preference was to place conservancy easements into large outlots which reduces the potential for encroachment into the easement and provide for greater expanses of open space. The platting of lots 7 & 8 were particularly noted with regard to the platted lot lines and conservancy easements.

Planner Hogue noted that this issue had been discussed with the Village Attorney. The attorney indicated that the integrity of the conservancy areas could be protected via the PUD approval ordinance and covenants and restriction placed on the property. Planner Hogue also noted the impact of the proposed Rt. 53 right-of-way on the property. This effectively reduces the useable area of the property by 10 acres and more or less bi-sects the property constrain the use of outlots. Although the status of the roadway remains uncertain the petitioners have chosen to respect the potential ROW for this proposed roadway expansion.

After discussion a motion was made by Commissioner Wilson, seconded by Commissioner Smith as follows;

- The conservancy district boundaries as identified on the preliminary plans and plat may remain as identified. Per advice from village counsel the covenants and restrictions as well the PUD approval ordinance shall provide adequate protection of the integrity of the conservancy easements as shown.
- Stormwater detention easements/basins within the scenic corridor are acceptable. Detention areas within the conservancy easements are acceptable per Chapter 5, Section 7-5-3 (F) of the Village Code as part of the SUP/PUD approval. Detention basins as proposed within these areas shall utilize plantings from the

approved plant species list as well as the use of native plantings which grow well in detention basins unless otherwise approved by the CSCC. Petitioner shall provide detailed drawings and plant species lists and/ or seed mixes as part of the final PUD submittal for further CSCC review and consideration.

- The CSCC concurs with the goal of better “looping” and integration of the pathway system within the development and finds no objection to the use of asphalt pathways within the scenic corridor or along the boundaries of the conservancy easements. Pathways may deviate from those identified on the preliminary plans and plat in furtherance of the goal on pathway integration and final plans shall be brought back for the review and consideration of the CSCC.

## **OTHER BUSINESS;**

- 1) **Introduction of Sharon Dal Campo** – Chairman Smith recognized Ms. Sharon Dal Campo as a potential new member of the CSCC. Ms. Del Campo briefly explained her interest in serving on the CSCC as well as her involvement with Boards & Commissions in other communities. Chairman Smith welcomed her to CSCC pending her appointment by the Village President.
- 2) **Proposed amendments to the Village of Long Grove Comprehensive Plan** - Planner Hogue provided information to the CSCC concerning the proposed update to the Village Comprehensive Plan. He noted “stakeholder” meetings had been established for all day for Tuesday, February 9<sup>th</sup> and key community individual including Boards & Commissions chairs were invited to attend (invitation letter included in the meeting packet).

He provided the project calendar and indicated future updates to the CSCC would occur to keep the CSCC informed of progress of the project, review and collect feedback from the CSCC regarding the proposed changes to the plan document as well as obtain consensus from the CSCC on the amendments to the plan document.

- 3) **Approved Plant Species List Review** – Commissioner Wilson noted a need to consider updating of the approved plants species list for the Village. Commissioner Wiberg explained the history of how the current list came to be. Commissioner Wilson indicated the list should be reviewed and potentially modified to better meet local needs and would welcome any assistance from fellow commissioners with this project.
- 4) **Selection of a Vice Chairman** – It was noted that in the absence of the Chairman a Vice Chairman should be available to act as the Chairman Pro-Tem for meeting purposes. As Commissioner Schmitt has seniority on the CSCC and was a former CSCC Chair a motion was made by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Wilson, to appoint Commissioner Schmitt as Vice Chairman to serve as Chairman Pro-Tem in the absence of the Chairman. On a voice vote; all aye.

**ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING;** Commissioner Schmitt moved to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Wilson. On a voice vote, all aye. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*James M. Hogue*

James M. Hogue, Village Planner