

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMORANDUM

**VILLAGE OF LIBERTYVILLE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
200 EAST COOK AVENUE
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048-2090**

FROM: PLANNING DIVISION

DATE: April 23, 2025

SUBJECT: Development Review Committee (DRC) Reports for Cases Scheduled for Consideration on **Monday, April 28, 2025**

The DRC Meeting was held on **Monday, March 17, 2025**. DRC members present included:

Heather Rowe	Director of Community Development
Tony Repp	Deputy Director of Community Development
David Smith	Senior Planner
Wil Richardson	Planner
Pat Geske	Interim Building Commissioner/Plan Reviewer
Jeff Cooper	Deputy Director of Public Works/Village Engineer
Harrison Meyer	Senior Project Engineer
Mike Weaver	Director of Fire Prevention

Attached herewith are the DRC Reports for the following cases:

Zoning Board of Appeals

Plan Commission

PC 25-05, PC 25-06, PC 25-07, PC 25-08,
PC 25-09, PC 25-10, and PC 25-11

- CASE NOS.:** **PC 25-05 Annexation**
 PC 25-06 Zoning Map Amendment
 PC 25-07 Amend Comprehensive Plan
 PC 25-08 Special Use Permit Planned Development
 PC 25-09 Preliminary Plat of Subdivision
 PC 25-10 Special Use Permit Senior Housing
 PC 25-11 Planned Development Concept Plan

DATE FILED: January 10, 2025

REQUESTED ACTION:

- PC 25-05 Request is to Annex unincorporated Lake County land area into the Village of Libertyville corporate limits in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road. ***The Plan Commission will not make a motion or recommendation regarding the annexation because it is outside the scope of the Plan Commission’s authority. The Village Board of Trustees has authority to review the annexation request and will do so at a public meeting, most likely at the same meeting at which the Village Board takes action on the Planned Development Final Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision.***
- PC 25-06 Request is to Amend the Village of Libertyville Zoning Map from R-1 Single Family Residential District, IB Institutional Buildings District, C-3 General Commercial District to R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
- PC 25-07 Request is to Amend the Village of Libertyville Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from Institutional land use to Single Family Attached Residential land use in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
- PC 25-08 Request is for a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
- PC 25-09 Request is for a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
- PC 25-10 Request is for a Special Use Permit for Senior Citizen Housing as part of a development of 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.

PC 25-11 Request is for a Planned Development Concept Plan in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.

APPLICANT INFORMATION:

Applicant: Pulte Home Company, LLC
Owners: SB Reserve Properties Inc.
SB Holdings Ltd.
Agent: Russ Whitaker, Rosanova & Whitaker, Ltd.
Address: 610 Peterson Road

SITE INFORMATION:

Location: The property is commonly known as 610 Peterson Road
Current Zoning and Land Use: IB Institutional Buildings District
R-1 Single Family Residential District
C-3 General Commercial District
Unincorporated Lake County
Size: The subject site is located on a lot approximately 42.3 acres in land area.
Surrounding Zoning:
North: Unincorporated Lake County
South: R-4 Single Family Residential District
East: R-1 Single Family Residential District
C-3 General Commercial District
West: Unincorporated Lake County
IB Institutional Buildings District
Land Use Plan: Institutional (I)
Destination Commercial Corridor (DCC)
Single Family Attached Residential (SFAR)
Road Classification: Peterson Road is owned and maintained by Illinois Department of Transportation and classified as an Arterial Street.
Physical Characteristics: The site is currently developed with the existing one-story Manor Care long term nursing care facility and child care facility, with ancillary parking.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Background:

The petitioner, Pulte Home Company, is requesting approval for the following zoning items:

- 1. To Annex unincorporated Lake County land area into the Village of Libertyville corporate limits in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted

duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road. *The Plan Commission will not make a motion on this item. The Village Board will hold a public meeting regarding this matter at time the Village Board takes action on the Planned Development Final Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision.*

2. To Amend the Village of Libertyville Zoning Map from R-1 Single Family Residential District, IB Institutional Buildings District, C-3 General Commercial District to R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
3. To Amend the Village of Libertyville Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from Institutional land use to Single Family Attached Residential land use in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
4. A Special Use Permit for a Planned Development in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
5. A Preliminary Plat of Subdivision in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
6. A Special Use Permit for Senior Citizen Housing as part of a development that includes 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.
7. A Planned Development Concept Plan in order to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.

The subject property is located on the north side of Peterson Road and has approximately 42 acres in land area consisting of 28.1 acres within the Village of Libertyville and 13.9 acres in unincorporated Lake County. The incorporated portion of the property is presently improved with the Manor Care Long Term Care Nursing facility. The applicant is proposing to demo Manor Care and develop a mixed residential development comprised of 64 single family detached dwellings and 70 age restricted duplex dwellings. Victoria Park townhomes abut along the west side of the subject property. Forest Creek residential subdivision and the Car Spa Car Wash & Shell Gas Station abuts the subject site along the east side. Unincorporated Lake County lies to the north of the Manor Care facility, a portion of which is subject to the annexation. The applicant is proposing two (2) points of access into the proposed subdivision from Peterson Road.

Current Zoning:

For that portion of the subject property within the Village of Libertyville corporate limits, approximately 18.7 acres is zoned IB Institutional Buildings District (IB), approximately 7.5 acres

is zoned R-1 Single Family Residential District, and approximately 2 acres is zoned C-3 General Commercial District. The Manor Care facility is located in the IB district portion of the site. The R-1 and C-3 portions are vacant, undeveloped and contain natural forest vegetation. The remaining unincorporated portion of the subject site is approximately 13.7 acres and is zoned by Lake County Government as R-1 Residential and lies just north of the Manor Care facility. The portion of the site is proposed to be annexed into the Village. Pursuant to Section 26-3-5 of the Zoning Code, annexed land is automatically zoned in the R-1 district unless an application for map amendment into another district is approved.

Proposed Subdivision and Zoning Map Amendment:

The applicant is proposing to annex the unincorporated portion of the site into the Village corporate limits, rezone the entire 42 acres to R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District and subdivide the entire property to develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units.

Proposed Density:

The Zoning Code requires a minimum of 7,200 square feet of land area for each Single Family Detached Dwelling unit and a minimum of 3,600 square feet of land area for each Single Family Attached (duplex’s) Dwelling in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District. The applicant’s proposal of 64 single family detached dwellings and 70 single family (duplex) attached dwellings will require 712,800 square feet of land area or 16.3 acres excluding roadways, outlots for stormwater management, preservation zones, and parks. The subject land area is approximately 42 acres which amounts to 3.19 dwelling units per acre.

Staff notes that the neighboring Victoria Park senior townhome subdivision to the west has 48 single family attached (townhome) dwellings on 8.8 acres of land, 52 townhomes were planned. There is one remaining vacant lot to be developed with a four dwelling unit structure. Victoria Park averages 5.9 dwelling units per acre when counting all 52 dwelling units.

The neighboring Forest Creek residential subdivision to the east has 36 single family attached (townhome) dwelling units on 10.7 acres of land which comprises 3.3 dwellings per acre.

Summary of proposed and surrounding density

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| 1. | Pulte Greenway Chase | = | 3.1 d.u. per acre |
| 2. | Victoria Park | = | 5.9 d.u. per acre |
| 3. | Forest Creek | = | 3.3 d.u. per acre |

Park Land Dedication:

Parks Impact Fees apply to both single-family and duplex units. The applicant is proposing to dedicate 1.14 acres in a parcel to be transferred to Village when fully improved. The improvements to this dedicated parcel must be of sufficient value to, at minimum, to satisfy the full fee-in-leu amount of balance of the land dedication requirement (approximately \$888,750). Proposed improvements include landscaping, pathways and playground equipment. The Village shall

approve the design and materials used for the improvements. A Village approved vendor and equipment design for playground. The applicant shall reach understanding with Village staff prior to applying for Final Plat of Subdivision and Planned Development Final Plan approval and shall incorporate necessary elements into the final development application.

Single-Family Detached Dwelling Exterior Design:

Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a) provides design regulations for single family detached dwellings in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District. These regulations apply to single family detached dwellings only and not to single family attached dwellings and not to two-family dwellings. The Applicant has submitted a design package that includes various elevations, color selections and optional exterior features to reduce monotony, however with these options, two deviations from the design requirements are requested as described below.

Currently the Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a)(1) provides the following design criteria in order to address residential subdivision monotony of housing dwelling units.

- (a) Single-family detached dwelling exterior design. The following single-family design dwelling limitations shall apply in the R-7 Single-family Attached District:
 - (1) *Exterior design.* No single-family detached dwelling shall have an exterior design substantially similar to any single-family detached dwelling located within three hundred (300) feet, measured from lot line to lot line, and fronting on the same street as the proposed single-family detached dwelling. For purposes of this section, a single-family dwelling shall be substantially similar to another single-family dwelling if the dwelling is identical or nearly identical to another dwelling in any four (4) of the following characteristics:
 - a. Roof type (gable, hip, mansard, gambrel, flat, combination, etc.).
 - b. Shape of the front elevation silhouette.
 - c. Relative locations and sizes of windows in the front elevation.
 - d. Relative location and dimensions of garage door(s), if included on the front elevation.
 - e. Type(s) of siding (e.g., brick veneer, lapped horizontal siding, half-timber, board and batten, shakes, etc.) on the front elevation.
 - f. Exterior color.

Pulte is requesting approval of a deviation from the Zoning Code by replacing Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a)(1) for Single Family Detached Dwelling Exterior Design with the following:

- 1. ***Single Family Detached Communities***
 - a. ***The following criteria apply to homes on straight or curved streets, cul-de-sacs, and corner lots.***
 - i. ***No house shall have the same configuration that is within one (1) house most directly on either side or on any of the three houses most directly across the street from the subject house.***

Additionally, the house directly behind a corner subject house is included in these criteria.

- ii. *No house shall have the same color package that is within one (1) house on either side or on any house across the street from the subject house. Additionally, the house directly behind a corner subject house is included in these criteria.*

Currently the Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a)(4) provides the following design criteria in order to address private garage doors for both Single Family Detached Dwelling Units and Single Family Attached Dwelling Units.

- (4) *Private garage doors.* For single-family detached dwellings constructed after the effective date of the ordinance from which this chapter is derived, no garage door or doors shall constitute more than thirty (30) percent of the area of the front face of the dwelling to which such garage is attached. (See "private garage door limitation" in appendix A.) For single-family attached dwellings constructed after the effective date of the ordinance from which this chapter is derived, no attached garage door or doors shall be permitted to be oriented on the zoning lot so that the garage door or doors face the front or corner property lines abutting the public right-of-way.

Pulte is requesting approval of a deviation from Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a)(4) For single-family detached dwellings by allowing the garage doors to exceed thirty (30) percent of the area of the front face of the dwelling to which such garage is attached.

Pulte is requesting an additional deviation from the Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a)(4) for single-family attached dwellings (duplexes) by allowing attached garage doors to be oriented on the zoning lot so that the garage doors face the front or corner property lines abutting the public right-of-way.

Special Use Permit for Senior Citizen Housing for the Age Restricted Duplexes:

In addition to the 64 single family lots the Applicant is proposing to construct 70 age restricted duplexes. Senior citizen housing is permitted in the R-7 district only pursuant to a special use permit. In accordance with the Village of Libertyville definition of Senior Citizen Housing the development must have the following components shall be required for this land use except for numbers 4 and 5, which are not required:

- 1.
 - a. Provided under any state or federal program that the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development determines is specifically designed and operated to assist elderly persons (as defined in the state or federal program); or
 - b. Intended for, and solely occupied by, persons 62 years of age or older; or
 - c. Intended and operated for occupancy by persons 55 years of age or older, and
 - 1. At least 80 percent of the occupied units are occupied by at least one person who is 55 years of age or older;
 - 2. The housing facility or community publishes and adheres to policies and procedures that demonstrate the intent required hereunder; and

3. The housing facility or community complies with rules issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for verification of occupancy, which shall:
 - (i) Provide for verification by reliable surveys and affidavits; and
 - (ii) Include examples of the types of policies and procedures relevant to a determination of compliance with requirement of clause 2., and
2. Prohibits residents younger than 21 years of age; and
3. Interpretations and implementation of this definition shall be according to the provisions of and regulations adopted pursuant to 42 USC 3607; and
4. May provide communal eating, recreational and other facilities for the exclusive use of the aforesaid occupants and their occasional guests; and
5. May provide personal care, sheltered care, intermediate care, or skilled care, including intermediate or skilled nursing care services, for the exclusive use of the aforesaid occupants.

Libertyville 2030 Comprehensive Plan:

The Village’s Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Village Board in March of 2021 identifies 18.6 acres of the subject property as Institutional (I) in the Comp Plan Future Land Use Map; and identifies 2 acres of the subject property as Destination Commercial Corridor (DCC); and identifies 7.5 acres of the subject property as Single Family Attached Residential (SFAR). The remaining 13.6 acres of the subject property are in unincorporated Lake County. The application includes amending the Comp Plan Future Land Use Map to Single Family Attached Residential (SFAR) for all 42 acres. The Comp Plan *Future Land Use Map – 1.5 Mile Unincorporated Strategy* exhibit identifies the unincorporated portion of the subject site as future Institutional.

Staff notes that there is an element of contiguity with the current land use designations to the proposed change of land use designations. The proposed residential duplex aspect of the development is designated to provide homes for age restricted seniors. Staff notes that the Zoning Code currently lists Senior Citizen Housing and Long Term Care Facilities as special permitted uses in both the IB district and the proposed pR-7 district facilitating a more congruent transition from the current Manor Care facility land use to the proposed age restricted single family attached (duplexes) dwellings land use.

In discussion of housing needs for the community, the Plan (p.29) states “There may be a greater need for housing product that accommodates the changing population, including a greater diversity of housing at various price points to accommodate aging seniors, young professionals/families and working households.” The Plan also suggests livable neighborhood strategies (p. 115) such as:

- “Identify opportunity sites for more diverse housing types and development transitioning corridor locations within and adjacent to employment centers, and near transit facilities and arterial roadways.”
- “Continue to support creativity and flexibility in achieving quality design in neighborhoods and locations where small lot housing development is encouraged to accommodate a variety of housing needs.”
- “Encourage construction of dwelling units that contain first floor master bedrooms...”

Traffic:

The applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Study completed by KLOA dated December 20, 2024, a Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis dated March 5, 2025, and an updated Traffic Impact Study dated March 27, 2025. There will be two access points into the subdivision from Peterson Road opposite Elderberry Drive and Sunnyview Road. KLOA asserts that the traffic that will be generated by the proposed development will be accommodated by the area roadway system. The Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis reviewed the findings of a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Peterson Road and Elderberry Drive as this intersection will serve as the main entrance into the proposed residential subdivision. The purpose of the analysis is to determine if the traffic that will be generated by the proposed residential subdivision will warrant the need for a traffic signal at the intersection of Peterson Road with Elderberry Drive. KLOA has concluded that neither the existing nor projected future traffic volumes will warrant the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Peterson Road with Elderberry Drive.

CIVILTECH ENGINEERING, INC.:

Please note that the Village traffic engineering consultant Civiltech Engineering has reviewed and made comments on the applicants' traffic impact studies and Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis completed by KLOA and offers comments on the attached Technical Memorandums dated March 19, 2025, and April 17, 2025.

Stormwater:

KIMLEY HORN:

Please note that the Village storm water management engineering consultant Kimley Horn has reviewed and made comments on the applicants site engineering for conformance with the Village of Libertyville Codes and the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO) and offers comments on the attached Kimley Horn Memorandum dated April 14, 2025.

LAKE COUNTY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMISSION:

The Village intends to defer Watershed Development Permit reviews and approvals to the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (LCSMC) for this project. LCSMC has provided preliminary review comments on the attached letter dated April 23, 2025.

Deviations from the Zoning Code:

The Planned Development technique is intended to allow the relaxation of otherwise applicable Zoning Code requirements. This special regulatory technique, otherwise known as 'Deviations' from the Zoning Code, is in recognition of the fact that traditional use, bulk, space, setback, and yard regulations that may be useful in protecting the character of substantially developed and stable areas may impose inappropriately rigid regulations upon the development or redevelopment of parcels or areas that lend themselves to an individual, planned approach.

The Planned Development process and its associated deviation capabilities are an appropriate mechanism to address atypical site characteristics evidenced on this project (i.e. tree preservation,

topography) that uniquely impact this site and unique site layouts intended to achieve special objectives (i.e. use of outlots for buffering between adjoining properties, the mix of uses under a single-zoning, park inclusion), without amending requirements on other R-7 zoned properties which were built under separate conditions.

The adjoining residential development to the west, Victoria Park, utilized Planned Development to augment the underlying zoning. Victoria Park is zoned IB, which permits senior housing, and is inclusive of attached single-family unit structures. While practice was not to individually list out deviations within the approval document at that time of authorization, the development contains numerous code deviations to achieve the current layout with the underlying zoning. The Forest Creek Subdivision which adjoins to the east could also not have been constructed under its strict R-1 zoning, however was approved under a court settlement agreement.

The proposed Planned Development and Plat of Subdivision by Pulte includes the following Deviations from the Zoning Code:

Deviations from the Zoning Code

1. The replacement of Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.4(a)(1) that provides the design criteria for Single Family Detached Dwellings in order to address monotony issues in single family residential subdivisions with a Pulte Monotony Code Elevation and Color Package Restrictions for the proposed single family dwelling models.
2. Section 26-4-8.4(a)(4) to permit garage door(s) on a single family detached dwellings to constitute more than 30% of the area of the front face of the dwelling to which such garage is attached.
3. Section 26-4-8.4(a)(4) to permit garage door(s) on a single family attached dwellings (duplexes) to be oriented on the zoning lot so that the garage door(s) face the front or corner property lines abutting the public right of way.
4. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(c). Reduce the minimum required lot width from 60 feet to 41 feet for the interior single family lots and from 60 feet to 51 feet for the corner single family lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
5. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(b). Reduce the minimum lot area from 7,200 square feet to 4,510 square feet for the interior single family lots and from 7,200 square feet to 5,610 square feet for corner single family lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
6. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(f). Increase the maximum permitted Lot Coverage from 45% to 50% for single family lots on interior lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
5. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(f). Increase the maximum permitted Lot Coverage from 40% to 45% for single family lots on corner lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.

6. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(f). Increase the maximum permitted Lot Coverage from 50% to 55% for the duplex lots on interior lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
7. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(f). Increase the maximum permitted Lot Coverage from 45% to 50% for the duplex lots on corner lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
8. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(e). Increase the maximum permitted Building Coverage for both the single family lots and the duplex lots on corner lots in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District. *The applicant did not indicate the percentage increase in their application materials.*
9. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 30 feet to 20 feet for all lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
10. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Reduce the minimum required rear yard setback from 25 feet to 20 feet for the single family lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
11. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Increase the minimum required rear yard setback from 25 feet to 30 feet for the duplex lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
12. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Reduce the minimum required corner side yard setback from 30 feet to 15 feet for all lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
13. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 30 feet to 20 feet for all lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
14. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Increase the minimum required interior side yard setback from 5 feet to 6 feet for the duplex lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
15. Zoning Code Section 26-4-8.5(d). Remove the interior aggregate side yard setback requirement of 15 feet for all lots in the Greenway Chase subdivision located in the R-7 Single Family Attached Residential District.
16. Zoning Code Section 26-11-9(b)(4) states that the maximum height permitted for a free standing Residential Development Sign shall not exceed six (6) feet above grade. The proposed Greenway Chase residential development signs shown on Sheet L1.2 are 7'4" in height.

APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION:

The applicant appeared before the Appearance Review Commission at their February 17, 2025 and March 17, 2025 meetings. The ARC supported the applicant’s proposal. The meeting minutes are attached to this report.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE REVIEW AND REPORT FORMAT:

Staff has completed a review of the petitioner’s application and offers review comments formatted in two (2) components as follows:

1. A separate **Supplemental Review Memorandum** from the Development Review Committee lists review comments that Staff recommends the petitioner address satisfactorily at a later stage, prior to application for either final development considerations or any site development permits or building permits for construction (memo denotes stage required) and are not deemed to be required as conditions for the ordinances for the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision. See attached memorandum.
2. The remaining Development Review Committee review comments that are provided in this Development Review Committee staff report **shall be addressed prior to resubmittal and prior to the Plan Commission making a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees.**

Staff has completed a review of the petitioner’s application and offers the following comments for your consideration. The following items should be addressed prior to a staff recommendation for approval:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION COMMENTS:

1. The proposed development in Libertyville directly addresses housing shortages identified in the Lake County Housing Analysis (2023) conducted by Kretchmer Associates in partnership with Lake County Partners, a regional economic development organization—particularly the need for more senior-friendly housing in the South-Central region of Lake County, which includes Libertyville. By adding new age-restricted and single-family housing units, the project enables seniors to remain in the community while introducing a diverse mix of residents.
2. With over (300) new residents anticipated, the development is expected to generate positive economic synergy, given its proximity to local retailers, restaurants, and service providers. Future homeowners in Greenway Chase are likely to shop and dine nearby, contributing to increased sales tax revenue and overall economic activity along the Peterson Road commercial corridor and downtown Libertyville. As evidenced by the fiscal analysis provided, the sales tax generation is expected to be over \$91,000 annually. (Gruen Gruen and Associates, p. 8).
3. Additionally, the removal of a functionally obsolete asset not only enhances the immediate neighborhood, but also stimulates broader economic growth by demonstrating the potential

for future reinvestment opportunities throughout Libertyville. Considering the recent industrial and manufacturing growth in Libertyville, providing housing options supports attracting and retaining employers which depend on the skilled, stable, and diverse labor pool offered in Lake County.

ENGINEERING DIVISION COMMENTS:

The Engineering Division offers the following comments to be addressed prior to approval of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

1. **Site Plan Coordination** – The applicant has submitted a revised Preliminary Plat and Civil Engineering Plans with some subtle changes to lot layout and site plan. These changes include shifting lots to accommodate drainage out-lots and keep driveways away from intersections, along with the elimination of some crosswalks. Other site plan exhibits have not yet been updated with these modifications. All other site plans and exhibits included in the applicant’s submittal package should be coordinated with the civil plans to show the same lot layout and site geometry.
2. **Storm Sewer** – The proposed layout of storm sewers should be revised to address the following comments for further review:
 - a. Public Storm Sewer shall be located within the public right of way whenever possible. Where necessary, public storm sewer should connect as directly as possible to a detention basin via an appropriately sized side yard easement (15’ minimum easement width over Village-owned utilities).
 - b. Roadway drainage and sump pump discharges should be connected to public storm sewer, typically within the right of way.
 - c. It’s anticipated that any storm sewer proposed for rear yard drainage would be privately owned and maintained by the association of property owners.
 - d. The designer has indicated a preference to keep storm sewers in the proposed (primarily) rear yard locations; however, this would not be acceptable to the Village as proposed. Further comments should be anticipated upon review of future submittals.
3. **Traffic & Roadway Geometry**
 - a. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was submitted by the applicant and reviewed by the Village’s traffic consultant. Please be sure to address the comments within the Technical Memorandum dated April 17, 2025, prepared by Civiltech Engineering, Inc.
 - b. A “Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis” was submitted and reviewed by the Village’s traffic consultant. Please be sure to address the comments within the Technical Memorandum dated March 19, 2025, prepared by Civiltech Engineering, Inc.

- c. IDOT approval would be required for the final plat of subdivision, and an IDOT permit would be needed based on work required in the IL 137 (Peterson Rd) right-of-way. The designer has indicated that coordination with IDOT is ongoing. Please CC the Village Engineering Division on all correspondence with IDOT.
 - d. Please note that any significant change to the proposed access points (including location and/or movement restrictions) after Village Board Approval (including preliminary site plan or PUD approval) would likely be considered a ‘major change’ to the original site plan approval, thus requiring the applicants to go back through the Village approval process for said change.
4. **Sanitary Sewer Main** – Staff notes the following regarding proposed public sanitary sewer, and additional comments should be anticipated upon review of future plan submittals:
- a. Based on review comments from the Village’s sanitary sewer consultant and subsequent discussion between staff and the design engineer, it’s understood that a new sanitary lift station will need to be constructed within the subdivision. Flows from upstream areas and a portion of the development would be directed to a sanitary sewer that crosses Peterson Road and connects to the existing public sewer within Elderberry Drive.

The proposed location and route of the sanitary sewer appear to be generally acceptable. However, per previous conversations with the design engineer, the provision of a gravity pipe underneath Peterson Road is preferred to a force main. It is anticipated that a gravity pipe will be proposed for the roadway crossing unless analysis is provided for our review and approval, demonstrating that a gravity pipe is not feasible. The details of the lift station and force main will be reviewed during final engineering.
 - b. Typically, sanitary mains should be located underneath the roadway pavement to allow for separation from other utilities (gas, electric, etc.) that need to be located within the parkway. Also, extra sanitary manholes (and shorter lengths of sewer between them) should be avoided wherever possible. Staff is open to discussions about the ideal location(s) for Sanitary main.

The designer has indicated that dry utilities will be located in the rear and that there would be no conflict with the proposed sanitary sewer alignment. However, it’s anticipated that gas mains will need to be located in public parkways, and that locating sewer mains in the roadway would help reduce excess bends and manholes. Further comments should be anticipated upon review of future submittals.
5. **Driveway Locations** – To confirm the layout of proposed lots works with the proposed roadway configuration, the size and location of all driveways should be shown. It is acknowledged that lot layouts were modified since the previous submittal, and certain driveway locations were shown with the intent to address conflicts at street intersections. However, additional locations, e.g. Lot 75, may also need to be addressed. Regarding Lot

80, it is anticipated that the eastern leg of the intersection will be stop-controlled for westbound traffic. It is unclear if a required stop bar/stop sign would be in conflict with the driveway location.

6. **Existing Utilities and Easements** – The preliminary engineering plans indicate that various existing utilities and easements within the property would be abandoned. Copies of existing easement documents have been provided, which are still under review by staff for verification of the rights granted. Any approval of the Preliminary Plat would be conditional on proper written authorization for the abandonment(s), from each utility owner or beneficiary of an easement. Should any existing easements or utilities need to remain within the property, the plans will need to demonstrate how these are accommodated by the proposed subdivision layout.
7. **Easement for potential future Watermain Extension** – The subdivision plat appears to identify a Watermain Easement which could accommodate a potential future extension of the Village water system to the north property line of the development. The minimum width of the Village watermain easement shall be 15 feet. This easement shall be dimensioned and defined on the plat of subdivision.
8. **Sewer & Water Recapture Fees** – The proposed development limits include “Parcel 25” as identified within Village Ordinance 91-O-56 and therefore appears to be subject to water and sewer recapture fees. A preliminary estimate of the fee due per the ordinance is \$810,675.81 (which had been calculated based on a payment date of January 1, 2025). This amount was calculated for only the property within Parcel 25, totaling approximately 25.48 acres.
9. **Preliminary Plat / Plat of Annexation** – The preliminary plat should be revised as needed to address all comments, for further review. It should be noted that staff has not reviewed provisions or certificates on the Preliminary Plat or Plat of Annexation. In general, these items would not be considered finalized on the subdivision plat until they are reviewed and approved in conjunction with the Final Engineering Plans. Any comments on the Plat of Annexation would be provided prior to its execution. Further comments on these items should be anticipated during review of subsequent submittals.
10. **Development Agreement** –The applicant will enter into a development agreement with the Village, which development agreement must be finalized prior to approval of the Final Plat of Subdivision.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION -- PRIOR TO PUBLIC HEARING:

That the public hearing be opened for presentation, public testimony and Plan Commission questions, and **CONTINUED** to the June 23, 2025 Plan Commission meeting agenda in order to allow the petitioner an opportunity to address all comments.

Minutes of the March 17, 2025, Appearance Review Commission Meeting

**ARC 25-04 Pulte Home Company, LLC, Applicant
SB Holdings, LTD, Owner
610 Peterson Road**

Request is for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

Mr. Russell Whitaker presented the proposal for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 610 Peterson Road. Mr. Whitaker opened his presentation with a summary of the project's goals, focusing on addressing housing needs as outlined in the previous meeting. He provided a brief overview of the project's scope, highlighting the distinction between the senior housing and single-family homes.

Mr. Whitaker showed the commission the unique configurations that are possible for the elevations. Mr. Whitaker explained the functionality of the second-floor loft option, noting that tenants in a duplex could choose to have separate loft spaces. He then presented updates made in response to requests for greater aesthetic diversity within the project. Initially, Pulte had proposed three distinct color packages for the duplex homes, each assigned to a specific elevation. However, a fourth color package has since been introduced, and color packages will no longer be fixed to particular elevations. Instead, they will be shared across elevations to allow for greater variation.

While Pulte typically allows buyers to select their own colors and materials for single-family homes, they have manually assigned elevations and color packages for duplex homes to ensure visual diversity and adequate spacing between similar designs. To provide further context, Mr. Whitaker presented photographs and real-life examples of comparable Pulte projects. Additionally, he displayed a visual representation of how the clipped gables would appear on the elevations once constructed.

Mr. Whitaker presented façade changes and improvements for the single-family homes including accents and garage windows explaining how the details are distributed among elevation types. He also showed a real-life example of how the garage and front door configuration will be occasionally flipped. He presented a landscape exhibit for the individual single-family lots to show how the street trees and lot trees will come together as a consistent landscape filter. The trees proposed for each lot will occasionally switch between tree types including ornamental and shade trees.

Mr. Whitaker presented the updated landscape plan for the entire site to showcase the updated buffers between Victoria Park and the subject development and the updated buffers between Forest Creek and the subject development. He also clarified their intent to use landscaping as a buffer to prevent headlights from shining into homes from the Victoria Park drive aisles. He specifically pointed out the new location of trees introduced to the landscape plan.

Mr. Whitaker discussed the proposal for signage. Since it is likely that the full-access points will be permitted with IDOT for the development, Mr. Whitaker would like to have both development

signs to advertise the duplex homes and the single-family homes separately which will require a deviation from the Zoning Code. He also clarified that the Libertyville logo has been removed from the proposed entryway signage and replaced with a Greenway Chase logo.

Mr. Whitaker brought forward the topic of tree preservation, using a staff-provided exhibit to identify seven additional large, high-quality trees that will be preserved beyond those in the previously submitted tree preservation plan. He also presented a buffer exhibit to illustrate the distance between homes closest to adjacent properties, demonstrating how the landscape buffer will function. Additionally, he explained that since Victoria Park is currently situated next to a drive aisle and a large institutional building, the proposed development represents a less intensive use and will require a comparable landscape buffer.

Chair Burger questioned whether the development signage should be addressed by the Appearance Review Commission or by a separate commission. Mr. Wil Richardson, Planner and Mrs. Heather Rowe, Director of Community Development clarified that while the ARC can comment on the signage from an appearance perspective, the permissibility and purpose of the signage will be evaluated by the Plan Commission and Village Board since it is a deviation from the Zoning Code.

Chair Burger brought forward the staff report to address outstanding staff comments. She first mentioned a staff comment regarding the split roofline when there is a second-floor loft addition on one side of a duplex. Mr. Whitaker provided a photograph to give context to how that looks in final construction.

Chair Burger brought forward the staff comment regarding landscaping on the Victoria Park landscape buffer but confirmed that Pulte addressed these comments in the presentation. Furthermore, she asked for clarification on the undetermined quantity and location of proposed trees within the landscape buffers and the request for low ground shrubbery. Mr. Whitaker explained that it is the team's intent and goal to create additional screening where possible, but the locations cannot be determined at this moment until future field verification can be performed. The landscaping will not be less than what is shown.

Commissioner Kollman asked for clarification on an image which showed an elevated deck element on the single-family homes. Mr. Whitaker explained that these elevated deck elements will not be provided in this project, the images were shown to give real-life visualizations of a similar project. Mr. Whitaker also went into depth on the inclusion of garage doors on each single-family home, he explained that this is a result of their choice to build 30ft-wide homes rather than wider models to hit a specific price point. He wanted to use these images, landscape exhibits and garage windows to show how they are addressing these issues and give an idea of how these elements stack up.

Commissioner Kollman asked about the garage door styles including the garage windows and how that works with the homeowners' customizations. Mr. Whitaker explained that the garage windows and styles are pinned to the variants of the models such as the 'Low Country' design. Commissioner Kollman asked how often these variants are distributed in a typical project. Mr. Whitaker stated that because the variants are buyer selected, it is not possible to say at this moment.

The 'Low Country' is although a popular option so it may be approximately 40-50% of homes. Commissioner Kollman expressed his validation for this proposal.

Mrs. Heather Rowe asked Mr. Whitaker for the total count of color packages and elevations for the single-family homes. Mr. Whitaker explained there is approximately 36 color packages for the single-family homes. In this explanation, he also showed how accent colors are used to create more variation between packages. He also elaborated that the texture and color of the brick in the duplex homes will have slightly more variation.

Commissioner Kollman asked if the homeowners could select their color packages for the duplexes. Mr. Whitaker explained that Pulte will preselect the duplexes color packages for the individual lots. He also clarified that there will never be half and half colors on a duplex. He also clarified that any exterior work for either side will fix the entire house.

Chair Burger moved to public comment. Mrs. Susan Nied of Victoria Park asked if Pulte had considered placing the senior citizen housing closer to Victoria Park and the single-family homes to the east. Mrs. Susan Nied had concerns about young children playing in backyards finding themselves in their detention pond. She believes there should be a safety fence around the Victoria Park retention pond to prevent hazards.

Mrs. Nied also asked about the various distances between Victoria Park and the subject development's homes and outlots. Mr. Whitaker showed the distance between the outlots, homes, and Victoria Park. He also explained that the HOA will manage and maintain the outlots. In all of Pulte's other developments, there are no fences around adjacent basins. Instead, natural vegetation grows a few feet high to act as a natural deterrent. He added that Pulte hopes children will gravitate toward the proposed public park for the development. Mr. Whitaker stated that there will be fences which homeowners can choose from that could protect children from roaming.

Chair Burger questioned the purpose of other outlots and other pieces of green space. Mr. Whitaker explained that these areas were not practical for homebuilding so they will act as HOA managed open space.

Mr. Steve Christensen of Forest Creek thanked Pulte for their additions to the project since their last submittal. Mr. Christensen expressed his appreciation for the additional trees added to the northeast corner of the development near the basin. He expressed that despite the quality of the trees, they act as important screening in any case for Forest Creek. He questioned if the HOA will ensure that this landscape buffer will be maintained and replanted over time. Mr. Whitaker explained that they are bound to maintain the landscape plan via the Planned Development. Additionally, he explained that the HOA will manage and maintain these landscape buffers, however, the approach will be different depending on newly landscaped areas or areas marked for tree preservation. Mr. Christensen asked for confirmation that trees will be removed due to the basin and that evergreens will be planted as an accommodation. Mr. Whitaker confirmed.

Mr. Rick Pyter questioned the outlot concept along the Victoria Park border with the proposed development. Mr. Whitaker pointed out the location of the outlot bordering Victoria Park and

explained that the placement of the homes and outlot is generally consistent with the existing location of Libertyville Manor and the western drive aisle. When asked whether the 25-foot setback between the Pulte homes and Victoria Park includes the green space and trees, Mr. Whitaker confirmed that it does.

Another resident questioned a tree preservation area located north of Victoria Park. He was asking about how this area is removing and keeping trees. Mr. Whitaker showed what is being kept and what is being removed within this tree preservation area. He explained that the reasoning for this is because there is a lot of proposed grading activity due to elevation changes.

Mr. Whitaker asked about the details of the northern detention basin of Victoria Park. The residents of Victoria Park provided details.

Mrs. Nied expressed that their neighborhood will not be used to presence of children once the development is complete and this is a concern. She stated that any kind of additional barrier is beneficial in order to provide safety and comfort to everyone.

Commissioner Kollman expressed his beliefs that Pulte has made a great effort in addressing the ARC's and staff's feedback. He believes that while improvement is always possible, the project is on the right track.

Commissioner Kollman made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flader, to recommend the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 601 Peterson Road, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Minutes of the February 17, 2025, Appearance Review Commission Meeting

**ARC 25-04 Pulte Home Company, LLC, Applicant
SB Holdings, LTD, Owner
610 Peterson Road**

Request is for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

Mr. Russell Whitaker presented the proposal for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 610 Peterson Road. Mr. Whitaker gave background on Pulte Home Company, LLC for the Commissioner's context including their previous projects and overall sales. Mr. Whitaker gave context on the history of the Libertyville Manor site highlighting various improvements over time since the 1980s. He further explained the benefits and purpose of this project in helping with Lake County housing stock issues. He presented a site plan for the project, explaining the layout of homes and specifically highlighting the locations of duplexes and single-family homes, as well as the access points, parks/open space, and landscaping. He continued to explain the location of tree preservation areas and perimeter open space for the site. In select areas, they used existing features to create space that did not create significant change such as utilizing the existing drive aisle on

the west perimeter as open space between Victoria Park and the subject development. Furthermore, the applicant designed a significant amount of the site based on grade and flood plains. Mr. Whitaker pointed out the setback between the Forest Creek subdivision and the subject development including a large detention zone as well as the proposal of a landscaped berm on the south perimeter.

Mr. Whitaker described the proposal for the various housing types and elevations. He explained Pulte Homes goal of providing options to future homeowners. There is however a limitation on optionality for the exterior configuration of homes on the Landings Series. Mr. Whitaker explained the anti-monotony code for the single-family homes with the goal of preventing similar homes from being constructed in close proximity. He explained the ability to change both halves of the landing's series duplex homes depending on the upgrades which homebuyers choose. Home customization is also available and encouraged for the Spring's series single-family homes. Mr. Whitaker went into detail on the variation in elevations and architectural features on the proposed homes.

Mr. Whitaker showed that each individual lot will have a landscape plan, he further mentioned that staff requested that each individual lot has its own tree which was not shown on the original plans. He stated that they will add one tree to each individual lot for a total of 99 additional trees. Mr. Whitaker also showed the proposed monument sign at the proposed access points. He explained these signs were proposed in an effort to establish character for the development. He further gave an explanation to their tree preservation plans including their efforts to categorize trees using the Libertyville Tree Ordinance. He explained that the project has an interest in preserving trees because of the added benefit it gives to their future homeowners but also recognizes that many of the trees are not in ideal condition. He gave an explanation on the existing topography to give the Commission an understanding of how they approached tree preservation since topography was an important factor in deciding the site plan and detention basins. He explained that the topography resulted in significant grading plans to align with Village Street standards which make tree preservation difficult. Mr. Whitaker thanked the Commission for listening to the presentation.

Chair Burger brought forward a staff comment regarding the considerable size of the roof elevation compared to the facade on the Landings Series. Mr. Whitaker showed a photograph of the model to showcase that the roof does not look as big in person. He further explained that Pulte Homes believes that design aspects like the roof are part of a larger initiative to bring down home costs.

Chair Burger asked about potential future fencing. Mr. Whitaker explained that the Landing Series Duplex homes will not have any fencing, but the Springs Series Single-Family homes will have specific fences that homeowners are allowed to have. This information will be provided to staff at a later time.

Chair Burger brought forward a discussion about the limited amount of color packages and elevations on the Landings series duplex homes which can create situations where a near identical home is located considerably close to one another. Mr. Whitaker explained that the project proposes several elevations and color packages for the duplex series but he further stated that this

is an attached community and similar homes should be expected. It was mentioned by an associate of the project that each elevation is matched with one color meaning that each elevation is always the same color. Chair Burger questioned if this is enough variety in between the duplexes.

Commissioner Galo brought forward concerns about the density and similarity of the homes and how it may cause a negative impact to neighboring communities. He further expressed his concerns on how close the houses are situated to each other and that these homes do not match the feel of traditional Libertyville housing.

Mr. Whitaker argued that it is not Pulte Home's goal to replicate traditional housing in Libertyville but rather to create more affordable housing for select demographic groups. Commissioner Galo said that he has heard this reasoning before throughout his time in Libertyville.

Mr. Whitaker argued that Libertyville has an aging demographic as well as a community which is difficult for young professionals to afford and it is Pulte Home's initiative to look at housing analysis and on-going trends to build homes which benefit a changing demographic. He further argued that people who want to live in smaller compact communities are more likely to have a desire for experiences rather than a larger house.

Commissioner Galo stated that it simply troubles him that the appearance of this project is vastly different than the neighboring communities and structures where it is proposed, especially considering its size as a very opportunistic site.

Chair Burger requested a summary of the setbacks, lot coverage and price points of the homes to give context to the Commissioners. Mr. Whitaker provided these numbers to the Commissioners.

Mr. Richardson reminded the Commissioners that the Plan Commission will be reviewing all issues related to setbacks, lot coverage and density.

Chair Burger brought forward a concern of managing the architectural features between each half of a duplex since the homeowner of each half has the respective choice to upgrade their side of the house. Mr. Whitaker showed the Commission, using the available elevations, that he believes the fully upgraded home on one side would not significantly impact the other side. He further mentioned that this tends to create more variation in developments especially in the single-family series where neighboring homeowners may choose very different materials.

Chair Burger questioned if patios will be available for the duplex homes. Mr. Whitaker stated that they set aside buildable area for the individual lots to be able to include add-ons such as a patio and that they can provide a specification which shows this. He also reminded the Commission that the HOA will manage what can be installed.

Commissioner Galo asked how the configuration of the front door and garage door seem to be in the same location on all of the single-family homes. Mr. Whitaker stated that in many situations, that houses will have a flipped configuration.

Commissioner Enochs requested that the applicant provide photographs of a completed project elsewhere to serve as an example to the Commission of what all the houses may look like together. Mr. Whitaker stated that they are happy to provide photographs of real-world examples.

Chair Burger asked if the applicant could talk more about landscaping for the proposed development. Mr. Whitaker pointed out the landscaped southern berm containing a plethora of landscaping materials along Peterson Road to serve as a buffer between the road and the development. He stated that a few homes of the Forest Creek subdivision are quite close to the proposed development so the project is proposing a 55ft setback in between the development and the Forest Creek subdivision in select areas in order to place a tree preservation zone. In the closest spot, a home is approximately 15ft from the development near the proposed north-eastern detention basin. The detention basin is preventing further tree preservation. Mr. Whitaker stated that he has had discussions with the homeowners and the HOA of Forest Creek to find where they can install more trees to serve as a buffer. He further stated that he understands many projects may not require buffers between residential developments but they are doing what they can to include buffers within this development.

Mrs. Susan Nied of the Victoria Park Condo Association asked if Mr. Whitaker could explain the distance between the proposed development and Victoria Park. Mr. Whitaker pointed out the existing drive aisle on the west perimeter of the Libertyville Manor property. It is the development's proposal to utilize the drive aisle as a buffer between Victoria Park and the proposed development by transforming it into landscaping and trees creating a buffer of approximately 40ft between property lines.

Chair Burger asked a question regarding the Libertyville logo being proposed on the entry way monument sign and if this is allowed with the Village. Mr. Richardson explained that a conversation has not yet been had with Pulte Homes or Village Administration to assess that topic.

Mr. Whitaker stated that this can be changed but was not sure if the Village would like to see it remain or not. Chair Burger mentioned that further administrative and legal approval may be necessary to allow the Libertyville logo. The Pulte Homes team mentioned that they have alternative options which they could provide the Commission. Commissioner Enochs questioned what the downside of this may be.

Mr. Tony Repp, Deputy Director of Community Development, expressed concerns that if the Village updated their logo or changed their marketing, then the sign would have an outdated Libertyville logo. Commissioner Enochs stated that he does not see an issue with putting our name onto this project because this project seeks to address relevant issues within the Village.

Commissioner Kollman questioned aspects of the grading plan as well as existing grade pointing out significant slopes into detention basins. Mr. Whitaker explained that the duplex homes are designed with this issue in mind.

Commissioner Galo questioned the proposed areas for parks. Mr. Whitaker explained that these parks will be designed with the Parks Department of Libertyville.

Chair Burger asked if there was any public comment at this moment.

Mr. Barry Kahn of Victoria Park expressed concerns about the traffic impact of this development. Mr. Whitaker explained that there is currently a publicly available traffic impact analysis but that all issues related to traffic will be addressed at a later date during a Plan Commission public hearing.

Chair Burger asked if there are any traffic lights proposed. Mr. Whitaker stated that they are seeking to maintain the traffic as it currently stands.

Mr. Jim White of the Forest Creek Condo Association spoke as a representative for approximately 60 residents of the Forest Creek Condo Association to discuss tree preservation. Mr. White previously has had meetings with Village staff and Pulte Homes to discuss the development. Mr. White first gave context on the layout of the Forest Creek subdivision and pointed out where the houses are adjacent to the development. For the residents of the Forest Creek subdivision, all of the trees including the trees of poor quality serve as important screening for the quality of life of the residents. This is a commodity that the residents of Forest Creek have enjoyed for a long time. Mr. White explained that he would like to see as much done possible in order to retain the screening and buffer from these trees, he further mentioned that he discussed adding more trees along the eastern perimeter with Pulte Homes. Mr. White urged the Commissioners to take a look on-site to get a better understanding of the situation and thanked the Commission for their time.

Chair Burger stated that due to the extensive scope of the work, this project should likely be continued to the next ARC meeting. Mr. Whitaker responded that this was his expectation after discussion with Village staff. He further mentioned that he hasn't heard too many requests from the Commission and stated that he would appreciate any more requests and feedback at this meeting.

Commissioner Flader stated that he would like to see a more detailed landscape plan around the eastern perimeter and the north-eastern detention basin to ensure that any landscaping appropriately fits with the topography and grading. Mr. Whitaker said that he can provide this for going forward.

Commissioner Flader also mentioned that more landscaping could be beneficial with potential headlight glare coming from both driveways on the Forest Creek subdivision and the proposed development. Mr. Whitaker understands the concerns from Commissioner Flader and Mr. White, he stated that he can provide photographs and look further into the situation to see what can be done.

Chair Burger asked the Commission if there were any more concerns about monotony prevention in the development, specifically, she mentioned that it was unclear whether there were color packages provided for the single family homes. Mr. Nicholas Adriano of Pulte Group, Inc. responded noting that this is correct, but the team can provide a list of color packages similarly to how they were presented for the Landing Series Duplex homes, there are about 3-6 color packages for the single-family homes.

Mr. Whitaker asked for clarification on the level of variability that is requested of the Commission for the color packages and elevations provided for the proposed homes. He further mentioned that Pulte Homes is used to having a similar set of homes within their development but they are open to feedback. He asked how many colors the Commission would like to see and how those should be distributed among elevations.

Commissioner Enochs explained that he feels that this development reminds him of a subdivision like Sun City in Arizona which does not typically offer a lot of variability but serves an important purpose which is economically viable. These developments help put people in homes who otherwise could have a difficult time finding a traditional home. He does not find a lot of issues with this development for this reason.

Chair Burger agreed with Commissioner Enochs and elaborated to say that the Commission understands what this community is and the purpose it serves but still believes that this development needs more variability, however, not an excessive amount more. She mentioned as an example, a possible increase from 3 color packages to 5-6 color packages for this development is what the Commission would expect. She stated that this is important in creating harmony with nearby neighborhoods.

Mr. Whitaker responded saying that he has no issue with providing a substantial amount of color packages for the single-family homes but would like to know specifically what is needed for the duplex homes. He said that he can provide more color packages for the duplex homes moving forward. A member of the Pulte Group, LLC., asked for more clarification on the goal of the variability, he asked how the colors should be distributed and how anti-monotony should be applied.

Chair Burger stated that they would like to see a mix of more colors but also more distance between color packages/elevations, however, noting that the project does not need to be as restrictive as a typical development in regard to variability between styles.

There was also a discussion regarding the configuration of the door and the garage door's locations in single-family homes. It was stated by the applicants that the configuration is simply the nature of the product, and it is difficult to change this other than mirroring the homes occasionally. Chair Burger asked if anything can be done to the types of doors to add more variability such as a more centered door or a double door. The applicants mentioned that some of these architectural features do change depending on the model type of the home. Chair Burger mentioned that a street rendering or photograph of the houses together will help tackle these issues by putting them into perspective.

Commissioner Kollman added onto these ideas by noting various architectural features which may help break up the monotony of the configuration.

Chair Burger also noted that the trim on all the models around the roofline and garage doors is white. It was mentioned by the applicants that there are more styles of doors such as glass doors and barn doors. Mr. Whitaker explained that he would not want the development to get caught in

a situation of homeowners trying to make their homes look more expensive by utilizing these architectural features but rather focus on breaking the monotony. Commissioner Kollman stated that he would like to see a combination of these ideas. Mr. Whitaker stated that these are very helpful points for the team moving forward.

Commissioner Kollman asked if there is a connection to the broader community in terms of recreation and bike paths for this development. Mr. Whitaker pulled up an exhibit to show the potential of available open space showcasing the location of paths and access points. At this time, areas will only be available via Peterson Road, however, in the future, a public effort could create new connectivity.

Commissioner Kollman asked if we could look at the FEMA flood plain map. He asked for an explanation on how the direction of the flood plains go to Forest Creek. He noted where the grading is possible in areas where the flood plains are avoided.

Mr. Richardson asked if the Commission had any specific comments or feedback on the proposed landscaping plan for each individual lot including the possibility of having one tree per lot.

Mr. Whitaker mentioned that they intend to include 99 new trees for the development as part of an effort to include one tree per lot. Commissioner Flader asked if there is a designated location for these trees on each lot. Mr. Whitaker explained that they have not yet decided but will decide moving forward on a thoughtful approach for the location of these trees.

Commissioner Kollman brought up lighting and street lighting. Mr. Whitaker stated that they intend to be compliant with Village code for street lighting and Village light poles. Mr. Richardson concurred stating that engineering will manage the street lighting using Village standards and Village light poles.

Commissioner Flader made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kollman, to continue the application for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 601 Peterson Road to the March 17, 2025, Appearance Review Commission meeting.

Motion carried 6 - 0.



Civiltech Engineering, Inc.
www.civiltechinc.com

Two Pierce Place, Suite 1400
Itasca, IL 60143
Phone: 630.773.3900
Fax: 630.773.3975

30 N LaSalle Street, Suite 3220
Chicago, IL 60602
Phone: 312.726.5910
Fax: 312.726.5911

Transportation Design

Traffic Engineering

Civil Engineering

Construction Engineering

Environmental Studies

Water Resources

Structural Design

Right of Way

Urban Design

Transportation Planning

Program Management

Technical Memorandum

Date: March 19, 2025

To: Mr. Jeff Cooper, P.E., CPESC
Village Engineer
Village of Libertyville

From: Brian R. DeSalle, P.E., PTOE
Louis E. Pukelis, P.E.
Civiltech Engineering, Inc.

Re: Greenway Chase Development
Intersection of IL 137 (Peterson Road) and Elderberry Drive
Review of March 5, 2025 Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

At the Village's request, we have reviewed the March 5, 2025 Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis (SWA) prepared by Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA) for the intersection of IL Route 137 (Peterson Road) and Elderberry Drive.

We offer the following comments on the March 5, 2025 SWA. These should be addressed, and a written disposition should be prepared as part of the Village's review and approval process.

Signal Warrant Analysis Comments

1. It should be noted that IDOT does not allow Warrant 2 (Four-Hour Volume) and Warrant 3 (Peak Hour Volume) to be used when warranting a traffic signal on a Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA)
2. For the purposes of this exercise, we concur with estimating the hourly volumes on for the intersection approaches that were not included in the traffic count data using the methodology provided. Normally, physical counts are required for the entire period analyzed in a warrant study.
3. Although it does not affect the outcome of this analysis, the number of right turning vehicles should be reduced per IDOT's methodology for warrant analyses.
4. We concur with the finding that a traffic signal is not currently warranted and will not be warranted in the future even with the added Greenway Chase development traffic at the intersection of Peterson Road and Elderberry Drive.



Civiltech Engineering, Inc.
www.civiltechinc.com

Two Pierce Place, Suite 1400
Itasca, IL 60143
Phone: 630.773.3900
Fax: 630.773.3975

30 N LaSalle Street, Suite 3220
Chicago, IL 60602
Phone: 312.726.5910
Fax: 312.726.5911

Transportation Design

Traffic Engineering

Civil Engineering

Construction Engineering

Environmental Studies

Water Resources

Structural Design

Right of Way

Urban Design

Transportation Planning

Program Management

Technical Memorandum

Date: April 17, 2025

To: Mr. Jeff Cooper, P.E., CPESC
Village Engineer
Village of Libertyville

From: Brian R. DeSalle, P.E., PTOE
Louis E. Pukelis, P.E.
Civiltech Engineering, Inc.

Re: Greenway Chase Development
610 Peterson Road
Review of March 27, 2025 Revised Traffic Impact Study

At the Village's request, we have reviewed the March 27, 2025 revised Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA) for a proposed 42-acre residential development located at approximately 610 Peterson Road. Previously, Civiltech prepared a February 14, 2025 review of a December 20, 2024 TIS for this development.

We offer the following comments on the March 27, 2025 Revised TIS. These should be addressed, and a written disposition should be prepared as part of the Village's review and approval process.

Traffic Analysis Comments

1. IDOT concurrence with the conceptual site access geometrics is noted, although there are still IDOT comments to be addressed. An approved IDOT access permit must be acquired prior to final development approval.
2. While we understand there are no existing stop signs at the Libertyville Manor entrances, they should be shown on the TIS figures to reflect the actual type of traffic control on those approaches, especially the total traffic exhibit on Figure 9, which should reflect proposed traffic control.
3. In Table 4, the northbound left turn delay should be 55.1 instead of 5.1 for the weekday morning peak hour under existing conditions. This was not addressed in the revised study.
4. We concur with the findings of the traffic signal warrant analysis, as reviewed by Civiltech on March 10, 2025 in a separate memo.



April 14, 2025

Village of Libertyville
200 East Cook Avenue
Libertyville, IL 60048

Attention: Mr. Jeff Cooper. PE

Subject: ***Greenway Chase Residential Subdivision
610 Peterson Road
Libertyville, Lake County, IL
Preliminary Engineering Stormwater Review No. 1***

At the request of the Village of Libertyville, Kimley – Horn and Associates, Inc. has completed a review of the above referenced project. The purpose of this review was to evaluate the preliminary engineering plan for conformance of the proposed development with respect to the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO) and Village adopted Appendix P.

The following item was provided for review:

- Preliminary Engineering Plans for Greenway Chase, prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated January 3, 2025.
- Drainage Memorandum prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated January 3, 2025.

We have reviewed the material provided and determined the preliminary engineering plan is in general conformance with the WDO. The memorandum and calculations provided were previously reviewed as part of the January 2025 submittal. The previous comments remain outstanding and should be addressed as part of final engineering:

1. If applicable, approval from the following agencies should be provided to the Village:
 - a. US Army Corps of Engineers
 - b. Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
 - c. Illinois Department of Transportation
 - d. Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (if applicable)
2. Should a portion of the site remain within the limits of Unincorporated Lake County, additional approvals from Lake County Planning, Building and Development will be required. Annexation documents were provided and appear to be in the process of being completed.
3. Prior to its current condition, it appears that much of the land the development will occupy was used for agricultural purposes. It is recommended that a draintile survey be obtained to verify the location and conditions of any remaining tiles.

4. A portion of the site was previously developed prior to 1992. The original development included approximately 5.6 acres of impervious surface associated with a structure and parking areas. Since this impervious area pre-dates, the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO), it is considered exempt from stormwater detention.
5. The proposed development will impact existing depressional storage and possibly riverine floodplain storage associated with Bull Creek. As part of final engineering, compensatory storage calculations will be required to verify the WDO requirements are met with respect to any fill placed within the floodplain.
6. During final engineering the following items will be required prior to permit issuance:
 - a. Stormwater conveyance calculations. This includes storm sewer sized for the flow rate associated with the 10-year rainfall event and overland flow route calculations adequately sized to pass the peak flow rate associated with the 100-year rainfall event while providing adequate freeboard protection to all proposed structures.
 - b. Description of how Runoff Volume Reduction measures will be incorporated into the overall design of the site.
 - c. A detailed soil erosion and sediment control plan will be required with all applicable details, construction sequencing and standard Lake County notes.
 - d. A detailed stormwater management report that includes all applicable calculations.
 - e. Calculations verifying that the water quality treatment requirements of the WDO are provided within the development.
7. Prior to permit closeout, the following items will be required:
 - a. As-Built survey of all stormwater management features including but not limited to:
 - i. Stormwater Management Basins
 - ii. Storm Sewer
 - iii. Critical overland flow path locations
 - b. Placement of all stormwater management features in a deed or plat restriction.
 - c. Maintenance plan for all stormwater features that clearly identifies the maintenance task, the frequency the tasks are performed and funding source.
8. Additional comments may be provided upon receipt and review of the requested information.

Please do not hesitate to contact me via phone (847.651.0909) or email at Scott.Griffith@kimley-horn.com with any questions.

Sincerely,



Scott Griffith, P.E.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

K:\CHS_WaterResources\168586XXX-Libertyville Reviews\NonResidential\Greenway Chase\L1.GreenwayPrelim.01302025.docx



STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

April 23, 2025

Jeff Cooper
Village of Libertyville
200 East Cook Avenue
Libertyville, IL 60048
jcooper@libertyville.com

Subject: Greenway Chase Preliminary Review

Dear Mr. Cooper:

We have completed our preliminary review of the Greenway Chase development in Libertyville. Please see our comments below.

Preliminary Engineering Plans

1. Clarification is needed on whether the proposed grading will allow for the 100-year flow containment and conveyance to the downstream detention basin.
2. Per Section 506.03A of the WDO for Overland Flow Paths, if the upstream drainage area is less than twenty (20) acres, the storm sewer pipe and inlet systems sized for the base flood can be constructed in lieu of providing an overland flow path.
3. Based on the Typical Lot/Unit Grading detail provided, there is a 2% minimum slope proposed for rear yard swales. It appears that this slope may be difficult to achieve for overland flow from Detention Basin 3 to Detention Basin 1, as there is a total drop in elevation of 5 feet over a distance of 1,000 feet (0.5%).
4. For Wetland C, the buffer will need to be determined, as it does not match Exhibit 8 of Bollinger Environmental Inc.'s Wetland Assessment Report. Please note that an 80/150 will be needed.
5. Clarification is needed on where Detention Basin 3 spillway drains. It appears that it will drain west, north, and then to Detention Basin 1.
6. On the east side of the development, will there be adequate space and grading for the overland flow route? The high-water level (HWL) in the overland flow route will need to be above elevation 691 based on the pond HWL.
 - a. Behind Lot 12, can the overland flow route be contained in the low spot without a retaining wall or a storm sewer sized for the 100-year event?
7. For Lot 22:
 - a. The rim of the inlet at the northern corner of the lot needs to be above elevation 702. The lowest adjacent grade (LAG) appears to be 693 based on the walkout basement and the drainage divide is between lots 22 and 23.

8. For Lots 14 – 15 and 54 – 55:
 - a. Is there an overland flow route proposed between the lots? If so, will there be a drainage easement?
 - b. Please provide the LAG for these lots and the HWL for the overland flow route.
9. Please note that proposed LAGs will need to meet the requirements of the Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO – Section 506.03 & 507.01).
 - a. Please confirm that the overland flow routes will have adequate freeboard, per the WDO. Please provide cross-sections for the overland flow routes in the final engineering plans.
10. Please clarify if there will be any fence or grading restrictions for the lots with drainage easements/overland flow paths.

Stormwater Report and Drainage Memorandum

1. In Table 1, there appears to be a typo in the existing impervious area for Subcatchment C and should be 1.93ac. (identified in Table 4) instead of 2.93ac.
2. In Table 3, there appears to be several typos in the impervious area values.
 - a. SMC believes the Pervious ROW area should be 2.3ac. instead of 230ac., Impervious ROW area should be 3.7ac. instead of 370ac.
 - b. Please clarify if the total area should be 6.00ac. or 6.17ac.
 - c. Please clarify if there truly is zero impervious within the outlots and parks.
3. Please clarify if the rear yards of lots 53 – 55 will drain to Basin 1 or Basin 3 given the overland flow routes and storm sewer configuration?
4. Please clarify if there will be a buffer for Wetland C and if there will be wetland area partially remaining on lots 21 and 22 or wetland buffer.
5. On page 37 of the report, the HydroCAD output table (Proposed Conditions – Theoretical Model, page 7), there appears to be an error in elevations for Pond 6: West Basin and the elevations look to be much higher than what they should be (706.13 instead of 733.13, 707.29 instead of 777.29 etc.)

April 23, 2025
Page 3

We would like to be of assistance. If you have any questions, or would like to set up a meeting, please call our office at (847) 377-7705 or e-mail me at ktraynoff@lakecountyil.gov.

Sincerely,

LAKE COUNTY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kelcey Traynoff".

Kelcey Traynoff, P.E.
Regulatory Supervisor

C: Scott Griffith – Kimley Horn/ Village of Libertyville EO
Eric Steffen – Lake County PB&D/ Unincorporated Lake County EO
Brian Frank – LCSMC



SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW MEMORANDUM

To: Applicant, Pulte Homes

Date: April 23, 2025

Subject: **Pulte Homes Redevelopment of Liberty Manor– Proposed Residential Subdivision (Greenway Chase)** Request for Annexation, Zoning Map Amendment, Preliminary Plat or Subdivision, and Site Plan Permit

Prepared By: Village Staff

This Memorandum is supplemental to the **Development Review Committee (DRC) Staff Report dated 4/23/2025. Please refer to the DRC staff report for comments that should be addressed as soon as possible for further review, in connection with the current request for Annexation, Preliminary Plat, and Site Plan approval.**

The comments in this memorandum are being provided to summarize items that were noted by Village staff which will require attention **prior to application for Final Plat Approval** for the potential development. These comments are provided for the Applicant's reference only at this time and should be considered supplemental to any comments included within the DRC Report referenced above. Comments included within this Memorandum are considered items that would not have a direct impact on the actions requested by the Plan Commission or the Village Board, but they will need to be addressed as the project advances.

The provision of this Memorandum or any specific comment herein shall not be construed as an assumption of positive recommendations and/or approvals from Staff or any Village Boards or Commissions. Subsequent permit issuances are subject to obtaining proper Village Board approvals as may be required.

This Memorandum is not intended as a comprehensive review of the construction documents. Additional review comments should also be anticipated at time of permit submittal.

ENGINEERING DIVISION

1. **Stormwater Management** – In addition to the specific items noted within the DRC report referenced above, engineering review of the plans has been conducted by the Village's consultant consultant and Lake County Stormwater Management Commission. Please be sure to address all comments including the following:
 - a. Comment within the attached review letter dated April 14, 2025, prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
 - b. Comments within the attached review letter dated April 23, 2025, issued by Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (SMC). Please Note: Response to these comments

should be submitted by the Applicant to SMC directly, in addition to providing a copy of all responses and subsequent correspondence to the Village.

2. **Curb and Gutter Type / Curb Cuts** – The Village standards are B6.12 Curb and Gutter, which should be depressed fully for each driveway location. Please revise the plans to show B6.12 C&G on the typical roadway section. Depressed curb locations (and driveway apron slopes) should be shown on final engineering plan submittals for coordination with locations of sidewalk curb ramps, parkway trees, light poles, and any other fixtures within the ROW.
3. **Grading** – Proposed grading (1-foot contours and spot grades at each key location) will be required for all outlots, ROWs, and public spaces.
4. **Overland Flow Routes** – It is noted that the plans have been revised to accommodate overland flow routes between homes within out-lots. Staff agrees with this approach, but notes that during final engineering, calculations will be required to confirm that the width of the out-lots is appropriate to convey overland flows.
5. **Public Watermain** – The plan shows that a portion of the public watermain would be located within front yard easements. Village design standards state that public watermain within easements shall be Class 55 DIP.
6. **Sanitary Sewer Flows** – While it is generally acceptable for a portion of the proposed development to be tributary to the existing Cass Avenue lift station, sufficient exhibits and flow calculations still need to be provided, demonstrating that the total flow tributary to Cass Avenue lift station will decrease compared to the existing condition.
7. **Utility Services** – Please show all utility services (water, sanitary, and storm) on the plans, stubbed to each lot. B-boxes should be located in the grass parkway, at least 4 feet behind the curb.
8. **Easements** – As stated within the DRC report referenced above, easement boundaries and provisions on the subdivision plat would not be considered finalized until they are reviewed and approved in conjunction with the Final Engineering Plans. Further comments should be anticipated during future submittals. At this time, please note the following items:
 - a. All stormwater management system elements (e.g. ponds, overland flow paths, storm sewers, etc.) should be located within an easement or stormwater restriction on the subdivision plat.
 - b. Utility easements should have a minimum width of 15 feet. Where easements are located along rear lot lines, the minimum width is typically 20 feet. Based on the proposed lot setbacks, it is understood that side yard easements would likely not be able to meet these standards. Side yard utility easements should still be provided where appropriate, and further comments may be issued upon review of future plan submittals.
 - c. It is understood that dry utility locations may not be finalized prior to approval of the subdivision plat. Public utility easements should be located and sized as generously as possible to provide for new and future installations within the subdivision. (Per Village standards, wires, cables, pipes, conduit and similar improvements shall be shown as installed underground. Service equipment and improvements shall be shown as installed along rear lot lines to the fullest extent practicable.)
 - d. Document submittals should show all proposed easements, including those needed in accordance with the provisions of annexation and development agreements, DRC Report comments, and / or Supplemental Review comments.

- e. Village Engineering staff can provide preferred easement provision language upon request, please contact the Engineering Division for more information.
9. **Landscaping in the Public Right of Way** – Landscaping installed in the ROW is subject to review and approval of the Public Works Department. Parkway trees shall be planted with at least (1) tree planted per lot or parcel and at least (1) tree every (60) feet. Trees shall be centered in the parkway between the curb and sidewalk. Canopy trees should be spaced so there is a minimum of 30’ between trees. To the extent possible, parkway trees should also be located at least 10 feet from the edge of any driveway, 10 feet from manhole structures, and 15 feet from street lights. Further comments may be issued upon review of future plan submittals.
10. **Construction Phasing** – During Final Engineering Plan submittals (and earlier if available), proposed construction phasing information should be included for review.
11. **Existing Conditions on the Property** – Staff noted the following items during review of the preliminary documents, and additional comments may be issued in response to future submittals:
 - a. A clean “Existing Conditions” plan should be included in the Final Engineering Plans, in addition to the Demolition Plan showing all symbols and notes for proposed removals.
 - b. Existing water supply wells or septic systems on the property should be identified on the existing conditions and demolition plans, including notes requiring them to be abandoned in accordance with applicable State and County standards.
 - c. Copies of existing easement documents have been provided, which are still under staff review for verification of the rights granted. Proper written authorization for the abandonment(s) would be needed from each utility owner or beneficiary of an easement.
 - d. The survey and demolition plan show (4) existing connections to the public watermain along Peterson Rd. Based on a recent review of our records, it appears likely that there are only (3) connections to the public main; and that the watermain that loops around the east side of the existing building does not extend south to connect to the public main but westward in the front of the building to connect to the nearest water line inside the property. This information is noted for reference only, as staff is unable to verify the location of water lines or number of public watermain connections.
 - e. The boundary lines of parcels adjacent to the subdivision (particularly to the north) should be verified and coordinated on all drawings where they are shown.
 - f. As noted within the Natural Resources Information Report dated January 29, 2025 prepared by McHenry-Lake County Soil & Water Conservation District, a field tile survey should be completed, and this information should be submitted for review.
12. **Development Agreement** – As noted within the DRC report referenced above, it’s anticipated that a Development Agreement will need to be finalized prior to approval of the Final Plat of Subdivision.
13. **Public Improvements (Resident Engineer)** – This project will include the construction of public improvements. Therefore, the project will be subject to the requirements described in Section 9 of the Village’s “Engineering Design & Construction Standards” (available on the Engineering Division webpage).
14. **Declarations / Association** – It’s anticipated the development agreement will need to require the establishment of declarations (DCCRs) and a homeowner’s association (HOA) to address long-term maintenance of the common elements, e.g. stormwater management, landscaping, etc.

15. **Lake County Sanitary Sewer Connection Fee** – The development site is tributary to Lake County’s Interceptor Sewer; therefore, Lake County sanitary connection fees will need to be collected at the time of construction permit issuance, by agreement between the Village and County. The Applicant should contact Lake County Public Works (LCPW) at 847-377-7500 to request a determination of the amount of credit that would be applied based on the existing sanitary sewer connection(s) for the property.
16. Permits will be required from the following outside agencies:
 - a. **IDOT Permit**
Permit authorization from IDOT would need to be issued before any work can proceed within the IL 137 (Peterson Rd) right of way.
 - b. **United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)**
It’s anticipated the USACE would need to issue wetland permit authorization associated with impacts to Waters of the United States, based on their jurisdictional determination letter dated 8/10/2021.
 - c. **Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (LCSMC)**
For this development, issuance of a Watershed Development Permit (WDP) has been deferred from the Village to LCSMC, for verification of compliance with the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance; and the WDP would include any necessary approval for impacts to isolated wetlands. (In conjunction with the WDP, a Village Site Development Permit will also be issued, for verification of conformance with all other municipal regulations and standards.)
 - d. **Lake County Health Department**
For abandonment of existing water supply wells or septic systems on the property, documentation of compliance with Lake County Health Department permitting requirements should be submitted when available.
 - e. **IEPA Sanitary Construction Permit**
The Applicant would need to provide IEPA Sanitary Permit application documents for our review and execution. LCPW would also need to sign applicable areas of the IEPA Sanitary Permit application.
 - f. **IEPA Water Construction and Operating Permit**
The Applicant would need to provide IEPA Water Construction Permit application documents for our review and execution.
 - g. **IEPA NPDES Permit (for construction disturbance greater than 1 acre)**
17. Please note that these comments are based on the nature of the preliminary submittal documents, and additional comments should be anticipated in response to subsequent submittals.

PLANNING DIVISION

1. Identify the property lines on Sheet L1.1 and verify that the proposed Residential Development monument signs maintain a minimum setback of 15 feet or more.
2. All individual lot landscaping including trees, shrubs, ornamental grasses and perennials as depicted on Sheets L1.4 and L1.5 shall be regulated by the HOA Declarations, Covenant, Conditions and Restrictions (DCCR) to maintain a minimum amount of plantings. Any reduction to the minimum landscaping as reflected on the approved landscape plan by an individual homeowner shall be regulated by the HOA. Removal of trees on an individual lot shall be subject to both the HOA’s DCCRs and the Village of Libertyville Tree Preservation Ordinance as amended from time to time.

3. It is understood that the applicant has agreed to provide a fee in lieu of providing attainable housing. The amount for which will be incorporated into the Development Agreement.
4. Sheet L1.0, Landscape Plan of the preliminary landscape plan, dated March 7, 2025, designed by Kimley Horn, shows a landscape buffer between Victoria Park and the subject development. Staff notes that the final quantities of trees are to be field verified to provide additional screening. While final quantities for the proposed landscape buffer have not yet been determined, they should not be less than what is currently shown. Consideration should be given to additional trees where possible and low ground shrubbery to fill any gaps within the landscape buffer.

Additional landscape elements should be concentrated at the edge of the drive aisles to block any headlights from filtering onto the single-family properties. Confirm that headlights will not filter onto the proposed home from the drive aisles of Victoria Park.

5. Indicate the location of the seven Silver Maple trees that may be preserved, as referenced in the response letter to the February 17, 2025, ARC Staff Report.
6. The project shall include a minimum of 70 duplexes maintained as deed-restricted senior residences. Units shall be designed with ground-level primary bedrooms. Applicant shall submit appropriate deed restrictions on the seventy (70) duplex units to restrict sales to persons over 55 years of age prior to occupancy.
7. Landscaped areas along property lines and tree preservation areas shall be in identified easements. Language regarding easement access and maintenance shall be incorporated in declarations for HOA.
8. An easement shall be provided with Village approved language designating future bikepath connectivity. HOA documents shall acknowledge and not refute ability to make future connection.
9. At time of application for Final Plat and Plan, the applicant shall provide a copy of the draft DCCRs for review. This is to verify that all common areas will be accounted within the responsibilities of the associations or a separate master association. A sample multi-year maintenance budget shall be incorporated into the draft document for the HOA's planning purposes. The DCCRs shall be recorded prior to any occupancy. If the single-family homes and senior duplexes are to have separate associations, clarification should be provided how areas of shared responsibility will be handled (tree preservation zones detention, etc.).

FIRE DEPARTMENT

1. Fire Department previously received acceptable auto-turn diagrams, hydrant layout and acknowledgement of the residential fire sprinkler requirement.
2. Applicant shall notify the Fire Department if any changes impact these items.