

VILLAGE OF ROUND LAKE
PLANNING BOARD

Peter Sheridan, Chair
Fred Sievers, Member - Absent
Tim Lesar, Member
Lance Spallholz, Member
Marybeth Murphy, Member

Mike Cantino - Lansing Engineering

MINUTES - Meeting 9/11/19

Peter Sheridan called the meeting to order.

Public Hearing Topic: Griffin's Ridge Subdivision Planned Development District (PDD) Updates

Background: The Griffin's Ridge Subdivision PDD was approved in April 2014 based on an agreement that approximately 4.5 acres be given to the village as a gift. The PDD was approved for 49 units, and then 9 units were given back to the village. Belmonte Builders bought that land back from the village roughly 2 years ago. Now Belmonte Builders wants to build, but that land is to be divided into 5 lots instead of the original 9 lots. The PDD administration needs to be updated to reflect this change.

Primary Concern: Does the PDD administration go with the land or the owner?

Consensus: The Land.

Secondary Concern: There are lots of trees by the stream and an old foundation. The Village Board requested to add a "buffer" by increasing the Army Core of Engineers 100 year flood plain around the stream by 50 feet.

Mike Cantino from Lansing Engineering representing Pete Belmonte reiterated the background of the original design for the section of the subdivision being revised (the nine original lots with a small cul-de-sac). He then presented the revised plans to remove the cul-de-sac, divide the land into 5 lots, and a larger preservation space around the stream. Lot access would be on either West Ave or Village Circle North with the houses being farther away from the wetlands. The average lot size would be between 0.33 acres and 0.76 acres. The impervious surface area would be reduced to 0.35 acres (60% reduction). The wetlands/preservation buffer was extended by the requested 50 feet, adding an additional 0.39 acres of undisturbed area. The plan had been presented to the Village Board on August 28, 2019. They deferred to the Planning Board for a recommendation/advisory opinion. Revisions to the subdivision administration and an application for the subdivision will be submitted based on the outcome of this meeting.

Comment 1: The PDD was originally signed by Ward Development, not Belmonte Builders. Although the land has changed ownership more than once since then, some of the "buffer" land on the subdivision being discussed is still owned by Ward Development and is deeded to the Village.

Response: When the Village Board approves a PDD, it is a rezoning of the land. The PDD goes with the land regardless of who owns it. The land that Warwick agreed to give the village was never filed and the sale never consummated. In 2017 there was a filed deed showing that the entire space was sold to Belmonte Builders. The Village does not and has not owned any of the property. The PDD was changed when the Village declared that they were not going to relocate the Library and no longer had a use for the property. Instead of giving a gift of property, Warwick paid for it. The lots were then sold to Belmonte Builders.

Comment 2: The nine lots were transferred one at a time - each lot was assessed for \$8k. The property that Warwick owns was assessed at \$100. Why would Belmonte want to reduce the number of lots from nine to five?

Response: The deed provided shows the transfer happening all at once. The property that Warwick still owns is the preservation area, stormwater management area, and the wetlands, which gives it little to no intrinsic value when assessing. Belmonte is reducing the number of lots because he has buyers who are interested in a specific ranch model, which requires wider lots.

Comment 3: Why not combine other lots to make the space the necessary? Are there any other reasons why the original nine lot layout could not be built?

Response: There are no other reasons to deviate. Belmonte finds this solution acceptable. It would also remove the need to build a road.

Comment 4: One of the draw backs is putting an additional five driveways so close together on the main road.

Response: There are areas in the subdivision where driveways are closer together than what is being proposed with the new lots.

Comment 5: Why does the Subdivision Board need to approve this?

Response: After the Village Board approves the modification it will need to be approved by the Subdivision Board because this subdivision is under local law. While the modification is less than five acres, the entire PDD is not.

Comment 6: This modification is more complex than a simple lot-line adjustment. It would need a full review. One of the lots has a six-foot slope; is this going to require bringing in more soil.

Response: It will require much less soil addition and grading than the original lot arrangement.

Comment 7: What happens to the buffer zone? Does it need to be rezoned for preservation, or is the lot owner going to take it.

Response: It is being restricted as preservation area within the owner's property.

Comment 8: Does the language of the HOA have any bearing on this change?

Response: No.

Comment 9: We have one homeowner that had a twenty-foot buffer and decided to clear it. We would not want home owners to cut trees down in the buffer areas on their property. We also don't want to lose the sound buffer between the lots and Route 9. Several trees already have to be taken down to build lot 49. The new building lot #5 will also require the removal of several trees.

Comment 10: There are some houses which are setback from the road more than others.

Response: Setbacks are based on the width requirements for the proposed ranch model footprints. The surrounding house setbacks are for aesthetic transition between houses so that the front of one house is not facing the back of another.

Comment 11: There is not a lot of porch on the ranch model being proposed. Approval of the PDD was based on having at least six-foot front porches in the designs, although length or width was not specified.

Final Decision: There is more buffer, less pavement, less roofing, and less cars. The houses will feel more a part of the subdivision without the cul-de-sac. The roads will also be easier to plow. Peter Sheridan motioned to recommend the modification to the Village Board. Marybeth Murphy seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Meeting Adjourned.