



PLANNING
RESOURCES INC.

402 West Liberty Drive
Wheaton, Illinois 60187
Web: www.planres.com
P: 630.668.3788
F: 630.668.4125

Memorandum

P20129-256

To: Kimberly Flom, Senior Planner
Village of Orland Park

From: Lori M. Vierow, RLA
Assistant Director of Landscape Architecture

Juli E. Crane, PWS
Director of Environmental Studies

Date: 19 November 2009

Subject: Wolf Point Plaza
Landscape Review #4

The following is a review of the following documents pursuant to requirements of Section 6-305 Landscaping and Bufferyards:

- Tree Inventory C0.3, C0.4, by Craig R. Knoche & Associates, dated February 2, 2009
- Landscape Plan and Natural Area Monitoring Details, C4.1 and C4.2, by Craig R. Knoche & Associates, dated November 4, 2009
- Grading Plan, C2.1, by Craig R. Knoche & Associates, dated September 14, 2009
- Plan Commission Meeting Minutes, June 27, 2008

Review Comments

Bufferyards

On this site, four bufferyards exist (north, south, east and west).

North Bufferyard

The land use adjacent to the north bufferyard is estate residential, residential and open lands. The required bufferyard between the planned retail and the existing residential is bufferyard "D" with a minimum width of 60 feet. Assuming a length of 1,250 feet, a width of 60 feet, and a 25 percent ratio of evergreen trees and shrubs, required landscaping within this area is described as follows:

Plant Type	Required Quantity	Quantity Proposed	Difference
North Yard			
Canopy Trees* (Evergreen)	60 (15)	238 (159)	+178
Ornamental Trees	30	26	-4
Shrubs* (Evergreen)	238 (59)	238 (0)	--

* 25% of which should be evergreen

Comments & Recommendations – The petitioner has provided the required bufferyard width and the required plant materials per the screening comments received in the Plan Commission meeting minutes. In addition, the north bufferyard includes the 46 required trees towards mitigation; see the Tree Preservation section below.

South Bufferyard

The land use adjacent to the south bufferyard is residential supporting business and a large-scale planned development. The required bufferyard between the planned retail and RSB is bufferyard “B” with a width of 10 feet. The required bufferyard between the planned retail and the LSPD is bufferyard “D” with a width of 10 feet. Assuming a length of 1,250 feet, a width of 10 feet, and a 25 percent ratio of evergreen trees and shrubs, required landscaping within this area is described as follows:

Plant Type	Required Quantity	Quantity Proposed	Difference
South Yard			
Canopy Trees* (Evergreen)	73 (18)	40 (0)	-33
Ornamental Trees	35	15	-20
Shrubs* (Evergreen)	317 (79)	0 (187)	-130

* 25% of which should be evergreen

Comments & Recommendations – The petitioner has not met the plant material requirements. However, due to the narrow bufferyard width it is not feasible to meet the ordinance. The petitioner’s plan meets the intent of the ordinance and will provide a visual separation from the street and adjacent land use. We recommend approval of the plan as shown.

East Bufferyard

The land use adjacent to the east bufferyard is estate residential. The required bufferyard between the planned retail and existing estate residential is bufferyard “D” with a width of 15 ft. Assuming a length of 250 feet, a width of 25 feet, and a 25 percent ratio of evergreen trees and shrubs, required landscaping within this area is described as follows:

Plant Type	Required Quantity	Quantity Proposed	Difference
East Yard			
Canopy Trees* (Evergreen)	17 (4)	24 (5)	+7
Ornamental Trees	8	0	-8
Shrubs* (Evergreen)	70 (18)	47 (0)	-23

* 25% of which should be evergreen

Comments & Recommendations – The petitioner has not met the required number of shrubs or ornamental trees. However, due to the additional canopy trees proposed, we recommend approval of the plan as shown.

West Bufferyard

The land use adjacent to the west bufferyard is an existing retail center. The required bufferyard between the planned retail and existing retail is bufferyard “B” with a width of 12 feet. Assuming a length of 590 feet, a width of 12 feet, and a 25 percent ratio of evergreen trees and shrubs, required landscaping within this area is described as follows:

Plant Type	Required Quantity	Quantity Proposed	Difference
West Yard			
Canopy Trees* (Evergreen)	19 (5)	18 (0)	-1
Ornamental Trees	6	12	+6
Shrubs* (Evergreen)	94 (24)	0 (139)	+45

* 25% of which should be evergreen

Comments & Recommendations – The petitioner has not met the required number of evergreen trees. However, due to the additional ornamental trees proposed and the narrow width prohibiting the use of evergreen trees, we recommend approval of the plan as shown.

Parkway Trees

At 40-foot spacing, there are 30 required parkway trees along 159th Street and 15 required trees along Wolf Road. The parkway tree requirement has been met along 159th Street. The petitioner is proposing only 13 trees along Wolf Road; however, due to the large planting at the southwest corner and the required sight triangles, we recommend approval of the plan as shown.

Foundation Plantings

All buildings that front a dedicated street are required to provide a 10-foot landscaped area along 70 percent of the sides of the building. The petitioner has provided adequate foundation plantings that consist of a mixture of deciduous shrubs, evergreen shrubs and groundcover that provide seasonal color, texture and interest for all the buildings.

Parking Lot/Landscape Islands

The ordinance requires one landscaped island for every seven parking spaces, resulting in 126 required islands for this site. Each island is required to have one canopy tree and a minimum of one shrub per island, for a minimum of 126 required canopy trees and 126 shrubs. The petitioner has provided 116 canopy trees and 463 shrubs for the parking lot islands. The petitioner has not provided the required number of parking island trees; however due to the number of shrubs proposed, we recommend approval of the plan as shown.

Tree Preservation

The petitioner has submitted a Tree Survey prepared by Craig R. Knoche & Associates, dated February 2, 2009, indicating the species, size and condition of the 334 existing trees 4-inches and larger. Thirty trees are indicated by a graphic symbol to be removed due to the development. Per the Village Tree Preservation Standards, Section 6-305.1.C.1.b, 46 2.5-inch caliper trees or 23 four-inch-caliper trees are

required to meet the replacement standards. The petitioner has provided 46 mitigation trees. Tree protection details and notes have been added to the Landscape Plan.

Screening of Trash Enclosures/Utilities

The petitioner has indicated the location of three trash enclosures on the landscape plan and has provided appropriate screening.

Detention/Retention

A single basin occurs in the northeast portion of the site, near an existing non-jurisdictional wetland. With the bottom elevation the same as the NWL, the basin is designed as a “soggy bottom” facility. The landscape plan proposes dry-mesic prairie on the slopes and emergent vegetation in the basin bottom. The plans identify the Village of Orland Park as the party responsible for long-term management of the naturalized basin and the adjacent preserved wetland.

Per Village Ordinance, Section 6-413.F.2.b, hydrology information was provided for the 2-, 5-, 10- and 100-year storm events. Although not in graphical format, data were sufficient to assess the potential for success of proposed seed mixes relative to the anticipated frequency and extent of inundation. The basin will experience 2.13 feet of bounce in the 2-year storm and 4.89 feet in the 100-year storm. Duration data reflect full drawdown in 2 days for the 2-year storm and 3.42 days for the 100-year storm. These values are typical for urban stormwater basins. The proposed prairie mix should perform well on the upper and middle slope areas. Provided water levels are controlled in the basin bottom during the germination and establishment period (typically up to 2 months after installation), species in the emergent seed should perform in the basin bottom.

Clarification was not provided regarding where the IDOT #3 mix indicated on the grading plan will be installed. There are a number of species in that mix that would be disadvantageous to prairie development. Sheet C2.1 should be revised to clarify that IDOT #3 is not to be used where prairie landscape installation will occur.

As requested in the previous review, the specifications information should be provided discussing appropriate timeframes for native landscape seed installation, as those timeframes differ from traditional turfgrass installation timeframes.

In compliance with Section 6-413.G.2.d., the petitioner has provided a three-year (near-term) monitoring and maintenance program for all naturally landscaped areas. We provide the following clarifications and guidance:

- We note that monitoring is intended for the seeded areas; however, maintenance actions such as debris management and prescribed burning, should extend to include the preserved wetland.
- By way of clarification (as it has been a point of confusion on other projects), the low-maintenance turf cover criterion refers to cover by low-maintenance turf, not general vegetative cover (which could reflect a dominance of weeds).

It is our understanding that the Village will rezone the basin and preserved wetland as open space. In addition, the land will be deeded to the Village, who will be responsible for long-term management. As such, the intent of Section 6-414-B.1 is satisfied.

Wetlands

Per Plan Commission meeting minutes, a non-jurisdictional wetland exists in the northeast corner of the site that is part of a larger wetland system. The site plan shows the wetland preserved with a proposed adjacent detention basin. We assume the Village has documentation on file regarding the wetland delineation and a letter from the Corps of Engineers supporting the non-jurisdictional status.

Recommendation

Based on the aforementioned memos and plans, we recommend accepting the Tree Inventory C0.3, C0.4, by Craig R. Knoche & Associates, dated February 2, 2009, Landscape Plan and Natural Area Monitoring Details, C4.1 and C4.2, by Craig R. Knoche & Associates, dated November 4, 2009 subject to the following conditions:

- The petitioner confirms there is no seeding conflict between Sheet C.2 and the landscape plans; and
- The plans are revised to reflect general timeframes appropriate for native seed installation.

Please submit the following to Kimberly Flom at the Village of Orland Park. Your project will then be placed on the next Village Board meeting for Consent Agenda Approval.

1 full size set of drawings

1 reduced size set (no larger than 11x17)

Drawings may be submitted electronically in PDF format to kflom@orland-park.il.us