

AGENDA VILLAGE OF GLENCOE PLAN COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

675 Village Court July 27, 2022 7:00pm

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Bruce Huvard, Chairman, Public-at-Large Representative Gail Lissner, Vice Chair, Village Board Representative Marc Gale, School District 35 Representative Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative Scott Novack, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative Michael Pope, Glencoe Public Library Representative Carol Spain, Glencoe Park District Representative James Thompson, Public-at-Large Representative Greg Turner, Public-at-Large Representative Peter Van Vechten, Historic Preservation Commission Representative

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE JUNE 22, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Individuals interested in addressing the Plan Commission on non-agenda items may do so during this time.

- 4. CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION AND ASSOCIATED VARIATIONS FROM THE SUBDIVISION CODE FOR FRONT LOT LINE LENGTH, LOT AREA, AND LOT WIDTH AT 538 GREEN BAY ROAD
- 5. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE GOALS
- 6. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

7. ADJOURN

The Village of Glencoe is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend the meeting who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, are requested to contact the Village of Glencoe at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at (847) 835-4114, or the Illinois Relay Center at (800) 526-0844, to allow the Village of Glencoe to make reasonable accommodations for those persons.



Virtual Meeting Wednesday, June 22, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The June 22, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Glencoe, Cook County was called to order virtually at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Huvard provided the legal basis for holding a virtual meeting.

The following Commissioners were in attendance: Bruce Huvard, Chairman, Public-at-Large Representative Gail Lissner, Vice Chair, Village Board Representative Carol Spain, Park District Representative Marc Gale, School District 35 Representative Georgia Mihalopoulos, Public-at-Large Representative Michael Pope, Glencoe Public Library Representative Scott Novack, Zoning Board of Appeals Representative Peter Van Vechten, Historic Preservation Commission Representative James Thompson, Public-at-Large Representative Greg Turner, Public-at-Large Representative

The following Village staff were also in attendance: Taylor Baxter, Development Services Manager Lee Brown, Village Planner

Also in attendance were: Trustee Dudley Onderdonk Michael Blue, Teska Associates

2. CONSIDER THE April 27, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Van Vechten made a motion to approve the April 27, 2022 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes, as submitted. Commissioner Novack seconded the motion.

| RESULT: | ACCEPTED |
|----------|--|
| AYES: | Gale, Huvard, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Novack, Pope, Van Vechten (7) |
| NAYS: | None (0) |
| ABSTAIN: | Spain, Thompson, Turner (3) |
| ABSENT: | None (0) |

3. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

4. INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS

Taylor Baxter advised that discussions about the update of the 27-year-old Comprehensive Plan have been on-going. He reported that about a year ago, staff discussed what a Comprehensive Plan does and why the current plan is in need of a re-write. The Village Board approved the hiring of Teska Associates, a planning consultant firm, to help with the process. He said that Lee Brown and Michael Blue are present tonight to give a presentation on the basics of Comprehensive Planning, and they will assist in starting the process with the Plan Commission being the lead body. He noted that the entire process is expected to take 18 to 24 months.

Chairman Huvard advised that Trustee Dudley Onderdonk is present at the meeting and will be serving in an advisory role in the Comprehensive Plan process because his background is in city planning, and he welcomed Trustee Onderdonk's expertise.

Chairman Huvard explained that the existing Comprehensive Plan is from 1996 and the principal author of the plan was Michael Blue, who is now with Teska Associates.

Lee Brown, Village Planner from Teska Associates, began the presentation on "Comprehensive Planning 101". He explained that the Plan should not be limited to the current moment, but should be long-range, and issues that face the community over a period of time should be considered. He gave highlights of the history of planning in general and also in Glencoe. Mr. Brown explained that municipal powers come from the State of Illinois. They give the power to acquire and to use land in the public interest (for example, eminent domain), and the power to plan for and to regulate the use of land and property (police power), along with the capacity to regulate behavior and enforce order within the municipality for the betterment of the health, safety, morals and general welfare of their inhabitants. He said planning is within the state's police powers because it identifies public purposes, streets and utilities, public open spaces, regulates subdivision of land, regulates zoning, protects health and safety through building codes, and protects the public welfare through aesthetics and urban design.

Mr. Brown explained the meaning of a Comprehensive Plan as a statement of communitywide values, a vision for the future, and a means to give insights and recommendations about places and programs. He noted that it is developed by the Plan Commission but adopted by the Village Board. In addition, he said Comprehensive Plans are long-range and address issues 20 years into the future and beyond. The Comprehensive Plan is for the entire community, including unincorporated land within 1.5 miles of the community. He explained that it also recognizes the interrelatedness of issues. He noted that what makes it comprehensive is that it considers the past, present and future of the community. Mr. Brown said that a Comprehensive Plan includes land use, economic development, transportation, community character, community facilities and services, housing, sustainability, resilience and implementation strategies.

Mr. Brown highlighted the steps in the process of crafting the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

- Gather and analyze existing conditions
- Identify issues and opportunities
- Build a consensus for a community vision
- Develop goals and objectives
- Prepare and evaluate plan options against the goals and objectives

- Select a preferred alternative
- Adopt the plan
- Implement actions in the plan
- Monitor results
- Update every five years

Mr. Brown emphasized that the role of the planner is as a facilitator and translator, and public engagement must be a priority. He noted that the content of the Comprehensive Plan is vision-driven, encompassing sustainability and resilience, community character, and a healthy community. He explained that this is not just a land-use plan and other issues included in the plan will be equity, resilience and climate protection. He said it is very important to include residents, businesses, staff, boards and commissions, and other public agencies as part of the overall process. This will encourage ownership of the Plan and support implementation.

Mr. Brown asked Taylor Baxter to continue the presentation and discuss the reasons why the Comprehensive Plan should be updated now. Mr. Baxter shared that the current Plan is old enough and Glencoe has changed enough in the last 26 years so that the Plan does not adequately serve as a source of useful guidance and decision-making anymore. He explained that the end-users of this Plan include the Village Board, commissions and staff. He noted that an updated plan will lead to establishment of the community's values and vision, and it will be a useful guide for decision making. In addition, he said it will help with land-use elements as far as where, how much, what character, identify infrastructure needs, character of public places, short and long term capital budgeting, operations and public services. Mr. Baxter further explained that all these things need to be revisited in light of changing demographics, changes in how people work, and the way people move about the Village. He noted that all these things have changed substantially since 1996 and having an up-to-date guide that the Village can lean on will be very useful going forward.

Next, Mr. Brown addressed the role of the Plan Commission will be serving as representatives of the larger community and assisting with the engagement process, providing feedback of the plan, sharing perspectives and insights, and acting as liaison to other bodies. Mr. Brown said that Teska Associates will be writing the actual document. For reference purposes, he provided links to materials on the History of Planning, Planning for the Chicago Region, and Climate Resilience in the Great Lakes Region.

At this point, Chairman Huvard asked Trustee Onderdonk to share his thoughts about the process. Trustee Onderdonk explained that the Village Board asked him to attend the meetings relating to the Comprehensive Plan because he has been a planner for over 45 years. He commented that Teska Associates presented a good overall view of the Comprehensive Plan process. He said this is a context of discovery and we are all going to learn a lot about the community as far as different lifestyles and different values. Trustee Onderdonk emphasized that it is important to reach out to the citizens, especially those who are members of the advisory boards and commissions, and the real challenge will be how to make this connection. He noted that the goal will be how to be "approximately right rather than absolutely wrong", so an overall direction as to where we are going should be provided for everyone, including our sister agencies, citizens, school district, park district and other groups. In conclusion, Trustee Onderdonk stated that this is an interesting project and an exciting time for the whole Glencoe community.

Chairman Huvard shared that he would like this process to be informal and collaborative. He noted that he is hoping to informally meet to discuss the information that is being provided by the consultants and

he is trying to keep this process from being directed by a single source. He suggested having some of the materials made available to members as PDFs or links so they can read it ahead of time. He displayed a slide which showed a timeline and budget of tasks. The timeline is 18 months and the tasks are broken down into different phases. He said he would also like a preview of three meetings ahead to be shared with everyone involved.

At this point, Chairman Huvard asked for comments or questions from Commissioners.

Commissioner Pope commented that the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) is a great organization and it might be helpful for Commissioners to read their easy-to-understand document first.

Chairman Huvard asked about the agenda for the July meeting. Mr. Brown said that he will be reviewing the timeline in terms of phases and tasks and also discussing communication strategies, including a survey of the public. He noted that Teska Associates will first survey the Commissioners for a list of issues that they think are important to the community, so then they will be able to frame the larger questions for the community.

Commissioner Pope asked if the community is going to be surveyed, what is the acceptable rate of responses because most of the time only 10 to 15% of the community responds. Mr. Brown answered by explaining that Teska Associates is going to put out digital surveys (similar to Survey Monkey) and make the surveys very visible. He noted that they will not be looking for a percentage, but will be making this the first step for building some momentum about making people aware that the community is going to go through a comprehensive planning process and let them know what kinds of issues the Village is facing. Chairman Huvard explained that they are not just going to rely on a survey and this is just one of the tools for getting people involved.

Commissioner Van Vechten commented that 18 months seems like a distant future and asked Mr. Brown if he foresaw a series of milestones along the way where they can change direction, if necessary, or measure progress. Mr. Brown answered that they have built this process which has a series of tasks that have to be accomplished and they realize that sometimes a task might take longer than anticipated. Commissioner Van Vechten urged the consultants to give some consideration to measuring progress and milestones. Mr. Brown explained that there will be a dashboard available to the entire community which will constantly show the progress on the Comprehensive Plan process.

Chairman Huvard asked Taylor Baxter to review the agenda for the July 27 meeting. Mr. Baxter reported that final plat approval for 538 Green Bay Road should be ready for review. Also, he said a discussion is planned for the former Walgreens site in the Hubbard Woods Plaza to determine if the Plan Commission would consider a zoning amendment for increasing the building height limitation and to review the Design Guidelines document for further clarification about the intent of height restrictions.

5. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Vice Chair Lissner reported that the Board discussed the necessity of a new golf course clubhouse and provided information on the Fundraising Committee's efforts to raise money.

Commissioner Pope reported that the Glencoe Public Library had a very successful book sale.

Commissioner Spain reported that the hot topic at the Glencoe Park District is pickleball and they are exploring options to expand the program and add more courts.

Commissioner Novack reported that the Glencoe Park District appeared before the Zoning Board last month to discuss their upcoming renovations, and sign code issues in the Village will be discussed at the next meeting.

Commissioner Van Vechten reported that the Historic Preservation Commission is still working on modifications to the Preservation Ordinance and the goal is to encourage restoration and renovation in lieu of demolition. He said they are also discussing administrative modifications which include abating photography requirements, expediting permit applications for those properties that have been landmarked, increasing the Commission from five to seven members, changing the name to the "Preservation Commission, and specifying that all Commissioner terms are to be five years.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Following a motion by Commissioner Pope and a second by Commissioner Gale, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

| RESULT: | ACCEPTED |
|----------|---|
| AYES: | Gale, Huvard, Lissner, Mihalopoulos, Novack, Pope, Spain, |
| | Thompson, Turner, Van Vechten (10) |
| NAYS: | None (0) |
| ABSTAIN: | None (0) |
| ABSENT: | None (0) |



VILLAGE OF GLENCOE **MEMORANDUM**

675 Village Court, Glencoe, Illinois 60022 p: (847) 835-4111 | info@villageofglencoe.org | Follow Us: @VGlencoe

www.villageofglencoe.org

| SUBJECT: | Staff Memo – Final Plat of Subdivision and Associated Variations – 538 Green Bay Road |
|----------|---|
| FROM: | Taylor Baxter, Development Services Manager |
| CC: | David Mau, Public Works Director Lee Brown, Village Planner James Tigue, Village Engineer |
| TO: | Village of Glencoe Plan Commission |
| DATE: | July 19, 2022 |

Project background and applicant's request

At its April 2022 meeting, the Plan Commission recommended approval of the proposed preliminary plat and associated variations for this subdivision by a vote of 6-2. At its May 2022 regular meeting, the Village Board unanimously approved the preliminary plat of subdivision and associated variations. As described below, there are no substantial changes to the subdivision proposal since the preliminary plat was approved. The Plan Commission's role in the final plat process is to review the proposed plat for conformity with the approved preliminary plat and for compliance with any required changes or conditions of approval. The Commission should provide a recommendation of approval or denial of the final plat to the Village Board, which will then make a final decision on the proposal.

The applicant proposes to subdivide a 26,400-square-foot zoning lot comprised of three underlying parcels into two new lots to replace the existing single-family home with two new single-family homes. Per the zoning code, the three parcels function as a single lot for zoning purposes. The property does not have direct street frontage, but instead accesses Green Bay Road via an easement across Park District-owned property to its east. The property is in the RC single-family residential zoning district and could currently be redeveloped with one single-family home of up to 6,907 square feet.

The applicant has also proposed the transfer of the northernmost 6,400-square-foot part of the subject property to the owners of the property to the north at 550 Green Bay Road. This would create a buffer between the proposed subdivision and the property that would be most impacted by it. Because it does not create or increase a zoning non-conformity, and because it involves only the adjustment of a property line between adjacent zoning lots, this transfer is not subject to Plan Commission or Village Board review. Once this transfer is complete, the lot area will be 20,000 square feet.

The proposed subdivision requires three variations from the requirement in the Subdivision Code that new subdivisions meet the requirements of the Zoning Code. First, the subdivision of a lot without direct street frontage requires a variation, as the minimum street frontage for a lot is 20 feet. The second and third variations relate to the potential need for an access easement across the northmost lot to the southernmost lot, as depicted in the proposed Preliminary Plat. In the RC district, the minimum lot area is 10,000 square feet and the minimum average lot width is 60 feet. At 62.5 feet by 160 feet, the proposed lots meet these requirements. However, the zoning code requires the exclusion of access easements from the calculation of "lot area", which in turn is used to determine average lot width. With the access

easement in place as proposed, the lot area and average lot width of the northmost lot would technically be 9,477.8 square feet and 59.23 feet, even though the lot would be 62.5 feet by 160 feet.

Principal building setbacks in the RC district are typically:

Front: 30-50 feet, depending on the average of other front setbacks on the block frontage Corner: 8 feet on each side, with a combined setback of at least 25% average lot width Rear: 20% of lot depth or 30 feet, whichever is greater.

However, per the Zoning Code, "In the case of a lot that does not have a front lot line equal to at least 50 feet, the front yard line shall be established by the Board of Trustees so as to conform as closely as practicable to the intent and purpose of this Code to require uniform setbacks and appropriate spacing between buildings. Such front yard line shall be marked on the plat for any lot hereafter divided and shall be established prior to the issuance of a building permit for all other lots." Because the proposed lots do not have any street frontage, the Village Board, with the recommendation of the Plan Commission, may determine the appropriate front setback as part of this subdivision process.

Although there is not a confirmed connection, there appears to be a repurposed, formerly combined sewer line that may be functioning as a storm sewer line the Village system. This may result in uncontrolled stormwater runoff onto neighboring properties, which often suffer from standing water following rain events. The applicant is proposing stormwater detention infrastructure on both proposed lots with connection to the Village's storm sewer along Green Bay Road. The Park District has also approved a proposal from the applicant to allow water and storm sewer utility access in the location of the existing driveway access easement across its property.

In 2021, the applicant proposed rezoning the subject property from RC to RD, along with a Special Use Permit, for the construction of a six-unit multifamily residential building. After a recommendation of denial by the Zoning Commission, the applicant withdrew the application prior to a final decision by the Village Board.

| Standard | Required | Current Lot | Lot after property | Proposed lots | Proposed lots w/ |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | | | transfer | w/o easement | easement |
| Lot size | 10,000 sq ft (min.) | 26,400 sq ft | 20,000 sq ft | 10,000 sq ft | 10,000 sq ft (south) |
| | | | | | 9,477.7 sq ft (north) |
| Average lot | 60 ft (min.) | 165 ft | 125 ft | 62.5 ft | 62.5 ft (south) |
| width | | | | | 59.23 ft (north) |
| Lot frontage | 20 ft | 0 ft | 0 ft | 0 ft | 0 ft |

Applicable zoning code standards

Standards for review

Subdivision Criteria

The Subdivision Code provides the following standards for subdivision plat review. Staff analysis of each standard is provided in italics.

- (1) The subdivision is consistent with the zoning code. The proposed subdivision requires three variations from the Zoning Code. An analysis of these variations is provided below.
- (2) The subdivision will not create a nonconforming building, nonconforming use or nonconforming lot, nor will the subdivision create, increase or extend any existing nonconformity. The applicant has not proposed any buildings or uses that are non-conforming. The proposed new lots require three variations, an analysis of which is presented below.

- (3) The subdivision will accommodate development on a lot that will comply with required setbacks and will not result in the substantial loss of existing trees or the significant alteration of the existing topography on the lot. *The subdivision will accommodate development in a way that will comply with required setbacks. The applicant has not proposed any setback variations. There is no substantial change to the topography on the lot proposed. The applicant has provided a tree preservation and removal plan, showing the removal of a 13-inch Ohio Buckeye tree. Staff will also review tree removal, protection, and replacement plans as part of building permit review.*
- (4) The subdivision will not substantially modify or threaten the integrity of natural resources, including without limitation existing steep slopes, floodplains, wetlands, mature trees or the use of public open spaces. There are no floodplains, wetlands, or steep slopes that would be impacted by the proposed subdivision. The subdivision would be unlikely to have a significantly greater impact on the nearby parks than the potential construction of a new, larger single-family home on the property.
- (5) The proposed development of the subdivision will not result in an increase in the storm water release rate from the subdivision.

The proposed development would comply with the Village's stormwater management requirements, which would not allow for an increase in the stormwater release rate. Instead, an improvement over existing conditions is likely. Engineering plans show stormwater detention infrastructure on both proposed lots. Any building permits on the property would receive a full engineering review.

(6) The subdivision will be served by adequate sewer or water service, electric service, natural gas and other public or private utilities available within the village.

The properties will be required have access to all necessary utilities. The applicant has secured approval for storm sewer and water utility access through Park via easements through Park District property to the east and sanitary sewer access via easements through neighboring residential properties to the north.

(7) The subdivision will dedicate easements or rights-of-way necessary to provide for current and future extension of public utilities and services.

These proposed easements are shown on the Final Plat.

- (8) The existing public street system, and any proposed extension of that system, is sufficient to meet the projected traffic demand that will be created by the subdivision. The existing public street system is adequate to meet the demand of one additional single-family residence on the property.
- (9) The design of the proposed street improvements meets minimum village standards and does not exceed village standards in a manner that threatens the health, safety or welfare, such as by inducing excessive speed of travel or modifying traffic patterns in a manner inconsistent with street design capabilities or by unnecessarily displacing pervious open spaces.

There are no new streets proposed as part of this subdivision.

(10) The subdivision will extend, or does not inhibit the extension of, the existing village street system and recognizes the interconnection of adjacent neighborhoods.

The subdivision does not inhibit the extension of the existing Village street system.

- (11) The subdivision will provide appropriate access and turning movements for vehicles, and the proposed access is not so large so as to be inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood surrounding the subdivision. *There are no proposed or required changes to the access driveway from Green Bay Road.*
- (12) The development of the subdivision can be accomplished in a manner that does not unduly disrupt or damage public services or facilities.

The development of the subdivision would be unlikely to disrupt or damage public services or facilities.

The Subdivision Code allows the Village Board to grant variations from its provisions, including from the requirement that new subdivisions meet the requirements of the Zoning Code. The applicant has requested the following variations:

- (1) A variation from the requirement that new lots have a front lot line at least 20 feet in length. Because there is no street frontage, there is technically no front lot line, requiring a variation for subdivision.
- (2) A variation from the requirement that new lots meet minimum lot area requirements. Both proposed lots are 62.5 feet by 160 feet, or 10,000 square feet, which is the minimum lot size in the RC zoning district. However, the definition of the Zoning Code excludes access easements from its definition of "lot area". Depending on the

final location of the access easement across Park District property, an access easement across the northmost of the proposed lots of up to 522.2 square feet may be needed to provide access to the southernmost lot. Because of this, regardless of its actual size, the northernmost lot as currently proposed would technically have a lot area of 9,477.7 square feet, requiring a variation. The northernmost 6,400 square feet of what is currently 538 Green Bay Road is not included in lot area calculations, as it is proposed to be transferred to the property owners to the north to provide a buffer area.

(3) A variation from the requirement that new lots meet average lot width requirements. Both proposed lots are 2.5 feet wider than the minimum 60-foot average lot width required in the RC zoning district. However, the Zoning Code has multiple definitions dealing with the width of a lot. "Lot width" is the width of the lot at the front setback line, which, for both proposed lots, is 62.5 feet. "Average lot width" is determined by dividing lot area by maximum lot depth. As noted above, "lot area" does not include access easements. Reducing what is technically the northmost lot's lot area by 522.2 square feet would then reduce the lot's average lot width to 59.3 feet, necessitating a variation, although the lot is consistently 62.5 feet in width.

If the proposed lots had frontage on Green Bay Road, no variations would be needed for this subdivision.

Requested Variations

The Subdivision Code provides the following standards for justification for proposed variations:

- (1) The requested variation is in keeping with the overall purpose and intent of this chapter; The proposed variations would result in a two-lot subdivision and public improvements that are in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, the RC zoning district, and the Green Bay Road corridor, in compliance with the overall purpose and intent of this chapter. From a use and appearance perspective, there would be little to no difference between what could be built on the property with the grant of the variations and what could be granted on a property of the same size and width that had direct street frontage. The two new lots would likely appear to passers-by to be typical, conforming single-family residential lots on Green Bay Road.
- (2) The grant of the requested variation will not impair the public health, safety or general welfare and will not contravene the goals of the comprehensive plan nor the intent of this chapter; A two-lot subdivision with two new single-family homes, both of which would be relatively modest in size compared to typical new development in Glencoe, would be unlikely to impair the public health, safety, or general welfare. Without a lot frontage variation, any subdivision would be prohibited, while the average lot width and lot area variations would allow for a subdivision with appropriate access from Green Bay Road and buffering from nearby property.

The Comprehensive Plan calls for decision-makers to balance the preservation of Glencoe's existing character with the fact that it "specifically encourages development of housing for residents who would like to continue living in Glencoe, but no longer need a large house or a large lot" (p. 28). Without the approval of the proposed lot frontage variation, what is currently a 26,400-square-foot lot would not be subdividable, leaving what would likely be a large, new single-family home on a large lot as the only redevelopment option. The development of two single-family homes of not more than 3,400 square feet would increase housing options near Downtown and transit while maintaining the character of the RC district and the Green Bay Road corridor. Likewise, the proposed lot width and lot area variations are only necessary because of the need for an access easement across the northmost lot and the transfer of part of the subject property to create a buffer area.

(3) The grant of the variation will not adversely impact adjacent properties; and

The grant of the proposed variations is unlikely to adversely affect adjacent properties. If the property were to remain a single, 26,400-square-foot lot, it could be developed with a 6,907-square-foot home. At 20,000 square feet in area, it could be developed with a home of up to 5,386 square feet. While the requested variations are needed to build two homes of not more than 3,400 square feet in size, the resulting lots and the homes they could support would not substantially differ from what could be built on two fully conforming RC lots.

(4) The situation of the applicant is not of a general or recurring nature for similarly situated properties within the village or within its jurisdiction.

The subject property is unusual in the Village and similar variation requests are unlikely to recur with any frequency. While there are a small number of other "landlocked" lots in the Village, they tend to be small and located behind other houses, rather than being a relatively large lot with street access through a property that will remain permanently undeveloped.

Front Setback Determination

The Preliminary Plat shows the proposed lots with 30-foot front setbacks. As mentioned above, the Village Board has the ability to determine the appropriate front setback for these lots. During review of the Preliminary Plat, neither the Plan Commission nor the Village Board recommended changing the 30-foot front setback.

Public notice

Public notification signage was placed on the property and notification letters were sent to residents within 300 feet of the subject property per the requirements of the Subdivision Code. Email notification was provided to individuals that provided comments on the 2021 rezoning and Special Use Permit application.

Staff recommendation

The Plan Commission's role in plat review is to hold a public meeting, evaluate the Final Plat proposal and requested variations for conformity with the approved Preliminary Plat and for conformity with any required conditions of approval or changes and based on the standards found in the Subdivision Code, and provide a recommendation to the Village Board.

Staff is of the opinion that the Final Plat meets the standards for review for new subdivisions. There have been no substantial changes to the proposal since the approval of the Preliminary Plat. The applicant has secured utility access through Park District property as required.

As discussed during Preliminary Plat review, staff is also of the opinion that the proposed variations meet the standards for approval. As the size and width of the proposed lots are identical to conforming lots, and because they could be developed with single-family homes of a similar size to conforming lots, the approval of the variations would result in a development indistinguishable from one on a typical lot with direct street frontage that did not require variations.

Motion

If the Plan Commission determines that the proposed Final Plat and variations meet the standards of review found in the Subdivision Code, staff recommends a motion to recommend approval to the Village Board. This motion may include any conditions of approval determined to be appropriate by the Commission. If the Plan Commission determines that the proposed Preliminary Plat or variations do not meet the criteria for review found in the Subdivision Code, staff recommend denial to the Village Board.



BOARD OF TRUSTEE

BY: VILLAGE PRESIDENT, GLENCOE, IL

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF GLENCOE, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS THIS _____ DAY OF ______, A.D., 2022.

APPROVED ON THIS DAY OF _____, 2022 BY THE VILLAGE ENGINEER OF THE VILLAGE GLENCOE , COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

A PERMANENT AND PERPETUAL NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT IS HEREBY GRANTED TO LOT 2, IN ALL AREAS DESIGNATED SANITARY SEWER ON THIS SUBDIVISION-HATT, SAD RASEMENT SHALL BE OR THE INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, RELOCATION, IN, UNDER, ACROSS, ALONG AND/OR UPON DESIGNATED PROPERTY. IT SHALL INCLUE THE RIGHT TO ENTRE THE SUBDIVIDED PROPERTY AND SUCH AREAS FOR ALL SUCH PURPOSES, AND THE RIGHT, WITHOUT LIABLILTY, TO CUT, TRIM, ALTER AND/OR REMOVE AN Y VAGETATION, MON'S, STRUCTURES OR DEVICES WITHIN THE DESIGNATED PROPERTY AS MAY BE REASONABLY REQUERD DATEDENT TO THE RIGHT HEREIG GIVEN.

BE REASONABLE I REQUIRED INCLUENT OF THE GRANTERS, NO BUILDINGS, WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTIN CONSENT OF THE GRANTERS, NO BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES OR OTHER OBSTRUCTION SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED, PLANTED OR PLACED IN ANY SUCH ALSEMENT AREAS, NOR SHALL ANY OTHER USES BE MAI THEREOP WHICH WILL INTERFERS WITH THE EASEMENT GRANTED HERBY, SU LASEMENTS SHALL FURTHER BE FOR THE PUROSE OF SERVING ALL AREAS SH ON THER VLAT AS WELL AS OTHER PROPERTY, WHETHER OR NOT CONTIGUOUS THERETO, SANTARY SEWER.

SUCH EASEMENT SHALL SURVIVE THE VACATION BY PROPER AUTHORITY OF ANY STREET AND OTHER PUBLIC WAY AND PLACE SHOWN ON THIS PLAT, UNLESS OTHERWISE EXPERSILY MENTIONED IN AN ORDINANCE OF VACATION

MORTGAGEE CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS)) SS COUNTY OF COOK)

BY:

AS MORTGAGEE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF A CERTAIN MORTGAGE DATED AD, 20 ____ND RECORDED IN THE RECORDER'S OF DEEDS OFFICE OF ______COUNTY, ILLINOIS ON THE ____

OF THE EASEMENT(S) DEPICTED HEREO DATED THIS ______ DAY OF _____ PRINT MORTGAGEE NAME: ______

_ATTEST:

OWNER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF ILLINOIS)) SS COUNTY OF COOK)

BY:

DATED AT_ , ILLINOIS, THIS _____ DAY OF ____ , A.D., 20_

___, AS TRUSTEE UNDER TRUST NO. ____

ATTEST:

VILLAGE COLLECTOR

VILLAGE ENGINEER

VILLAGE ENGINEER

STATE OF ILLINOIS)) SS COUNTY OF COOK)

I, VILLAGE COLLECTOR FOR THE VILLAGE OF GLENCOE, ILLINOIS, DO HEREBY CRITHY THAT THERE ARE NO DELINQUENT OR UNPADD CURRENT OR FORFEITED SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS, OR ANY DEFENDED INSTALLMENTS THEREON THAT HAVE BEEN APPORTIONED AGAINST THE TRACT OF LAND INCLUDED IN THE FLAT OF SUDDIVISON.

____, A.D., 2022 DATED THIS _____ DAY OF _____

VILLAGE COLLECTOR

PLAN COMMISSION CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS

) SS COUNTY OF COOK)

APPROVED BY THE VILLAGE OF GLENCOE PLAN COMMISSION

A.D., 20____ AT A MEETING HELD THE _____ DAY OF____



DRAINAGE CERTIFICATE:

TO THE BIST OF OUR KNOWLEDGE AND REFER, THE DAMNAGE OF THE SUBFACE WORKLOWLEDGE AND REFERENCE TO A CONTROL STREAM OF THE SUBPARSON WORKLOWLEDT, OR ON THIS STRE, OR ANY PART THEREOR, OR THAT F SUCH SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE WILL BE CHANGED, RLASONABLE PROVISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR THE COLLECTION AND DIVERSION OF SUCH SURFACE WATERS BEEN MADE FOR THE COLLECTION AND DIVERSION OF SUCH SURFACE WATERS BEEN MADE FOR THE COLLECTION AND DIVERSION OF SUCH SURFACE WATERS BEEN MADE FOR THE COLLECTION AND DIVERSION OF SUCH SURFACE WATERS WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE XIL OF THE VILLAGE CONC, SO AS TO REDUCE THE LIKELHOOD OF COMPLIANCE WITH STREED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH BEEN MORTH AND FOR THE VILLAGE CONC SO AS TO REDUCE THE LIKELHOOD OF COMPLIANCE WITH STREED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH BEEN MORTH AND THE VILLAGE CONC SO AS TO REDUCE THE LIKELHOOD OF COMPLIANCE WITH STREED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH BEEN MORTH AND THE STREED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH BEEN MORTH AND THE VILLAGE CONC SO AS TO REDUCE THE LIKELHOOD OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE STREED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND THE ONE THE STREED FOR THE STREED ENGINEERING PRACTICES AND THE STREED FOR THE STREED

DATED THIS _____ DAY OF _____ A.D., 20 ____

OWNER ENGINEER

PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT

A PERMANNA TAN PERPETUAL NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE VILLAGE, IN ALL AREAS DESIGNATED PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ON THIS SUBDIVISION ULT, SAD DESIGNATS HALL BE FOR THE INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, RELOCATION, IN, UNDER, ACROSS, ALONG ANDOR UPON THE SO DESIGNATED ROPERTY, TSIALL INCLUE THE RIGHT TO BUTTE THE SUBDIVISION PROPERTY AND SUCHAREAS TER ALLOOR REMOVE ANY VEETATION, ROOTS, STRUCTURES ON DEVICES WITHIN THE DESIGNATED BASEMENT PROPERTY AS MAY BE REASONABLY REQUIRED INCIDENT TO THE RIGHT THEREIN GRVEN.

BE REASONARTY REQUIRED INCLINENT ID THE RUNT HARAR GIVEN. WITHOUT PRIOR WARTITIN CONSENT OF THE REANTERS NO BUILDINGS. STRUCTURES OR OTHER OBSTRUCTION SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED, PLANTED OR PLACED IN ANY SUCH ASSEMENT AREAS, NOR SHALL ANY OTHER USES BE MADE THEREOF WHICH WILL INTERFERE WITH THE BASEMENT GRANTED HEREBY, SUCH ASSEMENTS SHALL PRICHERE BE FOR THE PROPOSE OF SERVING ALL AREAS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AS WELL AS OTHER PROPERTY, WHETHER OR NOT CONTIGUOUS THERETO, STORM SEVER A NO WATERMAND.

SUCH EASEMENT SHALL SURVIVE THE VACATION BY PROPER AUTHORITY OF ANY STREET AND OTHER PUBLIC WAY AND PLACE SHOWN ON THIS PLAT, UNLESS OTHERWISE EXPERSIVE MENTIONED IN AN ORDINANCE OF VACATION

SHARED ACCESS AND PRIVATE UTILITY EASEMENT.

A PERMANENT AND PERPETUAL NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT IS HEREBY GRANTED TO LOT 2, IN ALL AREAS DESIGNATED SARED ACCESS EASEMENT ON THIS SUBDIVISION FLAT, SAD EASEMENT, UNDER, ACROSS, ALONG AND/OR UPON THE SO DESIGNATED PROPERTY.

INGRESS AND EGRESS AND PRIVATE UTILITIES EASEMENT.

A PERMANENT AND PERPETULA INON-EXCLUSIVE RASEMENT IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE VILLAGE, IN ALL AREAS DESIGNATED INCRESS AND EGRESS AND PUBLIC TO THE VILLAGE, IN ALL AREAS DESIGNATED INCRESS AND EGRESS AND PUBLIC UTILITIES ESEMENT. ON THIS SUBDIVISION PLATSADE DESEMENT SHALL BE FOR THE INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, RELOCATION, IN, UNDER, ACROSS, ALONG ANDOR UPON THE SO DESIGNATED PROPRET, IT SHALL INCLUDE THE RUBOT ENTER THE SUDDIVIDED PROPRETOR OF COLUMN ALTIES ANDOR REMOVE ANY VIGENTATION, ROOTS, STRUCTURES OR DEVICES WITHIN THE DESIGNATED LASEMENT PROPERTY AS MAY BE REASONABLY REQUIRED INCIDENT TO THE RIGHT HEREIN GIVEN.

HEREIN GIVEN. WITHOUT PERIOR WRITTEN CONSERT OF THE GRANTEES, NO BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES OR OTHER OBSTRUCTION SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED, PLANTED OR FLACED IN ANY SUCH RASEMANT RAEAS, NOR SHALL ANY OTHER USES BE MADE THEREOF WHICH WILL INTERFREE WITH THE BASEMENT GRANTED HEREI'S SUCH RAMENTS SHALL FURTHER BE FOR THE FURDER OF SERVING ALL AREAS SHOWN ON THE PLAT AS WELL AS OTHER FROMENT, WHETHER OR NOT CONTIGUOUS THERETO, SANTAY AND STORM BEWERS.

SUCH EASEMENT SHALL SURVIVE THE VACATION BY PROPER AUTHORITY OF ANY STREET AND OTHER PUBLIC WAY AND PLACE SHOWN ON THIS PLAT, UNLESS OTHERWISE EXPRESSLY MENTIONED IN AN ORDINANCE OF VACATION

| ris: | 115: |
|--|---|
| THE FOLLOWIN | G NOTARY CERTIFICATE SHOULD BE INSTALLED |
| BELOW THE MO | ORTGAGEE CERTIFICATE ON ALL SUBDIVISION PLATS |
| WHERE THE LA | ND WILL BE MORTGAGED AT THE TIME THAT THE PLAT |
| IS RECORDED. | |
| NOTARY'S CER | TIFICATE |
| STATE OF | |
| | 22 |
| COLDETY OF |)55 |
| TITUTION | NUCLARY RURLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE |
| ARODREATD | NED, A NOTART FOBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE |
| AFORESAID, | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| NOTARY'S CER | TIFICATE |
| | |
| STATE OF ILLIN | NOIS) |
| |) \$\$ |
| COUNTY OF CC | NOK) |
| | |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESÁID, DO HEREBY CE | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTIFY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE | NED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE RTIPY THAT AND |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTIPY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIO AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS | NED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTIPY THAT AND AND OP ONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OFOF WHO ARE PERS WHO SE NAMES | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE INTERPT THAT AND OF ONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF OF WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTHY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIE | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTIPY THAT AND OF SONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS BUT O THE POREGOING INSTRUMENT AS SUCH |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIP | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE INTERVITIAT INTERVITIANT INTERVITIANTIANTIANTIANTIANTIANTIANTIANTIANTIA |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS WHO SE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIP | INED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE RITHY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF OF WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIP | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE INTIPY THAT AND OR ONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS SOUTH FOREGOING INSTRUMENT AS SUCH AND |
| THE UNDERSIC APORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF OF WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAME: ARE SUBSCRIE | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE INTERVITIAT AND OF OR AND FOR TO BE THE SAME PRESONS SED TO THE FOREOONG INSTRUMENT AS SUCH AND AND AND |
| THE UNDERSIC AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CD OF WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAME: ARE SUBSCRIP RESPECTIVEL | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTIPY THAT OF ORALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS TO THE POREGOING INSTRUMENT AS SUCH AND AND AND AND |
| THE UNDERSIC AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIE RESPECTIVELD | NED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTIPY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIG AFORESAID. DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAME: ARE SUBSCRIE RESPECTIVEL ACKNOWLEDC | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTHY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIC AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CD OF OF WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIP RESPECTIVELD ACKNOWLEDC | NED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE INTIPY THAT AND OF ONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS ED TO THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT AS SUCH AND |
| THE UNDERSIC AFORESAID, OO HEREBY CE OF OF WHO ARE PERS WHO ARE PERS WHO ARE PERS ARE SUBSCRIE ACKNOWLED THAT THEY SIG | INED, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE INTERVITIAT OF ONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PRESONS ED TO THE FORECOING INSTRUMENT AS SUCH AND |
| THE UNDERSIC AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CE OF WHO ARE PERS WHOE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIE RESPECTIVELY ACKNOWLEDC AND VOLUMIT | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTHY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIC AFORESAD, AFORESAD, DO HEREBY CE WHO ARE PERS WHO ARE PERS WHO SE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIB RESPECTIVEL ACKNOWLEDC THAT THEY SIG | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE RTIFY THAT |
| THE UNDERSIC HORESAD, DO HEREBY CE WHO ARE PERS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIE RESPECTIVEL ACKNOWLEDC OWN FREE AND VOLUNTY OF SAID USES AND | NED, A NOTARY FUBLIC IN THE COUNTY AND STATE IRTHY THAT |

THIS ______ DAY OF _____, 20___.

NOTARY PUBLIC

| TTTLB: | TTTLE: |
|--|--|
| NOTARY'S CERTIFICATI STATE OF ILLINOIS)) SS COUNTY OF COOK) | 3 |
| L PRINT NAME IN THE STATE AFORESA NO FF SALD OWNER, WHO J WHOSE NAMES ARE SU BEFORE ME THIS AN THAT THEY SIGNED AN THAT THEY SIGNED AN USES AND PURPOSIS TI GIVEN UNDER MY HAN THIS DAY OF _ | A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE SAID COUNTY ID, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT, IRF PERSONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS SSCRIBED TO THE PORCINOL INSTRUMENT AS SUCH D |
| MY COMMISSION EXPIR | LES ON, 20 |
| LAND SURVEYOR CERE | FICATE |

L JACK A. ZLOTTEK, AN ILLINOIS LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR DO HERRENY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE SURVEYED AND SURDIVIDED THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PROPERTY: BEENG A RESURDIVISION OF LOT 4 (EXCEPT NORTHWESTERLY 40 FEET AND NORTHRASTERLY 80 FEET OF SAID LOT 4), LOT 5 (EXCEPT NORTHWESTERLY 40 FEET AND NORTHRASTERLY 80 NORTHWESTERLY 31 FEET OF LOT 6 (EXCEPT NORTHWESTERLY 40 FEET AND LOT 5) AND NORTHWESTERLY 31 FEET OF LOT 6 (EXCEPT NORTHWESTERLY 40 FEET AND LOT 5) AND ORTHWESTERLENJS IN ECOLO 7 (IO 7) (TOWNSHI 43 NORTH, RANGE 13, EAST OF THE THRD PRINCIPAL MERIDAN, IN COOR COUNTY, LENDES

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE PROPERTY SHOWN HEREON IS NOT SITUATED IN A SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA AS DENTIFIED BY THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, AS PER FIRM MAP COMMUNITY FANEL NUMBER 1703160094K EFFECTIVE AS OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2021, UNSHADED (20NE X).

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE PROPERTY SHOWN ON THE PLAT HEREON DRAWN IS WITHIN THE VILLAGE OF GLENCOB, ILLINOIS.

DATED THIS _____ DAY OF ____

ILLINOIS LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR NO. 3186

LICENSE EXPIRATION : No

Page 12



| T | 14 | Boxelder | 2 | 3 | Lean over road | |
|----|-------|----------------|---|---|----------------|---|
| 2 | 24 | Red Oak | 2 | 2 | | |
| 3 | 38 | White Oak | 2 | 3 | One sided | |
| 4 | 8 | Norway Maple | 3 | 3 | | |
| 5 | 30 | White Oak | 4 | 3 | Hollow | |
| 6 | 3.4.4 | River Birch | 2 | 2 | | |
| 7 | 5.6.4 | River Birch | 2 | 2 | | |
| 8 | 5.6.4 | River Birch | 2 | 2 | | |
| 9 | 5.6.4 | River Birch | 2 | 2 | Girdling Root | |
| 10 | 12 | White Oak | 3 | 2 | Lean and Decay | |
| 11 | 10 | White Oak | 3 | 3 | | |
| 12 | 48 | Burr Oak | 3 | 4 | Hollow | |
| 13 | 9 | Norway Maple | 4 | 4 | Wires | |
| 14 | 20 | American Elm | 3 | 4 | Leaning | |
| 15 | 10 | Norway Maple | 2 | 3 | | |
| 16 | 18 | Norway Maple | 4 | 4 | | |
| 17 | 13 | Ohio Buckeye | 2 | 2 | | X |
| 18 | 12 | Norway Maple | 4 | 4 | | |
| 19 | 9 | Norway Maple | 4 | 4 | | |
| 20 | 8 | Norway Maple | 3 | 4 | | |
| 21 | 8 | White Oak | 2 | 3 | | |
| 22 | 18 | Red Oak | 4 | 4 | | |
| 23 | 10 | Red Oak | 3 | 3 | | |
| 24 | 10 | Sugar Maple | 3 | 3 | | |
| 25 | 8 | Boxelder | 5 | 5 | | |
| 26 | 15 | Ponderosa Pine | 2 | 2 | | |
| 27 | 8 | Crabapple | 4 | 3 | | |
| 28 | 18 | Norway Maple | 3 | 2 | | |
| 29 | 24 | Honey Locust | 1 | 2 | Trunk decay | |
| 30 | 18 | Sugar Maple | 3 | 2 | | |
| 31 | 16 | Norway Maple | 3 | 2 | | |
| 32 | 12 | Norway Maple | 3 | 3 | Girdling root | |
| | | | | | | |

| 630 |
|----------------------|
| 630 |
| × 5 ^{90,6-} |
| 590.65 |
| _<< |
| < << < |
| <u> </u> |
| |
| ((|
| ((|
| W |
| v |
| GAS |
| COMED |
| ATT |
| CABLE |
| |
| × vé |
| |
| CF/SF |
| (\mathcal{S}) |
| ODS ODSIG |
| `·· |
| 0 |

<u>LEGEND</u> EXISTING CONTOUR PROPOSED CONTOUR EXISTING ELEVATION PROPOSED ELEVATION EXISTING SANITARY COMBINATION SEWER PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER PROPOSED COMBINATION SEWER EXISTING STORM SEWER PROPOSED STORM SEWER EXISTING WATERMAIN PROPOSED WATERMAIN EXISTING GAS LINE EXISTING UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC EXISTING UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE EXISTING UNDERGROUND CABLE EXISTING TREE REMOVE TREE TEMPORARY TREE FENCE TEMPORARY SILT / CONSTRUCTION FENCE SUMP PUMP [PROPOSED/EXISTING] DOWNSPOUT (IN-GROUND) [PROPOSED] SWALE [PROPOSED] OUTLET / POP-UP EMITTER

| • | CATCH BASIN |
|---|------------------------------------|
| ۲ | STORM MANHOLE |
| ۲ | SANITARY MANHOLE |
| \bigcirc | CLEANOUT |
| ٢ | B BOX |
| - | WOOD UTILITY POLE |
| | LIGHT POLE |
| • | FLARED END SECTION (F |
| 0 | INLET / DRAIN |
| \otimes | WATER VALVE VAULT / WATER METER |
| • | SIGN |
| \bigotimes | MANHOLE (UNCLASSIFIED |
| ЪС. | FIRE HYDRANT |
| 10 | TREE TAG NO. |
| CE7 | STOP LIGHT |
| 0 | GAS VALVE |
| $\setminus \setminus \setminus \setminus$ | ROOT PRUNE |
| <15"++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++ | TOP OF GARAGE SLAB |
| <14/4/14/14/14/14/14/14/14/14/14/14/14/14 | TOP OF FOUNDATION |
| < 1< * ++++ | FINISH FLOOR |
| | TOP OF WALL |

| | DIRECTIONALL BORE SEWE THROUGH TRE ROOT ZONE |
|---|---|
| Otelepherao Winger | |
| DETENTION CHAMBER SYSTEM 2 ROWS OF 5 CHAMBERS IN 12'x40'x3.5' GRAVEL BED MIN. GRADE 671.35 T/STONE 670.35 HWL (T/STORAGE) 670.00 T/CHAMBER 669.85 B/CHAMBER (B/STORAGE) 667.35 | E 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| B/STONE 666.85 | |
| STORM-SEWER | $X \rightarrow$ |
| 6" PVC SDR 26 | 13 Entry 1 |
| UBLICENT | · Sterra |
| 10 FT. EASEML. | 0.13 |
| | 535 2 |
| LOT 1 | 14 \$20 T |
| | |
| | 10.01 |
| RIM 670.00 - | +610.21 |
| INV. 668.50 | SANITARY SEWER |
| | 8" PVC SDR 26 124 LF @ 0.4% |
| | DIRECTIONALLY |
| | |
| | |





| | | | | | | DATE | 06-16-2022 | 07-13-2022 | 07-20-2022 | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | SNO | | COMMENTS | × | | | |
| | | | | | | REVISIO | PT PLAN | ONS TO ADDRESS VILLAGE C | D STORM WATER OVERFLOV | | | |
| | | | | | | ISSUE | IO, P.E. 1 CONCE | KI, P.E. 2 REVISIO | 3 REVISE | | | _ |
| | | | | | | PROJECT STAFF | MANAGER: B. BON | R. OPLAWS | R: AN: | | | |
| | | | | | | | PROJECT | ENGINEEF | ENGINEEF TECHNICI | | | 33 |
| | <u> 3E - LOT 2</u> | | | | | | | | SULTING, INC | ENGINEERS | PH : (847) 823-330 | FAX: (847) 823-330 |
| S STRUCTURES | 10000.0 0.67 <u>Proposed</u> Impervious Area | | | | | | | | BONO CON | CIVIL E | JUSSE HIGHWAY | |
| ouse veway & Walks OTAL of Lot | (\$4. n.) 2650 1000 600 4250.00 43% | | | | | | | | | | 1018 E | |
| STRUCTURES | <u>C-FAC TOR</u> 0.95 | Proposed Impervious Area 4250.0 4037 5 | | | | | 2 ⁽¹⁾ | IN | MANN | 1,10 | يت | |
| GREENSPACE) usted: DTAL | 0.5 | 5750.0 2875.0 6912.5 | | | | | ~0` | (| | | | |
| n <mark>r Allowed</mark> 0.67 | | Proposed C-Factor 0.69 | | | | | | | | | | |
| DETEN PRINSCO HYDR HWL=670.00 | ITION STORAGE | E PROVIDED - EACH | LOT | | | | | 0Z | | LINI | | |
| <u>Chamber</u> HS75 CHAMBER HS75 END CAP | Storage/Chambe (Cu.Ft.) 46.40 2.75 | r <u>Volu</u> <u>No. Chambers</u> <u>(Cu.F</u> 10 464 4 11. | <u>me</u> <u>•t.)</u> 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Chamber Sto Total Chamber Sto | orage = orage = | 475.0 cu. ft. 0.011 acre-ft | | | | |) T T | | | ק <u>כ</u> ק כ | |
| STORAGE IN GR | AVEL AROUND CHA | AMBER <u>Grav</u> Volui | <u>vel</u> me_ | | | | (c | う ざ | | | | ; |
| <u>Bed Width (ft)</u> 12 | Bed Length (ft) 40.00 | <u>Bed Depth (ft)</u> (Cu.F 2.65 808 | <u>•t.) Void %</u> .0 36% 290.9 cu.ft | | | | () = | | | | בטוער מאל | |
| | Storage in Gravel | Volume = | 0.007 acre-ft | | | | < - | Į — Ц | | | | |
| TOTAL STORAG | E PROVIDED Chamber Stora Storage in Grav | ge 475.0 cu. ft. /el 290.9 cu. ft. | | | | | Z | ב | | μ | |))) (|
| <u>Total Deten</u> | <u>tion Storage Provide</u> <u>Storage Requin</u> | <u>ed 765.9</u> cu. ft. <u>ed 746.0</u> cu. ft. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ALCULATION | | | | | COL | PYRIGI S DRA' | -IT: WING | SHALL | | E USED | , |
| Orifice Design Require Q = Cd = Max. Head = Orifice Area: | 0.660 [°] cfs 0.65 3.10 0.0719 | Det. HWL = Orifice Invert: Orifice Cent. | 670.00 666.75 666.90 | | | PF ST | | CED, DR IN CED IN CT | | | SOLD E T WHEN THE EN | |
| Calculated Max. | Restrictor Discharge | e: 0.660 cfs | ; | | | 30 | G | RAF | °HIC) | SC) | ALĒ | |
| Restrictor Diamo | ser = | 3.63 inches | | | | SC | ALE | : SHI | EET N | JUME | 1": 3ER | - |
| | | | | | | | | (| Ĵ. | -(| 3 | |