



City of Prospect Heights

Department of Engineering
8 North Elmhurst Road, Prospect Heights Illinois, 60070-6070
Office: 847/398-6070 x 210-FAX: 847/590-1854
www.prospect-heights.il.us



August 17, 2020

Mr. Dan Peterson
Building & Development Director
City of Prospect Heights
8 N. Elmhurst Road
Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070

Re: Reserve at Muir Park (formerly Prospect Pointe) – Lexington Homes PZBA Submittal
999/1001 Oak Avenue
City Engineer Review

Dear Mr. Peterson:

The City recently received the following documents:

Regarding the 69 unit proposal (items in bold are new submittals)

- Plan/Zoning Board of Appeals application, Prospect Pointe, 33 pages, submitted by Lexington Homes, undated.
- Traffic Impact Study for Proposed Residential Development, Prospect Heights Illinois, 110 pages, prepared by KLOA, Inc., dated March 25, 2020, revised May 19, 2020 and KLOA comment response letter dated May 19, 2020.
- Tentative Plat of Subdivision, *Prospect Pointe*, 1 sheet, prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated March 20, 2020, last revised May 28, 2020.
- Preliminary engineering plans, Prospect Pointe, 18 sheets, prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated March 20, 2020, revised May 28, 2020.
- Stormwater management report, Prospect Pointe, 75 pages, prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated March 20, 2020, revised May 22, 2020.
- Response letter from Haeger Engineering, dated May 29, 2020.
- **Fire Truck Turning Exhibit, prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated July 23, 2020.**
- **Report of Soils Explorations, prepared by Testing Service Corporation, dated June 29, 2020.**

The following comments from our April 6, 2020 and June 24, 2020 reviews remain unaddressed:

- 1) April 6, 2020 Comment: Provide data regarding the quality and quantity of groundwater available for the proposed water supply system as well as anticipated impacts on nearby private well supplies.

June 24, 2020 Comment: The only data provided were in the response letter indicating a proposed 8-inch well 200 feet deep and a demand of 40 gpm. In particular, the anticipated impact on existing wells needs to be addressed.

- 2) April 6, 2020 Comment: The proposed conditions narrative should describe how existing drainage patterns are maintained and how the proposed improvements will not adversely impact adjacent properties. In particular, the narrative and plans should include a clear indication of the point(s) of overland discharge if the receiving storm sewer is beyond capacity or fails.

June 24, 2020 Comment: This is not clear on the plans or in the report. The site overflow must remain in the existing location.

- 3) April 6, 2020 Comment: Analysis of the capacity of the existing 36" storm sewer and emergency overflow from the proposed detention facility.

June 24, 2020 Comment: The modeling provided does not adequately account for downstream/tailwater effects on pipe capacity.

- 4) April 6, 2020 Comment: The TIS should include traffic and parking demand generated by the athletic/recreational field south of the development.

June 24, 2020 Comment: It is not clear how the Year 2028 No-Build park traffic volumes were developed and how the park parking demand of 6 spaces was calculated.

- 5) April 6, 2020 Comment: KLOA noted that there were to be 40 guest spaces and 26 guest / shared spaces. Which spaces are to be designated as guest only and which one shared? These spaces are distributed fairly well throughout the site.

June 24, 2020 Comment: Preliminary concurrence should be provided by the Park District for the 26 shared spaces on their property. A formal agreement will be required to ensure that adequate park parking is available during their peak times.

- 6) April 6, 2020 Comment: Clarify whether on-street parking is proposed as well as proposed enforcement procedures regarding parking in the proposed guest spaces.

June 24, 2020 Comment: The response letter says this will be explored during final engineering. We recommend addressing the issue at this stage.

We recommend a favorable recommendation regarding this proposal with the following conditions:

- The applicant must provide a report by a qualified hydrogeologist demonstrating that the proposed well system will not have a negative impact on existing wells in the area.
- The development must maintain the existing location for overland stormwater discharge.

- The Park District must provide concurrence with the proposed shared parking arrangement.

Regarding a second, 61 unit proposal

- 61 Unit Open Space Exhibit dated 07/23/2020
- 61 Unit PUD Plan prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated July 23, 2020.
- 61 Unit Tentative Plat of Subdivision dated prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated July 23, 2020.
- 61 Unit Preliminary Engineering Plan prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated July 23, 2020.
- 61 Unit Preliminary Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated July 23, 2020.

It is our understanding that the applicant has prepared this proposal as an alternate plan if they are unable to come to an agreement to incorporate the Park District property into the development. For further consideration of this proposal the applicant should:

- Revise the plan to preserve access to and parking for the Park District property and provide formal concurrence with the plan from the Park District.
- Provide a report by a qualified hydrogeologist demonstrating that the proposed well system will not have a negative impact on existing wells in the area.
- Provide a Traffic Impact Study including a narrative regarding parking for the site and the Park District property.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
City of Prospect Heights


Patrick J. Glenn, P.E., CFM
City Engineer

cc: Jodi McCarthy, P.E., CFM, GHA
William Grieve, GHA