

City of Long Grove  
3-20-17 Plan & Zone Meeting Minutes

Present: Merle Hermsen, Al Pawloski, and Kent Long  
Absent: Doug Morrell & Erica Sellnau-Allan  
Guests: Mike Boddicker, Mark & Ashley Abdon, Mary Jo Weber, Shawn Meyer and  
Joe Zrostlik

Merle opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. Al motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Kent, all ayes.

Kent motioned to approve the February 20, 2017 meeting minutes, seconded by Al, all ayes.

The meeting began with a clarification of the Fence Ordinance. Mark Abdon questioned the 7-foot setbacks. Merle referred Mark to the Long Grove Zoning Ordinance, Page 87, Section 8.1 stating that fences, screening and walls are considered structures and as such must conform to district setbacks. Joel referred Mark to the R-1 Single Family Residential District Section 2, 2.4 B where it states that the lot width and yard requirements must observe a minimum of 7-foot side yard width.

The board discussed the Schreck Preliminary Plat with Mike and Sue Schreck. Joel stated that the City Engineer gave his approval on changing the turnaround from a 40-foot to a 30-foot right-of-way turn around.

Joel commented that their plans still need to show the location of the water and sewer lines, as well as the drainage and utility easements. Joel asked the Schreck's to have their engineer give our City Engineer the information about the culvert and easements for maintenance purposes.

Joel told the Schreck's that they need to confirm that their engineer has addressed all of our City Engineer's concerns. He also stated that they will need to go to each utility company involved to discuss the easements and the location of the utilities.

The board then discussed the Zrostlik Subdivision and went over the City Engineer's recommendations from the March 14, 2017 letter. Joel reminded Joe that the land dedication issue (which was not brought up in this letter) still needs to be addressed.

On the checklist for the Final Plat, Joel commented that the following three points are survey issues: Point #1 - a second section corner should be referenced, Point #2 - the land description does not indicate the point of beginning, and Point #6 - some justification is required for the 7.41 foot difference in dimension along the south line of Lot 4.

Point #3 – Need to have verification that the easement needs of the various utility companies have been met. Joel said each individual utility company will need to address this point.

Point #4 – Is it possible to get access at some location to the drainage easement? Joel pointed out that there is no access to the drainage easement off South First Street.

Point #5 – Adjoining owners along the east side of South First Street should be noted.

Referring to the checklist for the Construction Plans, the following comments were noted on Sheet C201:

Point #1 – Developer needs to obtain proposed sewer and utility easements from the property owner along the east side of South First Street.

Point #2 – What provisions have been made for repair of the bike path where the connection to the water main is to be made? How is the crossing to be handled? Joel commented that we need to avoid doing anything with the bike path or have restoration plans.

Point #3 – Is it possible to move the proposed fire hydrant near station 10 + 55 a little farther south to give more clearance from the bike path? Merle asked if there were specs on the distance from one fire hydrant to another. Joel said there were specs, but it can be moved.

Point #4 – 90 degree fitting on water main at approximate station 14 + 35 should be a tee with a stub to the south and valves on the south and west sides of the tee.

Point #5 – Sanitary sewer and water main crossing on South First Street should be in a carrier pipe. Joel clarified this was a casing pipe.

Point #6 – What are the manhole offsets referenced to? Joel said this was an engineering question.

On the checklist for the Construction Plans, Sheet C202, the following points were made by the City Engineer:

Point #1 – 90 degree fitting on water main at approximate station 15 + 50 should be a tee and the water main should be extended to the north property line of Lot 5. Valves should be placed on the north and south sides of the tee.

Point #2 – Is a wider utility easement needed to accommodate all utility lines? Joel stated that each utility company will need to address this question.

Point #3 – Proposed future sidewalk should be in the public right of way.

Point #4 – Proposed sanitary sewer service locations should be shown.

Referring to the checklist for Construction Plans, Sheet #C204, our Engineer made the following points:

Point #1 – Developer needs to obtain proposed sewer and utility easements from property owner to the south of Lot 4.

Point #2 – Manhole SW-301 should be located in such a manner to allow for a sewer extension to the west without creating conflict with the proposed fire hydrant. Joe Zrostlik said his engineer will need clarification on this point.

Point #3 – A valve is required at the south end of the proposed water main.

Continuing on the Checklist for Construction Plans, Sheet #C205, the following point was made by the City Engineer:

Point #1 – A portion of the new driveway approach as it abuts South First Street should be Portland Cement Concrete. Joel said there are no requirements, but the City would prefer that gravel not be used as gravel would track onto the main road.

Merle questioned if there was going to be a conflict with the power going to the Weber property. Joe Zrostlik said this will need to be addressed yet.

Shawn Meyer questioned whether it still stands that Lot 5 is unable to add more buildings? Joel stated he will have to talk with the City Engineer on this point to get clarification and he will get back to Shawn on this.

Shawn referred back to the point he made at the June 20, 2016 Plan and Zone meeting where he stated his concern regarding no additional buildings being allowed on Lot 5. At that time he

said it was Mary Jo Weber's intention to purchase the balance of Lot 5 and she did not want restrictions placed on that ground for future property owners.

Shawn also pointed out that Lot 5 really isn't one lot. Joel stated that the City is under the assumption that it is one lot. Joe Zrostlik said this still needs to be addressed.

With the conclusion of the Zrostlik Subdivision discussion, Merle asked if there were any further comments or questions.

Michael Boddicker wanted to discuss the drainage problem at his home located at 122 East Main Street. He wanted to know if East Main Street could be closed immediately after the Behren's property to mitigate the water issues he is experiencing. He has spent a lot of money to renovate his property, but the drainage issue is still a problem and needs to be addressed. Joel said he will talk with Mike at a later time and that this issue will need to be put on the City Council's agenda.

With no further business, Al motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Kent, all ayes.

Respectfully Submitted by Joel McCubbin and Pam Petersen