

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMORANDUM**

**VILLAGE OF LIBERTYVILLE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
325 N. MILWAUKEE AVENUE, SUITE 203  
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048-2286**

**FROM:** PLANNING DIVISION

**DATE:** November 20, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Development Review Committee (DRC) Reports for Cases Scheduled for Consideration on **Monday, November 24, 2025**

The DRC Meeting was held on **Monday, October 20, 2025**. DRC members present included:

Kelly Amidei	Village Administrator
Heather Rowe	Director of Community Development
Tony Repp	Deputy Director of Community Development
David Smith	Senior Planner
Wil Richardson	Planner
Keith Gronke	Building Division Manager/Building Commissioner
Jeff Cooper	Deputy Director of Public Works/Village Engineer
Harrison Meyer	Senior Project Engineer
Mike Weaver	Director of Fire Prevention
Linda Carlson	Project Engineer

Attached herewith are the DRC Reports for the following cases:

Plan Commission  
PC 25-24 and PC 25-25

**CASE NOS.: PC 25-24 Final Plat of Subdivision  
PC 25-25 Planned Development Final Plan**

**DATE FILED:** October 10, 2025

**REQUESTED ACTION:**

PC 25-24 Request is for a Final 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 25-25 Request is for a Planned Development Final 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 childcare facility, with ancillary parking.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

***Background:***

The Plan Commission may recall that the petitioner, Pulte Home Company, appeared before them at their April 28, 2025 and again on June 9, 2025 to make the following requests:

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 did 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 above listed requests were given a positive recommendation by the Plan Commission. On July 22, 2025, the Village Board of Trustees considered the recommendation of the Plan Commission. The Village Board of Trustees took action to direct the creation of an approval ordinance related to the applicant’s request. On August 26, 2025, the Village Board of Trustees adopted an ordinance approving a preliminary plat of subdivision, planned development concept plan, special use permit for a planned development and special use for senior housing. The ordinance acknowledges the requested deviations and amendments to zoning map and comprehensive plan. Formal action on these items, along with annexation, would be taken at time of final consideration by the Village Board.

***Planned Development Final Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision:***

Following the adoption of the ordinance approving the preliminary plat and development concept plan the applicant has submitted an application for a Planned Development Final Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision in order develop 64 single family detached dwelling units and 70 age restricted duplex dwelling units for property located at 610 Peterson Road.

***Purpose of the Planned Development Final Plan:***

The Planned Development Final Plan is intended to particularize, refine, and implement the Planned Development Concept Plan and to serve as a complete, thorough, and permanent public record of the planned development and the manner in which it is to be developed.

***Action by the Plan Commission:***

The Plan Commission shall, with such aid and advice of the village staff and consultants as may be appropriate, review and act on the plan. Such review shall consider:

1. Whether the submitted Planned Development Final Plan is in substantial conformity with the approved Planned Development Concept Plan under the definition of “substantial conformity” contained in the Zoning Ordinance ([link to Sec. 26-2-2 Definitions](#));
  - **Staff reviewed the definition of such and notes that the Planned Development Final Plan is in substantial conformity with the Planned Development Concept Plan.**
2. The merit or lack of merit of any departure of the Planned Development Final Plan from substantial conformity with the approved development concept plan;
  - **Staff notes that the Planned Development Final Plan has not departed from compliance with substantial conformity relative to the Concept Plan.**
3. Whether the final plan complies with any and all conditions imposed by approval of the Planned Development Concept Plan; and
  - **The ordinance passed in August of 2025 stipulated various conditions for the concept plan approval. A summary of certain conditions is included below:**
    - **Construction Phasing:** The ordinance stipulated that a construction phasing plan be submitted during the Final Plan review. No such

information has been submitted to date.

- **Relocation of Proposed Public Park:** Following the Plan Commission’s recommendation, the Village Board required that the applicant relocate the park to the north. This revision has been incorporated into all plans per Village Board direction.
  - **Perimeter Fencing:** Additional perimeter fencing along the shared property line with Victoria Park was a condition of the ordinance. The applicant has revised the plan to include privacy fencing in those areas.
  - **Additional Documentation:** Certain documents such as the Declarations of Codes, Covenants and Restrictions as well as information regarding age-restriction on the duplexes has not yet been provided. A draft should be provided prior to Village Board consideration with recordation prior to residential permitting. The Development Agreement will be presented to the Village Board as part of their overall review of the Final Plan and Final Plat approvals.
4. Whether the final plan complies with the provisions of the Zoning Code and all other applicable federal, state, and village codes, ordinances, and regulations.
- **Staff notes that the Planned Development Final Plan complies with the provisions of the Zoning Code and the approved deviations and all other applicable federal, state, and village codes, ordinances, and regulations.**

### ***Zoning Code Deviations:***

The applicant’s proposed Planned Development Final Plan shall include the following deviations from the Zoning Code which were approved as part of the Planned Development Concept Plan:

1. Exterior Architectural Design: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.4(a)(1) of the Zoning Code to permit the Single-Family Units and the Duplex Units (collectively, the ***“Proposed Dwelling Units”***) to have exterior designs substantially similar to another single family detached dwelling unit within 300 feet, provided that the exterior designs comply with the approved elevation and color packages identified in Exhibit J of Ordinance 25-O-53.
2. Garage Doors: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.4(a)(4) of the Zoning Code to permit: (i) the maximum permitted area that the garage doors may comprise of the front face of the Proposed Dwelling Units to exceed 30 percent; and (ii) the garage doors of the Duplex Units (single family attached dwellings) to face the front or corner property lines abutting the public right-of-way .
3. Minimum Lot Width: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(c) of the Zoning Code to decrease the minimum lot width for single-family lots in the R-7 District, from 60 feet to: (i) 41 feet, for the Single-Family Units located on interior lots on the Property; and (ii) 51 feet, for the Single-Family Units located on corner lots on the Property.
4. Minimum Lot Area: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(b) of the Zoning Code to decrease the minimum lot area for single-family detached dwellings on the Property, from 7,200

square feet to: (i) 4,510 square feet, for the Single-Family Units located on interior lots on the Property; and (ii) 5,610 square feet, for the Single-Family Units located on corner lots on the Property.

5. Maximum Lot Coverage: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(f) of the Zoning Code to increase the maximum lot coverage: (i) from 45 percent to 55 percent, for the Single-Family Units located on an interior lot within the Proposed Development; (ii) from 40 percent to 45 percent, for the Single-Family Units located on a corner lot within the Proposed Development; (iii) from 50 percent to 55 percent, for the Duplex Units located on an interior lot within the Proposed Development; and (iv) from 45 percent to 50 percent, for the Duplex Units located on a corner lot within the Proposed Development.
6. Maximum Building Coverage: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(e) of the Zoning Code to increase the maximum building coverage for an interior lot in the R-7 District, from 35 percent to 38 percent, for the Duplex Units located on an interior lot within the Proposed Development.
7. Front Yard Setbacks: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(d)(1) of the Zoning Code to decrease the required front yard setback for the Proposed Dwelling Units, from 30 feet to 20 feet, as shown on the Preliminary Site Plan.
8. Rear Yard Setbacks: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(d)(4) of the Zoning Code to decrease the minimum required rear yard setback from 25 feet to 20 feet for the Single-Family Units, as shown on the Preliminary Site Plan.
9. Corner Side Yard Setbacks: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(d)(2) of the Zoning Code to decrease the minimum required corner side yard setback for the Proposed Dwelling Units, from 30 feet to 15 feet, as shown on the Preliminary Site Plan.
10. Interior Side Yard Setbacks: Deviations from Section 26-4-8.5(d)(3) of the Zoning Code to waive the minimum required aggregate of both interior side yard setbacks for the Duplex Units.
11. Monument Signage: A deviation from Section 26-11-9(b)(4) of the Zoning Code to increase the maximum height of the proposed freestanding residential development signs on the Property, from six feet to approximately 7 feet 4 inches.
12. Required Sidewalks: Deviations from Section 26-16-13.5(b)(5)(h) of the Zoning Code to waive the requirement to provide a sidewalk along every street in or abutting a planned development, along the south property line of the Proposed Development along Illinois Route 137, as depicted on the Preliminary Site Plan.
13. Required Perimeter Landscaping: A deviation from Section 26-16-13.5(b)(5)(e) of the Zoning Code to reduce the amount of required perimeter landscaped open space for the Proposed Dwelling Units, from 30 feet to 19 feet along the western lot line of the Property, as depicted on the Preliminary Site Plan.

14. Marketing Signage: A deviation from Section 26-11-9(b)(4) of the Zoning Code to increase the maximum height of the proposed freestanding residential development signs on the Property, from six feet to approximately 7 feet 4 inches.
15. Dormers: A deviation from Section 26-4-8.4(a) of the Zoning Code to permit individual dormers for the Proposed Dwelling Units, with widths exceeding eight feet, as measured from the exterior framing dimension of the vertical edges of the dormer.

**APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMISSION:**

The petitioner presented the proposed Planned Development Final Plan before the Appearance Review Commission at their November 17, 2025 meeting for review and recommendation. Please find the attached ARC meeting minutes for Plan Commission consideration. The ARC supported the petitioner’s application.

**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 any site development or building permits for construction and are not deemed to be required as conditions for the ordinances for the Planned Development Final Plan or Final Plat of Subdivision. (Note demolition permits may be granted and not held subject to said requirements provided Village Board ordinance approvals have been issued on the project.)
2. The remaining Development Review Committee review comments that are provided in this **Development Review Committee Staff Report** are being provided for the Commission’s consideration in making recommendations based on the current application.

**Planned Development - Deviations:**

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.

**Attainable Housing:**

It is understood from the reference in the originally submitted application materials that the applicant is proposing to pay a fee-in-lieu of providing actual attainable units. Staff supports the fee-in-lieu proposal which will be incorporated into the Development Agreement at the time of final plan consideration by the Village Board.

**ENGINEERING DIVISION COMMENTS:**

The Engineering Division offers the following comments regarding the Final Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision:

1. **Landscape Plan** – The proposed parkway trees will need to be accepted by the Village as public improvements. The parkway tree layout shown on the landscape plan is generally acceptable, subject to the condition that the comments and concerns of the Village Arborist (regarding parkway trees) should be addressed. Prior to issuance of a site development permit, revised landscape plans should be submitted for review and approval, addressing the comments from the Village Arborist as summarized in the Supplemental Review Memo associated with this report.
2. **Traffic & Roadway Geometry** – As indicated within the previously issued DRC Report dated June 4, 2025, the applicant satisfactorily addressed all comments as requested by the Village’s traffic consultant (Civiltech). It should be noted that IDOT is the jurisdictional authority on Peterson Road and therefore any Village approval is conditional upon final approval from IDOT prior to issuance of a site development permit. Additionally, IDOT execution of the plat of subdivision is required prior to Village execution of the Final Plat of Subdivision.
3. **Stop Sign & Crosswalk Locations** - The design engineer should submit a detailed narrative for review, describing the warrant analysis and rationale for the proposed locations of stop sign controls and crosswalks in the interior of the proposed subdivision. Final locations of all stop sign controls and crosswalks are subject to the acceptance of the Village Engineer. This information is required for review and approval prior to Village Board consideration of the Final Plat.
4. **Stormwater Management**
  - a. As indicated within the previously issued DRC Report dated June 4, 2025, Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO) enforcement for this development has been formally deferred to Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (LCSMC), which is the County-wide WDO enforcement authority. It should be noted that any Village

- approval is conditional upon completion of WDO review and approval from LCSMC prior to issuance of a site development permit.
- b. In addition to LCSMC review, the Village's consultant (our WDO Enforcement Officer) is also providing review of all stormwater management submittal documents, in accordance with our standard process as a WDO Certified Community. Based on the information submitted, staff and our consultant agree that the proposed stormwater management design is generally compliant with the WDO; and approval of the final plat can proceed.
  - c. Both LCSMC and the Village's WDO Enforcement Officer have issued review comments pertaining to the October 2025 submittal documents. Both sets of review comments have been provided to the applicant and shall be addressed for review and approval before a site development permit can be issued.
  - d. The document submittal does not yet show the necessary stormwater management easements over the basins, storm sewers, and overland flow routes. The provisions of the stormwater management easement would prohibit installations that may obstruct drainage or interfere with the function of the stormwater management system. As currently shown, it appears that overland flow routes are situated so they coincide with the rear property lines of a large number of proposed lots. If fences, electric / communication pedestals, grading modifications, certain landscape improvements, etc. would not be allowed at the rear boundary of certain lots, these restrictions should be called out and the provisions clearly stated on the Final Plat, and also outlined in the Declaration of CCRs for the subdivision. This should be clarified on all future document submittals.
5. **Declaration of CCRs** – Prior to consideration of final plat approval by the Village Board, a draft Declaration of CCRs shall be provided for staff review and approval. The Declaration will need to include provisions for the following items:
- a. Identify 'common areas' for which the association of property owners will have responsibility for maintenance and all associated costs, e.g. outlots generally, landscaping (other than parkway trees), stormwater basins, private storm sewer, signage, etc.
  - b. The approved stormwater management maintenance plan should be included as an exhibit to the Declaration.
  - c. Specify restrictions on above-ground modifications within overland flow routes and stormwater management easements generally. Identify any lots which are subject to restrictions on fences, etc.
6. **Final Plat** – Staff has the following comments on the proposed subdivision plat:
- a. Provide documentation that the respective grantees of existing easements shown on the plat have consented to the vacation of these easements. The vacation of each such easement should be accomplished on the plat or by a separate recorded document. In the latter case, the document number of the easement vacation should be cited on the plat.
  - b. Village Utility Easements with a width of at least 15 feet shall be provided and centered over all public water main, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer that is located outside the public right of way, including the future water main extension at the north end of the subdivision. (These should be distinct from public utility easements.) Please note that

- staff comments regarding the final layout of public utilities are listed within the Supplemental Review Memorandum dated November 20, 2025, and these comments need to be addressed for review and approval before easement locations can be finalized. Staff can provide the preferred provisions language for Village Utility Easements.
- c. A Sanitary Lift Station Easement shall be provided over the lift station within Outlot C. Staff can provide the preferred provisions language.
  - d. Stormwater management easements shall be provided over all stormwater basins, storm sewer, and overland flow routes that are outside the public right of way. Staff can provide the preferred provisions language.
  - e. The plat does not show any side yard easements, except for ‘corner side yards’ within those corner parcels fronting on two streets. Has the designer confirmed that no utilities will need access through any side yards (including street lighting and dry utilities)? This should be clarified on the documents, and appropriate side yard easements should be shown.
  - f. It’s anticipated that property owners’ rights and obligations with respect to the outlots would be addressed in the Declaration of CCRs. However, descriptive labels for each outlot should be shown, to clarify the designated purpose(s). In the case of Outlot D, it may be desirable to provide an access easement on the final plat.
  - g. Clarify the purpose of Outlot F, shown at the southeast corner of the subdivision, which appears to encompass the existing Forest Creek sign and associated landscaping. If this outlot is intended to establish rights and obligations for an outside entity, a recorded easement agreement should be cited accordingly.
  - h. Headings for easement provisions should typically match the easement labels shown on the drawing. For example, if easements are labeled “P.U. & D.E” the corresponding provisions should have a heading that reads “Public Utility & Drainage Easement (P.U. & D.E.)” Staff can provide suggested provisions language, and this may either replace or amend the utility easement provisions currently shown on Sheet 5.
  - i. Remove the Northern Illinois Gas Company Easement provisions. NI-Gas does not provide service in the Village of Libertyville. Easement rights for North Shore Gas can be granted within the Public Utility easement provisions.
  - j. It’s recommended that a blanket public service easement be provided throughout the subdivision. Staff can provide suggested provisions language.
  - k. Restriction should be placed on wetland and wetland buffer areas to be preserved, in accordance with Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (SMC) standards.
  - l. Provisions should be provided for the proposed 10’ Access Easement within Outlot A (adjacent to Lot 52).
  - m. Within the plat exhibit, remove any building setback lines or unnecessary references to underlying existing parcel configurations.
  - n. 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.
  - o. Provide easement provisions related to the proposed access easement connecting to future bikepath. Easement provisions are subject to Village of Libertyville approval and shall be incorporated into applicable HOA documents and shall not refute ability to make future connections.

- p. The final plat appears to be missing required the required Drainage Certificate and Village Treasurer Certificate.
- q. The plat shall be revised to address the above comments, and the revised plat shall be submitted for staff review and approval.

**FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:**

- 1. The Libertyville Municipal Code states that no street shall bear a name that duplicates or is deceptively similar to the name of any other street in the village or within one and one-half (1½) miles of the village's corporate limits. Street names require approval of the fire marshal and postmaster and the developer must provide evidence of those approvals.
- 2. The fire marshal has the following comments on the proposed street names:
  - a. Muir Trail: There is an existing Muir Avenue which is in the primary response district of the Libertyville Fire Department. This street name will not be approved.
  - b. Pennsy Trail/Pennsy Road: This street should have one street name to avoid confusion. Additionally, there is an existing Penny Lane in the primary response district of the Libertyville Fire Department. Given the similarities of the two names, and the fact that Pennsy is not a common word or name, there could be confusion between these two street names. This street name will not be approved.
  - c. Burnham Trail and Great Western Court: Streets similar to these exist in our immediate neighboring communities of Mundelein and Lake Forest respectively. Mundelein and Lake Forest are communities that Libertyville Fire Department frequently responds to through mutual aid agreements. Additionally, non-resident 911 callers frequently are unsure of which town they are in and could report the correct street but wrong municipality. These street names would not be approved.

Revised names should be offered for consideration prior to Village Board consideration of the Final Plat.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION -- PRIOR TO PUBLIC HEARING:**

Regarding **PC 25-24**, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** for a Final 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, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. That the following items shall be addressed prior to final plat / plan approvals by the Village Board:
  - a. The plat of subdivision shall be revised to address comments within the DRC Report dated November 20, 2025, and the revised plat shall be submitted for staff review and approval.
  - b. A draft Declaration of CCRs shall be provided for staff review and approval. The Declaration will need to include provisions addressing the comments within the DRC Staff Report dated November 20, 2025.
  - c. The design engineer shall address the comments within the DRC Report dated November 20, 2025, regarding the location of stop sign controls and crosswalks in the

- interior of the proposed subdivision, and shall provide any supporting information and/or plan revisions which are appropriate in the determination of the Village Engineer.
- d. The Developer shall execute, or provide verification of its intent to execute, a Development Agreement in a form acceptable to Village staff.
  - e. The applicant shall provide alternate street names for consideration by the Fire Marshal.
  - f. The applicant shall submit a phasing plan as outlined in Ordinance 25-O-53.
2. That the following items shall be addressed prior to Village execution of the Final Plat:
    - a. Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) shall have executed the Final Plat.
  3. That the following items shall be addressed prior to issuance of a site development permit:
    - a. Revised landscape plans should be submitted for review and approval, addressing the comments from the Village Arborist regarding parkway trees, within the Supplemental Review Memorandum dated November 20, 2025.
    - b. Issuance of a Watershed Development Permit (WDP) by Lake County Stormwater Management Commission.
    - c. Submittal documents shall be revised to address comments within the Supplemental Review Memorandum dated November 20, 2025, and the revised documents shall be submitted for staff review and approval.
  4. That the following conditions shall be met prior to recording of the Final Plat of Subdivision:
    - a. The certified Annexation Ordinance shall be recorded with the Lake County Recording Division.
  5. The declarations of protective covenants, conditions, and restrictions must be executed and recorded with the Lake County Recorder of Deeds prior to the Village's issuance of any building permit for construction of residential structures in the Residential Development.
  6. The Development Agreement, or a separate instrument to be recorded against the Duplex Units, must contain provisions which restrict the age of residents of the Duplex Units in the Proposed Development in compliance with the definition of "Senior Citizen Housing" set forth in Section 26-2-2 of the Zoning Code.

Regarding **PC 25-25**, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** for a Planned Development Final 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.

**Draft November 17, 2025 Appearance Review Commission Meeting Minutes**

**ARC 25-29 Pulte Home Company, LLC., Authorized Agent for Debra Stokovich, SB Reserve Properties Inc., SB Holdings LTD, Property Owner  
610 Peterson Road**

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

Mr. Wil Richardson, Planner, provided the Commission with a brief overview and history of the project thus far before the applicant presented the project.

Mr. Nicholas Andriano, Pulte Home Company LLC, presented the proposal for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

Mr. Andriano began the presentation by expressing that their goal is to show that the plans remain in substantial conformity with the preliminary development plans. Mr. Andriano noted that the Liberty Junction site has sold out since their last presentation.

Mr. Andriano gave an overview of the site including its location and size. Mr. Andriano showcased the site plan to give context to the Commission. He explained that the park has been relocated. He indicated the location of a new fence. He noted that an easement has been included for a future bike path.

Mr. Andriano presented an illustrative site plan to give a visual impression of the landscaping. Mr. Andriano explained that he would like to discuss in detail the landscaping, fencing, and park relocation. He noted that the park relocation was based on the Village Board of Trustees' feedback. He noted the location of a new outlot due to this relocation. He indicated the location of 21 new parallel parking spaces.

Mr. Andriano presented several slides on landscaping. He explained that their team addressed several staff reports in the last ARC report for the meeting agenda that Pulte was previously pushed off of. Mr. Andriano stated that they used this time to revise their landscaping plan to address the staff comments. He explained that there was a miscalculation of street trees that has now been revised and illustrated. He noted that the plans show the diversity of street tree species. Mr. Andriano also explained the tree preservation plan and where trees are being preserved. He expressed that the goal of tree preservation is to beautify the space, create buffers, and make a comfortable place to live.

Mr. Andriano showcased renders that visualize the proposed landscaping buffers around the property. He explained that these buffers will be well landscaped and create a proper transition between properties. He utilized a new tree overlay plan to showcase the total amount of trees expected on site with plantings and preservation. Additionally, a data chart was put together to showcase the total amount of good vs. poor quality trees by using a cross section between the Certified Arborist ratings and the Village Tree Ordinance rating system. Mr. Andriano stated that their team typically removes trees of poor quality and preserves high quality trees. He ultimately

explained that the proposed plan has significantly swayed the total tree population toward good quality trees where the site previously had a majority of poor quality trees.

Mr. Andriano stated that 42 percent of the site is green space. He included outlots, parks, wetlands, landscape buffers, etc. This will be leveraged by enhancing these spaces with additional landscaping. All of this new landscaping will be high quality species and incorporate diversity up to 81 percent total desirable trees. Mr. Andriano stated that the landscape architect put together the visualization and data report. Mr. Andriano explained the street tree diversity map.

Mr. Andriano discussed the east and west perimeter of the site that borders neighboring subdivisions. He presented existing imagery of these perimeters and then presented a rendered photo with the proposed landscaping and fencing. He explained that they incorporated the fence at the request of the Village Board. The fence looks nice and creates continuity, and it will be maintained by the HOA. He presented several other existing images and a rendered version with the proposed landscaping to show adequate buffers and fencing. He indicated the structure and material of the fence.

Mr. Andriano explained the actions they are taking to improve the northeastern corner and perimeter to the Forest Creek subdivision. He noted that the basin will now be pulled back. This allows the team to preserve additional trees to create a buffer to neighboring existing properties. A render was shown to illustrate the view that residents at Forest Creek will have. It shows that there will be trees preserved, plantings installed, and a pulled-back basin. He explained that in real life, there will be even more landscaping because of existing foliage and shrubbery.

Mr. Andriano stated that a tree will be planted at every lot. There is also general landscaping around all of the residences. He also explained the orientation of each home. He stated that this will be the same for the duplex residences.

Mr. Andriano provided a zoomed-in close-up of the park plans but stated that this is still a work in progress. He also explained the outdoor amenity space for residents.

Mr. Andriano briefly discussed elevations of each residence. He stated that these plans have not changed nor has the anti-monotony plan. He described the elevations and anti-monotony plan to the Commission as a reminder. Mr. Andriano also presented images of some developed properties that Pulte has built.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if the coniferous trees that are proposed under canopy trees might grow into one another.

Mr. Daniel Grove, Kimley-Horn, stated that the canopy trees are tall. Mr. Grove stated that they are looking for specific spots where the evergreen trees can be installed to avoid this and is confident there is enough room.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked how the applicant intends to protect the wetlands given their sensitive nature. Mr. Andriano stated that they will meet SWEP protocol standards.

Mr. Matt Brolley, Pulte Group, stated that a silt fence will be installed around the wetland. There will also be a buffer that does not allow encroachment or disturbance.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if there are any other precautions taken to preserve trees during construction. He asked how the applicant will determine when a tree will be removed or efforts will be taken to support the tree.

Mr. Brolley stated that the team will follow the Village standards and they have provided exhibits for tree protection.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if there is any oversight of the health of the tree after the work is complete. Mr. Brolley stated that any damaged trees will need to be removed but they do not intend to damage a lot of trees because of their goal to follow tree protection standards. The HOA will take care of trees after the project is done.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked a question about an exhibit shown on Sheet C3.0 about earth grading. He asked if this visual is accurate to the slope on the property. Mr. Brolley stated that this visual is exaggerated and not accurate to the actual slope of the site. The civil engineers exaggerate the visual so the reader can see better.

Commissioner Neuendank examined their mass grading plan and determined that the grading looks appropriate.

Commissioner Neuendank asked about the tree caliper. Mr. Grove stated that they will be around 2.5 inches per code. Commissioner Neuendank asked if this is a single-phase plan for landscaping. The applicant confirmed.

Commissioner Neuendank complimented the colorful visuals on the landscape addendum.

Commissioner Neuendank asked if staff has any comments or requests. Mr. Richardson stated that staff does not have any requests at this time but noted that the Engineering and Public Works divisions will have comments regarding the street trees to ensure they are manageable.

Commissioner Galo shared his remarks that it is difficult for him to support the project due to its density.

Commissioner Villiard stated that it appears that the applicant has addressed the Commission's previous comments and the public's concerns.

Chair Pro-tem Kollman asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

*Commissioner Neuendank made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Villiard, to recommend the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals approve the application for new building facades, landscaping, lighting, and signage at 610 Peterson Road, in accordance with the plans submitted.*

*Motion carried 4 - 0.*



## SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW MEMORANDUM

**To:** Applicant, Pulte Homes

**Date:** November 20, 2025

**Subject:** **Pulte Homes Redevelopment of Liberty Manor– Proposed Residential Subdivision (Greenway Chase)** Request for Final Plat of Subdivision and Planned Development Final Plan Approval

**Prepared By:** Village Staff

---

**This Memorandum is supplemental to the Development Review Committee (DRC) Staff Report dated November 20, 2025. Please refer to the DRC staff report for staff comments and conditions in connection with the current request for Final Plat of Subdivision and Planned Development Final 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 issuance of a Site Development Permit** (or as otherwise specified) for the 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** – As noted within the DRC report referenced above, engineering review of the plans has been conducted by the Village's consultant and Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (LCSMC). Please be sure to address all comments accordingly, including the following:
  - a. Comments within the attached review letter dated November 10, 2025, prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
  - b. LCSMC issued a review letter dated November 10, 2025, providing their comments based on the October 2025 submittal documents. As noted within the DRC report referenced above,

any Village approval is conditional upon completion of WDO review and approval from LCSMC prior to issuance of a site development permit.

- c. As stated within the DRC Report referenced above, the Final Plat and Declaration of CCRs will need to identify the lots which are subject to restrictions within overland flow routes and clearly state the provisions.

2. **Storm Sewer** – The proposed layout of storm sewers has been revised and addresses most comments previously issued by staff. Based on the current plan, the following updated comments should be addressed for further review:

- a. It is anticipated that any storm sewer proposed for rear yard drainage would be privately owned and maintained by the association of property owners.
- b. Public storm sewer will discharge to private detention basins; however, private storm sewers should generally not receive flows from public storm sewer. (All storm sewer downstream of public storm sewer should be public.)
- c. A utility plan markup is attached showing suggested modifications to the proposed plan.
- d. The plans shall clearly identify private vs. public storm sewer. This may be accomplished with some form of notation or line type distinction on the current plan sheets or with a new sheet serving as a public/private exhibit.
- e. Where Public Storm Sewer needs to be located outside the public right of way, Village Utility Easement shall be provided (15' minimum easement width over Village-owned utilities).
- f. Further comments should be anticipated upon review of future submittals.

3. **Sanitary Sewer** – The proposed layout of sanitary sewers has been revised and addresses most comments previously issued by staff. Based on the current plan, the following updated comments should be addressed for further review:

- a. The plans indicate the provision of a gravity pipe underneath Peterson Road (as previously requested). However, the plans have not yet provided any information to demonstrate that the gravity pipe is feasible, e.g. proposed inverts or plan & profile for the crossing. This information still needs to be provided for review.
- b. Bends in the force main should be proposed only where absolutely necessary.
- c. A utility plan markup is attached showing suggested modifications to the proposed plan.
- d. The details of the lift station installation will be reviewed prior to issuance of a site development permit.
- e. Where Public Sanitary Sewer needs to be located outside the public right of way, an appropriately sized Village Utility Easement shall be provided (15' minimum easement width over Village-owned utilities)
- f. 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.

g. Further comments should be anticipated upon review of future submittals.

4. **Street Lighting** - The plan shows proposed street light locations. The following comments shall be addressed before street light installations will be authorized to proceed:

- a. Provide complete street lighting design plans and specifications for review and approval.
- b. Obtain an electrical permit from the Village's Building Division.

5. **Signage & Striping**

- a. As stated within the DRC Report referenced above, the design engineer should submit a detailed narrative for review, describing the warrant analysis and rationale for the proposed locations of stop sign controls and crosswalks in the interior of the proposed subdivision. Final locations of all stop sign controls and crosswalks are subject to the acceptance of the Village Engineer. The engineering plans will need to show a final signage & striping plan accordingly, prior to issuance of a site development permit.
- b. The proposed crosswalk nearest to each cul-de-sac circle should be removed.
- c. For the on-street parking adjacent to the public park, individual spaces should not be marked. Instead, a white lane line should be proposed to delineate the boundary between the parking lane and the roadway.
- d. It is anticipated that most crosswalk locations should be marked with two parallel stripes in accordance with Village standards. High-visibility crosswalk striping (as currently shown) should be reserved for the collector streets at the intersections closest to Peterson Rd, and any other locations that may be identified based on review of the above-requested narrative.
- e. Show the proposed location of streets signs for review. Street sign locations should be shown on the plans; and street signs should be identified as a public improvement, as they will need to be installed by the developer.

6. **Curb and Gutter Type / Curb Cuts** –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.

7. **Grading** – Proposed grading (1-foot contours and spot grades at each key location) will be required for all outlots, ROWs, and public spaces.

8. **Utility Plans** –

- a. 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.
- b. The location of parkway tree centers should be indicated on all utility plans (except the overall plan)

9. **Easements (Generally)** – As stated within previously issued comments, 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. The plat of subdivision needs to be revised to address comments within the DRC Report referenced above, and the revised plat shall be submitted for staff review and approval. Further comments may be issued upon future submittals.

10. **Landscaping in the Public Right of Way** – Landscaping installed in the ROW is subject to review and approval of the Public Works Department. Revised landscape plans should be submitted for review and approval, addressing the following comments from the Village Arborist:
- a. Revise the plans to remove newly proposed trees within the Peterson Rd (IDOT) right of way.
  - b. The proposed Princeton American Elm trees should be replaced with Accolade Elms or Hybrid Elms.
  - c. The plan proposes 27 Red Maple parkway trees. While Red Maples are acceptable, they are not the most desirable in conjunction with the Village’s parkway tree program. Please replace 50% of the Red Maples with Sugar Maples or State Street Maples.
  - d. In no event should parkway trees be located closer to each other than 20 feet.
  - e. For parkway trees located closer to each other than 30 feet, the pair should be ‘like’ species in most cases. Eventually, each pair of these trees will have a single (shared) canopy, and it’s anticipated that the failure of one tree after that would require the removal of both trees.
  - f. Parkway trees near intersections should be located at sufficient distance to allow for visibility of stop signs.
  - g. Parkway trees near driveways should be located at sufficient distance to allow for visibility of street traffic when backing or pulling out of the driveway. Generally, a minimum distance of 10 feet is recommended. A parkway tree should never be located less than 5 feet from the edge of a driveway apron.
  - h. Wherever possible, parkway trees should also be located at least 10 feet from manhole structures, and 15 feet from street lights. Where this is not possible, please note that the final tree location should be staked for acceptance by the Village Arborist prior to installation.
11. **Construction Phasing** – Please provide the proposed construction phasing information for review.
12. **Existing Conditions on the Property** – Staff noted the following items during review of the documents, and additional comments may be issued in response to future submittals:
- a. 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. The survey information indicates an existing water well near the southeast corner of the existing Libertyville Manor building. However, the survey does not show the location of well and septic for the existing residential building on the property to be annexed. This information will need to be confirmed and the systems abandoned properly. Notes should be added to the demolition plan accordingly.
  - b. Copies of existing easement documents have been provided, for verification of the rights granted. The demolition plan indicates that it remains to be confirmed that the dry utilities within these easements do not serve offsite properties. In addition to that confirmation, proper written authorization for the abandonment/vacation of each existing easements is needed from the respective utility owner or beneficiary.
  - c. 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.
  - d. The boundary lines of parcels adjacent to the subdivision (particularly to the north) should be verified and coordinated on the plat and any other drawings where they are shown.

13. **Final Plat** – Prior to Village Board approval of the final plat, comments within the DRC report referenced above shall be addressed for our review and approval.
14. **Development Agreement** – In accordance with previously issued comments and discussions, a Development Agreement will need to be finalized prior to approval of the Final Plat of Subdivision.
15. **Declarations / Association** – Prior to Village Board approval of the final plat, a draft Declaration of CCRs (DCCRs) shall be provided for staff review and approval. The Declaration will need to include provisions addressing the comments within the DRC Staff Report referenced above.
16. **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).
17. **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 was previously provided in the amount of \$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. It is acknowledged that a request to waive incorporated interest has been received and will be considered in conjunction with final developmental approvals by the Village Board.
18. **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.
19. 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. **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. LCSMC’s review and WDP authorization would include the necessary approval for impacts to isolated wetlands. LCSMC would determine if additional authorization is needed from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for any impacts to federally regulated wetland. (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.)
  - c. **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.
  - d. **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.

**e. IEPA Water Construction and Operating Permit**

The Applicant would need to provide IEPA Water Construction Permit application documents for our review and execution.

**f. IEPA NPDES Permit (for construction disturbance greater than 1 acre)**

20. Please note that these comments are based on the nature of the submittal documents, and additional comments should be anticipated in response to subsequent submittals.

**PLANNING**

1. The DCCRs shall reflect a requirement to maintain a minimum amount of plantings on individual lots. Any reduction by an individual homeowner to the minimum landscaping amount as reflected on the approved landscape plan 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.
2. The draft DCCRs shall clarify 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. 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.).



November 10, 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  
Final 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).

The following item was provided for review:

- Final Engineering Plans for Greenway Chase, prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated October 7, 2025.
- Drainage Report – Greenway Chase, prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated October 7, 2025.

It is our understanding that the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission has been delegated the regulatory authority for issuance of a Lake County Watershed Development Permit. Kimley-Horn is performing this review on a cursory basis and providing an additional comments to the Village.

We have performed review of the above-mentioned project and offer the following comments:

1. All comments provided by the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission must be addressed and approved by prior to permit issuance. Some comments provided in the letter may be duplicates from what was provided within a separate letter.
2. All applicable approvals from the following agencies will be required by the Village prior to the issuance of any development permit:
  - a. Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
  - b. Illinois Department of Transportation
  - c. Lake County Stormwater Management Commission demonstrating both stormwater and Isolated Waters of Lake County approvals have been obtained.
3. The Lake County Watershed Development Permit Application provided should be updated with signatures from all applicable parties. The included application does not include any signatures.

4. Verification that the Unincorporated Lake County portion of the site has been successfully annexed into the city should be provided. As part of preliminary approval, annexation documents were provided and appeared to be in the process of being completed. If the parcel is no longer being annexed, approval from Lake County Planning, Building and Development should be provided.
5. The proposed development will impact existing depressional storage associated with a previously constructed stormwater management basin. The calculations provided evaluated using only the 100-year, 24-rainfall event and should be revised to include the critical duration of rainfall events. It is our understanding that all compensatory storage will be provided within the proposed stormwater management basins and will be accessed by over restricting the stormwater management basins.
6. The proposed development includes improvements within the Illinois Department of Transportation Right-of-Way that require new impervious surfaces. Calculations should be provided demonstrating that the proposed stormwater management system for the overall development can accommodate improvements within the Right-of-Way.
7. The stormwater conveyance calculations utilize a global runoff coefficient that depended on the density of specific structure on the lot. While we do not disagree with this approach, many of the runoff coefficients were used in areas that are designed to be predominately impervious with road and driveway coverage. It is recommended that in the condition where the subbasin consists mostly of impervious coverage, the runoff coefficient be revised to demonstrate the higher runoff condition.
8. The following items were noted as part of the proposed stormwater management basin review. These items should be revised or clarified as necessary:
  - a. The required stormwater detention volume required for the overall development was determined by excluding all impervious areas constructed prior to 1992, which is allowed by the WDO. Therefore, the total area used to determine was 29.7 acres, which is 5.66 acres less than the area used in the actual stormwater detention analysis. No response is necessary.
  - b. The overall allowable release rate from the site using the full 35.37 acres was met by over restricting the north basin and over releasing the east basin. This is an acceptable method since Section 502.01 states that the release rate requirement applies to the hydrologically disturbed area of the ownership parcel and both ponds ultimately discharge to Bull Creek Tributary. No response is necessary.
  - c. The construction and function of the West Basin is unclear and stormwater storage accounted for within the basin may be more effective within one of the other basins. As currently configured, the basin provides less than 0.4 ac-feet of stormwater storage volume. It is recommended that this basin be better used as a water quality feature or pass through structure used to capture runoff directly tributary and convey it to the North Basin with little to no restriction.

- d. Stormwater Management Basin design standards should be applied to the West Basin. This includes an adequately sized emergency overflow weir sized to convey the 100-year peak critical flow rate associated with the tributary area and freeboard requirement of the top of berm being 1-ft above the depth of flow within the emergency weir.
  - e. Per the WDO, the minimum size orifice is 4-inches in diameter. The provided actual condition stormwater management basin modeling proposes the use of an orifice less than the WDO allowed. This should be revised as necessary.
  - f. There appears to be a small amount of off-site tributary area conveyed to the proposed stormwater management basins. Calculations should be provided demonstrating the Detention Volume Safety Factor is provided within the basin.
9. The top of the berm associated with each stormwater management basin should be constructed at an elevation that is 1-foot above the depth of flow within the emergency overflow weir. Currently the plans show 1-foot above the emergency overflow weir, not accounting for the flow depth. It should be noted that the flow rate used to determine the overflow weir size should utilize the peak flow associated with the critical duration rainfall event. The calculations provided only the 1-hour peak flow rate.
10. Additional overland flow route calculations should be provided to show adequately sized overflow locations are sized to pass the peak flow rate associated with the 100-year rainfall event while providing adequate freeboard protection to all proposed structures. This includes but is not limited to the following:
- a. Conveyance of Stormwater Management Basin 3 overflow immediately adjacent to the basin.
  - b. Rear yards of Lot 44 - Lot 52.
  - c. Rear yards of Lot 9 – Lot 17.
  - d. Overland flow reduction locations that are serviced by a 10-year storm sewer.
11. The sediment control plan should be updated with the following:
- a. The standard Lake County Soil Erosion and Sediment Control notes and construction sequencing notes.
  - b. The plan should be enhanced to note the location of any temporary stock pile locations.
  - c. The applicant should clarify if the proposed stormwater management basins will be utilized as sedimentation basins during the construction phase. If the plan is to use them as sedimentation basins, calculations should be provided demonstrating the required live and dead storage is provided above and below the Normal Water Level.
  - d. A note should be added stating the Village and SMC will be notified prior to the start of any dewatering activities.
12. 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.
- 13. Additional comments may be provided upon receipt and review of the requested information.

Please do not hesitate to contact me via phone (815.529.3553) or email at [Scott.Griffith@kimley-horn.com](mailto: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\438 - Greenway Chase\L1.GreenwayFinal.11102025.docx



**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

November 10, 2025

Ty Morris  
Pulte Home Company, LLC  
[Ty.morris@pultegroup.com](mailto:Ty.morris@pultegroup.com)

Subject: Watershed Development Permit Application #WDP-25-757  
Greenway Chase

Mr. Morris:

Thank you for the submittal received by the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission (SMC) October 7, 2025 for the proposed residential community in Libertyville (42.30826, -87.97469).

We have completed our review; please amend your permit application to address the following concerns:

Stormwater Review Comments

1. The fees due to the SMC for the proposed activity are:
  - Non-refundable standard engineering review fee of \$5,440 (07/11/2024 fee schedule #11050, Major Development with Detention, No Floodplain).
  - Refundable pre-construction meeting deposit of \$500 (07/11/2024 fee schedule #40500).
  - Refundable inspection deposit of \$5,000 (07/11/2024 fee schedule #47000)
  - Therefore, the total fee is **\$10,940**.
2. Please revise the Watershed Development Permit (WDP) application to include the following:
  - Signature of the applicant or authorized agent
  - Signature of the Professional Engineer
3. The project hydrologically disturbs more than 1-acre of land therefore a Notice of Intent (NOI) must be filed with the IEPA. Please provide SMC with a copy of the NOI application to the IEPA to comply with NPDES requirements. The form is available at the following link: <https://www2.illinois.gov/epa/topics/forms/water-permits/storm-water/Pages/construction.aspx>.

4. The SMC will not require a separate performance guarantee on a project if the Village of Libertyville is also holding a performance guarantee and the following items are provided.
  - A copy of the performance guarantee along with written correspondence from the Village of Libertyville indicating that the stormwater management and SE/SC portions of the performance guarantee will not be reduced/refunded until SMC approves the required as-built submittal. Additionally, SMC recommends that the public entity hold maintenance guarantee, equivalent to 10% of the performance guarantee or \$1,000 minimum, for two years following final site stabilization.
  - Please provide an engineer's cost estimate for the stormwater management system and SE/SC portions of the project and for the creation of an as-built set of plans after the development is complete.
  - A copy of the performance guarantee document for our records.

Please note that, SMC will require a performance guarantee if one is not being held.

5. A maintenance plan for the ongoing maintenance of all stormwater management system components including drain tiles, native vegetation and wetlands is required prior to plan approval. The plan shall include [WDO 401.09]: maintenance tasks, the party responsible for performing the maintenance tasks, a description of all permanent public or private access maintenance easements, overland flow paths, and compensatory storage areas, and a description of dedicated sources of funding for the required maintenance. Please provide a copy of the required maintenance plan that has been signed by all responsible parties and recorded with Lake County. The maintenance plan is intended to be a usable document written for the people that will be doing the work.
6. All stormwater management systems (storm sewers, detention basins, compensatory storage areas, etc.), conservation areas (including wetlands and buffers), and overland flow paths shall be located and described within a deed or plat restriction recorded with Lake County. SMC recommends that the deed restriction be depicted graphically on a drawing that can be referenced as an Exhibit in the restriction text in addition to the surveyed legal description.
7. Please add a drainage statement on the Plat of Subdivision and the engineering plans accounting for changes in the drainage of surface water as required under WDO Section 500.03. The drainage statement needs to be signed and sealed by an Illinois licensed professional engineer.
8. On the Plat of Subdivision, please provide a definition for Stormwater Management Easement.

9. Please verify that there are appropriate easements on all outlots (B, C & D) to cover the storm sewer infrastructure including overland overflow routes. The existing 10' easements shown do not appear to contain said infrastructure (example Lots: 16-17, 25, 63, 82).
10. Please provide an exhibit of sub-watersheds showing the areas that are free-draining and not draining to a detention basin. The back of Lots 21-23 appear to be flowing offsite.
11. Please provide cross-sections for the overland flow path for Lots 10-17. The cross-sections should show that the overland flow path can handle the 100-year event and that there is adequate freeboard from the overland flow path to the lowest adjacent grade of the proposed houses (example Lot 16: HP=692.72; T/B=693.65).
12. In the HydroCAD summaries provided in the Drainage Report, please clarify if the 10-acre surface area used to calculate the cumulative storage for the detention basins is correct.
13. In the Drainage Report and engineering plans, inconsistencies were noted in the high water levels and orifice sizes. Please verify the high water levels and orifices sizes are accurate and consistent between the Drainage Report and engineering plans.
  - Basin 1: 9.46 Acft @ 697.45 vs 11.42 Acft @ 698.45 (plans = 698.11)
  - Basin 2: orifice 7.5" or 8"; 4.26 Acft @ 691.24 vs 4.85 Acft @ 691.81
  - Basin 3: orifice 9" or 10"; 0.3 Acft @ 704.85 vs 0.77 Acft @ 706.50
14. Please provide a detail for the outlet control structure for Basin 3.
15. It is recommended that all stormwater detention basin outlet pipes be equipped with anti-seep collars. Please add a plan note or detail regarding embankment soil compaction and the use of a cut-off/anti-seep collar on the outlet pipe.
16. Please enhance the plans to include the following
  - A note that all silt fence must meet the applicable standards of AASHTO 288-00 (Section 600.06), or equivalent. A standard detail for equivalent silt fence can be found at <https://www.lakecountyl.gov/2352/Checklists-Design-Guidance>.
  - Please enhance the plans to include the SMC standard Soil Erosion / Sedimentation Control (SE/SC) and Typical Construction Sequencing notes, as appropriate. They can be obtained from the SMC website at: <https://www.lakecountyl.gov/2352/Checklists-Design-Guidance>
17. Please provide a final landscape plan including the proposed seed mix list for the natively planted grass-bottom basins.

18. SMC anticipates that dewatering will be a concern on this project. Coordinating with the SMC Inspector prior to start of dewatering operations will be a permit condition. No response is required for this comment.
19. A designated erosion control inspector (DECI) is required for this development in accordance with WDO Section 601. The DECI may be identified at the pre-construction meeting. Additional information on the DECI program can be obtained at: <https://www.lakecountyil.gov/2470/Designated-Erosion-Control-Inspector-Pro>. No response is required for this comment.

#### Wetland Review Comments

1. SMC will assess a wetland review fee once the level of review is determined. Please note that the wetland review fee is separate from SMC's standard provisions review fee associated with the WDP. No response is required.
2. The WDP submittal does not include a statement identifying the Permit Category being applied for, consistent with WDO 1005.01A. Please provide this information.
3. The Watershed Development Permit (WDP) application and submittal documents do not include a signature for the Applicant/Owner or Certified Wetland Specialist (CWS), consistent with Watershed Development Ordinance (WDO) 1005.01B. Please provide a completed and signed WDP application form.
4. The WDP submittal does not include resources supporting the wetland delineation report, consistent with WDO 1000.02.C (USGS, LCWI, FEMA, Soil Survey, Hydro Atlas); WDO 1000.02.D (USACE Data sheets with color photographs of each data point); WDO 1000.02.E (Floristic Quality Assessment generally done between May 15-Oct. 1). The information is noted as being included in Appendix A (Not Provided). Please provide the necessary information.
5. The WDP submittal does not include a wetland mitigation plan meeting the requirements of WDO 1007, consistent with WDO 1005.01J. Please provide this information.
6. The existing tributary drainage area for Wetland C shown on Wetland C – Pre Development Exhibit does not appear to be drawn correctly. Please correct the tributary drainage area as required in WDO 1006.01.A and revise the wetland hydrology calculations accordingly.
7. The WDP submittal does not include land use and soil type documentation meeting the requirements of WDO 1006.01.B. Please provide this information to justify the curve numbers (CN) used in the calculations.
8. The WDP submittal appears to use runoff rate rather than runoff volume to make the wetland hydrology determination, as required in WDO 1006.01.B and 1006.01.C. Please update the calculations and determination.

November 10, 2025  
Page 5

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](mailto: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: Ryan Martin – Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.  
Dan Krill – DK Environmental Services, Inc.  
Jeff Cooper – Village of Libertyville  
Scott Griffith – Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc./Village of Libertyville EO  
Eric Steffen – Lake County Planning, Building, & Development

