

MEMORANDUM

TO: Village President and Village Board

FROM: James M. Hogue, Village Planner

DATE: October 8, 2020

RE: Board & Commissions Report for 10/13/20

This memo intends 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 10.6.20 - 1 Action Item

PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of a request for variation of the required side yard setback of forty feet (40') feet down to fourteen (14') for the north side yard within the R-2 Zoning District, for the construction of an attached accessory structure (garage) and expansion of the principal structure on the property located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road and submitted by Mr. Robert Douglass on behalf of property owners Brian & Michelle Praner.

Planner Hogue reviewed his staff report noting the property is located on the west side of North Willow Springs Road four (4) lots north of the intersection of Meadow Lane and Willow Springs Road. The property is zoned under the R-2 District Classification and consists of 1 +/- acre (43,563 sq. ft.). The property contains a single family residence constructed in 1954 and garage built in 1987. The property was subdivided as Lot 14 of the Fred & Russell Towner Subdivision which was recorded on May 21, 1952. The property was developed and the residence built as part of unincorporated Lake County, and annexed into the Village, in the 1986. The subdivision of the property and construction of the residence both pre-date the incorporation of the village.

The attached front porch (east side) does not meet the required front yard setback of 75°. The existing detached garage (north side) does not meet the required side yard setback of 40°. The property is non-conforming with regard to lot size and the front and side yard setbacks (north side only). The existing detached garage is proposed to be demolished. A new addition consisting of an expansion of the existing house and construction of an attached garage is contemplated. The garage addition is proposed to be 14° from the north lot line. The applicant is asking for slight further encroachment than presently exists (14.37 feet to 14.00 feet). The proposed structure will be larger than present structure along this lot line in both length and height. The existing garage has a width of 22.41 along this side of property. The proposed addition will have a dimension of 45 feet along this lot line and be 20° in height. The house addition will be within the 40° setback but as it is attached to the proposed garage is included in the variation request. There are no proposed changes to the existing non-conforming front porch and, as such, it may remain in its present configuration.

As the current Village Code does not identify a maximum square footage for the "subordinate" aspect of accessory structures and uses, a policy of "50% or less" of the principal structure/use has been established. This was done after litigation on the "Nevel Property" in which a building permit was erroneously issued for a 5000 sq. ft. detached accessory structure for property on Route 83.

As the standards are identical for both accessory structures and accessory uses, **the established policy** of "50 % or less" (The "50% Rule") should apply to both accessory structures and uses.

Attorney Filippini noted a concern with the use of this policy and the language in the village code. He indicated the total floor area of accessory structures and uses must be less than the total floor area of the principal use. That is the only way to abide by the actual language of the Zoning Code. If the Village desires to keep accessory structures and uses at 50% of the total floor area of the principal structure, then it is recommend that the Zoning Code be amended to say so. To implement a "policy" that is inconsistent with the language of the Zoning Code is laying the groundwork for a lawsuit that will be difficult to win.

In this instance the proposed total square footage of the structure is 2,731 sq. ft. with 1,396 sq. ft. (51%) being devoted to the principal use (residential) and 1,335 sq. ft. (49%) being devoted to an attached accessory use (garage).

In short, the accessory structure/use is less significant (slightly) than the principal structure/use on the property and the accessory use serves (i.e. is "subordinate to") the principal residential use of the property and in conformance with the zoning code (as noted above).

Mr. Robert Douglass, project architect, reiterated the proposal and reviewed the elevations and proposed floor plans for the addition. He noted that with exception of the existing front yard non-conformity, which is not being altered, all other R-2 zoning requirements (on a 1 acre parcel) are met or exceeded with the exception of the north property line for which the variation is being sought.

The property owners Brian & Michelle Praner were present and indicated they has personally spoken to their neighbors on the matter. They received no objections to the proposal and received several letters of support.

During PCZBA discussion of the matter it was noted that a 10' x 10' shed was noted on plat of survey. If included in the "use: calculations noted above the principal vs. accessory use ratio would be exceeded.

The applicant noted the structures is used for storage and agreed to remove that structure if the variation was granted.

Drainage was discussed as well as more "decorative' garage door for the addition (one which blended better with house and character of the neighborhood).

The PCZBA as a whole noted the addition was an improvement property and neighborhood as a whole and served to better meet the needs of the applicant at this location.

Chairman Wilson noted a concern with the uses aspect of the proposal and the distinction between principal and accessory use. She noted a 50/50 split (in addition to the height of the addition) was not a clear distinction between a principal and accessory use in this instance.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bauer, Seconded by Commissioner Terrett to recommend approval variation of the north side yard set-back requirement from the required 40' down to 14 feet within the R-2

District for the construction of an attached accessory structure (garage) and addition to the existing single family dwelling subject to the following conditions;

- 1. An alternative garage door be placed on the addition which better blends with the house;
- 2. The 10 x 10 storage shed be removed to maintain zoning compliance.
- 3. A drainage requirements, including the standards of the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO) be complied with;

On a Roll Call Vote; 6 ayes. 1 nay. Motion Carries

CSCC 10.7.20 – Discussion Items

a.) Welcome New Member – Maggie McCasey

The CSCC welcomed Ms. McCasey to the Commission. Ms. McCasey thanked the Commission and indicated she was excited to participate.

b.) Discussion of natural plantings on landscape islands (Rt. 22; Rt. 83 & O.M.R entering the CBD).

Planner Hogue noted at their August 25 Village Board meeting the Board here the report of the CSCC meeting of August 19th which included a discussion of this issue.

The direction of the Board was to explore the possibilities on a preliminary basis with emphasis on;

- 1) Providing preliminary suggestions for natural plantings in landscape islands.
- 2). Fiscal Impacts\Financial Costs associated with these improvements.
- 3). The suggested plants list for natural plantings in medians.

He stated this project was not a high priority of the Board at this time and suggested perhaps a policy paper or brief could be created which contained basic data for natural planting of medians.

He reviewed the "Successful Medians" document included in the meeting noting that while typically more urban than the village there were concepts in the document which would be useful in this effort.

He had also included the landscape maintenance contract with Milieu Landscaping. Maintenance of the existing landscape islands and plantings came to approximately \$4,000 per year.

Discussion then followed about the size of the medians, which medians would be a priority, acceptable native plant species for medians (3 species discussed), possible native trees & shrubs for consideration, availability of drawings (cross-sections) of the median construction.

Once this data has been assembled and compiles the CSCC will schedule a meeting "in the field" to perform a visual inspection of the medians and the surrounding environment.

Trustee O'Conner was present and mentioned the proposed landscape plan (included with the meeting packet materials) for the Route 22 widening. She asked the CSCC to review the plantings and make and suggestions, particularly as it related to any native plantings. This information would be forwarded to IDOT for consideration in the Route 22 landscape plans. If successful this plant species mix could serve as model for future landscape planting along roadways. This could provide a more uniform look to roadway planting village wide.

The CSCC will review and comment on the Route 22 landscape plans.

c.) Updated Plant Species List

Commissioner Burger noted that 1700 plant species in the updated list. She is working to determine which species are readily available to make the smaller and more practical for those using it. Due to the COVID epidemic local native plant sales has been cancelled. Her goal is to pare down list and identify species readily available to the public. This list made available to the public as mote "user" friendly than the master list.

If however, a proposal for other species not on the approved list, but on the "master list" were identified in an application they may be considered as well. She continues to work to find commercial vendors which have the "desired species" readily available.

d.) 2021 Meeting Calendar

Planner Hogue presented the proposed 2021 meeting calendar. This calendar maintains the "status quo" for CSCC meeting dates. He noted a motion to approve this calendar is required.

The CSCC reviewed the calendar noting that July 7th date as presented was potentially problematic with the 4th of July holiday. The CSCC determined that it would best to not schedule a meeting on this date and hold a meeting on the 2nd meeting date of the month to consider any business which may arise.

A motion was made by Commissioner Burger, seconded by Commissioner Seitz to accept the 2021 meeting calendar with following amendment; the July regular meeting date (7.7.20 be cancelled) and any business for this month be addressed at the "As Needed" 2nd meeting date of the month (July 21, 2021). On a voice vote; all aye.

Next Regular Meetings; CSCC; 11.4.20 AC; 10.19.20; PCZBA; 11.3.20

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at 7039 RFD ______, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

9/7/2020 Date / 7/2020

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at 7039 RFD ______, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

9-17-20

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at 7020 RFD Mesdow Lave, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

Sept 17, 2020

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Sincerely,

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

connected directly to the house.

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Sincerely,

Pachel Bochm 9/19/2020

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Sincerely,

James W. Meyoner 9/19/20

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at 7043 N Willow print, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

Sincerely,

May Tyli

9-21-20

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

7021 RED, L6.

I, the undersign, who lives at ______, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

10/20/2020 Date

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

Sincerely,

9/20/20 Date

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

Sincerely,

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

Sincerely,

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at 7034 Willow Spring Rd, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

1908 Kostyuk

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner
Village of Long Grove
3110 Old McHenry Road
Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner

N Diamon I DR Rol # 3

Mundelein

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at _______, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

Caylos Roman

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue, 25035 N Dramond LK Rd

I, the undersign, who lives at reviewed the drawing at 1500000

____, in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely,

Moala Vens 09/17/2020

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

Sincerely,

Rathy mitchell

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Sincerely,

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

Sincerely,

Mr. James Hogue, Village Planner Village of Long Grove 3110 Old McHenry Road Long Grove, Illinois 60060

Re: Side yard variance request at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road

Dear Mr. Hogue,

I, the undersign, who lives at 7041 N Whow Spring Rd , in Long Grove have reviewed the drawings of the proposed variance request for the Praner residence located at 7031 N. Willow Spring Road. We throughly understand the request for the variance and support the Praner's so they can rebuild the existing garage and expand the garage so that it will be connected directly to the house.

Sincerely

9-22-2020