



ITEM #3: ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION – March 15, 2021 @ 7:00 P.M.

REQUEST: Consideration of preliminary plans & plats including landscaping and signage for the proposed “Phillip Estates” PUD/ Subdivision in conjunction with the petition for a SUP/PUD development as submitted by The Phillip Estates L.L.C. for property located on the south side of Cuba Road formerly known as the Canterbury Park PUD.

HISTORY:

The property consists of 34.82 net acres +/- of land area. The property is presently zoned R-1 PUD District and received final approval as the Canterbury PUD. The property is presently vacant.

The Canterbury project received preliminary PUD approval\ zoning by the Long Grove Plan Commission on June 7, 2005. Subsequently the Village Board also granted preliminary approval in April of 2006 via Ordinance #2005-O-23. Per the Village Subdivision\ PUD regulations and preliminary approval ordinance, a final plat was to be submitted within two years of the preliminary plat approval. For a number of reasons this was not accomplished and an extension on the submission of the final plans and plat was granted until July 2008.

The final plan\ plat to allow twelve (12) single-family home sites to be situated on the property to be known as Canterbury Park was recommended for approval by the PCZBA on April 15, 2008. Subsequently the Village Board approved the final plan\ plat via Ordinance 2008-O-16 on May 13, 2008. The property was to be serviced by a communal septic system and private wells.

Despite these approvals, the property has remained and continues to remain vacant. The applicant and property owner note the present configuration of the property and lot sizes have made this property unmarketable. They are requesting reclassification of the property to the R-2 PUD District (with a density bonus) to allow 19 single family lots, to now be served by public sewer and a private water main system, for this property. Reclassification requires referral from the Village Board to the PCZBA which was completed 7.28.20.

At the March 3rd 2021 PCZBA meeting the PCZBA considered this matter and made the following recommendation;

A motion was made by Commissioner Kazmer, seconded by Commissioner Bauer to recommend approval of the reclassification of property from the R-1 PUD District to the R-2 PUD District classification (with a 15% density bonus) and preliminary PUD plan/plat approval to allow for the creation of a 19 lot single family development (to be serviced by a private water system and public sanitary sewer) for vacant property on the south side of Cuba Road to be known as the Philip Estates PUD submitted by the Phillip Estates L.L.C. (formerly known as the Canterbury Park PUD) subject to the following conditions;

- 1) *The recommendations of the CSCC (per their August 19th 2020 meeting) regarding the scenic corridor, conservancy easements, pathways and plantings are incorporated into and made a part of this recommendation.*
- 2) *The recommendations of the Village Arborist (per the correspondence of 7.27.20 & 2.19.21) regarding the plantings, tree preservation/mitigation and landscaping are incorporated into and made a part of this recommendation.*
- 3) *The proposed water system for the development shall be served by a water source that satisfies all applicable Federal & State standards for safe drinking water.*
- 4) *The proposed development shall establish that it has all approvals and authorizations necessary to install the requisite utility mains.*
- 5) *The comments and recommendation of the Village Engineer (per the correspondence of 2.24 21) regarding the proposal including Stormwater Management are incorporated into and made a part of this recommendation.*
- 6) *The application is hereby referred to the Architectural Commission for review as prescribed by the Village Code.*

On a Roll Call vote, 7 aye, 0 nay, 0 abstain; Motion carries

At the March 9th Village Board meeting the Village Board accepted this recommendation and directed the Village Attorney to prepare the necessary preliminary approval documents for consideration at the March 23rd meeting.

PROPOSAL:

Consideration of the reclassification of property from the R-1 PUD District to the R-2 PUD District classification (with a density bonus) and preliminary PUD plan/plat approval to allow for the creation of a 19 lot single family development (to be serviced by a private water system and public sanitary sewer) for vacant property on the south side of Cuba Road to be known as the Philip Estates PUD submitted by the Phillip Estates L.L.C. (formerly known as the Canterbury Park PUD).

STAFF REVIEW:

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

Preliminary PUD Plan / Plat

The PUD Plat in combination with the proposed site plan (included with the “Phillip Estates Attachments”) is in conformance with the Village regulations including a soils map depicting soil conditions, conservancy easements and other easements on-site.

A 100' scenic corridor easement is depicted along Old Hicks Road as required by the Village Subdivision Regulations. A pathway is proposed in this easement and in Conservancy Easements which were reviewed and approved by the CSCC.

50' road easements are proposed with a 22' pavement width. Roads are to be private and are contained in Outlot C as identified on the plat

The plat is consistent with the PUD plan also submitted for consideration. As side note, the PCZBA had raised the following concerns with the previously approved Canterbury Park proposal;

The Plan Commission raised the following questions/comments: (1) cul-de-sac orientation/design; (2) "flag-lot" concerns and (3) Septic field design questions (similar questions have been raised by the Village Board).

The current proposal under consideration has eliminated all of these concerns ultimately resulting in a much better development design than previously approved.

Landscaping/ Tree Preservation Ordinance

The attached landscape plan is as part of the submittal package (included with the "Phillip Estates Attachments"). The petitioner will provide internal subdivision landscaping per the requirements of the Village Code (Title 6, Section 6-6-5 Required Improvements). A detailed list of plantings has been submitted with the landscape plan.

The property will be subject to the Village Tree Preservation Ordinance. The preliminary landscape plan has been reviewed by the Village Arborist. His comments are attached to this report. He notes proposed plantings are generally in conformance with recommended and acceptable plant species for the village. Field verification of the existing tree inventory will need to occur as will further review of species to be removed for mitigation purposes.

The PCZBA (and CSCC) recommended the Village Arborist review of the landscape and tree removal/tree protection as a condition of approval. If the AC has any additional comments regarding the landscape plan these may be incorporated into the recommendation of the AC. Final landscape plans, in conformance with preliminary recommendation will be brought back to the AC for final approval.

Signage –

A single monument (ground) sign proposed for identification of the development (included with the "Phillip Estates Attachments"). The sign would be double faced situated in a landscape island at the entrance to the development. The sign face measures 3' x 8' or 24 square foot of signage. This is well within the maximum allowable size maximum of 40 square feet. The signage would be mounted on natural stone veneered base 2' x 8' in dimension.

Such signage needs to be placed outside the “vision triangle” defined as follows;

VISION TRIANGLE: A triangle measured twenty five feet (25') from the intersections of any two (2) right of way lines or roadway easements and fifteen feet (15') from the intersection of a driveway, a right of way or roadway easement.

Subdivision entrance signs are permissible as follows;

Subdivision Signs: A sign identifying the location and name of a subdivision may be installed at the entrance of the subdivision, subject to compliance with the following standards:

(1) Number Of Signs: No more than two (2) subdivision identification signs shall be permitted for each subdivision.

(2) Size: The cumulative total area of the subdivision identification signs permitted by subsection (G)2(c)(1) of this section shall not exceed forty (40) square feet in dimension.

(3) Lighting: A subdivision identification sign may be illuminated, subject to compliance with the following standards:

A. Type Of Lighting: A subdivision identification sign may utilize one of the following methods of illumination: sign mounted canopy light or ground mounted spotlight. Only white or clear incandescent illumination sources shall be permitted.

B. Direction Of Illumination: The illumination source shall only be directed onto the face of the subdivision identification sign.

C. Visibility Of Illumination Source: The illumination source or filament shall not be visible from adjacent lots.

D. Maximum Illumination: The maximum illumination for a subdivision identification sign shall not exceed two (2) foot-candles within a distance of one foot (1') from the surface of the subdivision identification sign and shall not emit any measurable illumination (i.e., 0 foot-candles) at the lot line most proximate to a subdivision identification sign.

E. General Restrictions: The illumination of the subdivision identification sign shall comply with the provisions of subsection (D)1 of this section.

AC should review the subdivision entrance signage against the aforementioned standards as well as the look of the sign in relation to the character of the area and make recommendations as appropriate. Illumination of this sign is anticipated as part of the proposal. The lighting will be placed in an in-ground cover bed on either side of the sign face. The fixture and type of illumination are to be determined and may be considered as part of the final approval.

Lighting –

The petitioner has indicated street lighting is **not** being considered as part of the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION DECISION:

Staff suggests the AC ratify the recommendation of the PCZBA at a minimum regarding the landscape plan. If the AC has any suggestions regarding landscaping plans these may also be incorporated into the recommendations of the AC which will be brought to the VB at their March 23rd meeting.

Proposed signage is approvable per the village code. The AC may review and make recommendations on subdivision entrance signage. The AC should review this signage for conformance with the standards noted above and in particular impacts to the vision triangle (if any). The AC may also consider the look of the sign in relation to the character of the area and may make appropriate suggestions as part of the recommendation.

No action is required on proposed elevations or lighting.

Any comments the AC may have regarding the design of the development may be incorporated in the recommendation of the AC. At a minimum acceptance of the preliminary plan and plat as submitted is suggested.

The AC should also be aware this is a request for preliminary approval. Final plans, in conformance with preliminary recommendations/ approvals, including those of the AC, will need to be brought back to the AC for final approval.