



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

VILLAGE HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS 200 E. WOOD STREET
PALATINE, IL 60067-5339 – (847) 359-9050
<http://www.palatine.il.us>

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES • JANUARY 14, 2025

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Patrick Noonan	Commissioner	Present	
Cindy Roth-Wurster	Commissioner	Absent	
Eric Friedman	Vice Chairperson	Present	
Jan Wood	Chairperson	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Absent	
Stephen Fedota	Commissioner	Absent	
Tim Schubert	Commissioner	Present	

II. MEETING MINUTES

1. Planning and Zoning Commission - Regular Meeting - Dec 10, 2024 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Schubert
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh, Fedota

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 518 N Brockway Street

VAR-000148-2024 – 518 N Brockway Street

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on December 26th, 2024 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

- . Application
- . Proof of Ownership
- . Plat of Survey
- . Site Plan
- . Public Notice
- . Subject and Surrounding Property Zoning Map

Staff - Mr. Vyverberg provides background:

The Subject Property is zoned R-1 Single Family and is approximately 7,767 square feet. The lot currently consists of a single-family home, with a 2-car detached garage in the rear yard. The existing lot coverage is approximately 47%, which exceeds the underlying maximum R-1 lot coverage of 35% and is legally non-conforming.

The Petitioner is proposing to rezone the Subject Property to R-2 single-family residential. In addition to the requested rezoning, the proposed plans include removing and replacing the existing asphalt and pavers at the rear of the home. The Petitioner also intends to construct a patio using permeable pavers to enhance the property's drainage features, but will increase the overall lot coverage. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to R-2 Single Family Residential District. Variation to permit lot coverage to be 52%, instead of the maximum permitted 45%.

Sworn in petitioner: Graham Pearce – 518 N Brockway, Palatine

Mr. Pearce explains that he would like to repave part of his driveway and add a patio adjacent to it using permeable pavers. Referring to the site plan, he describes the proposed changes and clarifies that the rezoning request is intended to align his property with the surrounding properties. He notes that his property is currently zoned R1, but its size—7,700 square feet—is significantly smaller than the 20,000-square-foot minimum standard for R1 zoning. Rezoning to R2 would bring the property into alignment with the surrounding neighborhood and address current non-compliance issues, such as the house being out of standard for setback requirements in R1.

Additionally, the lot coverage variance under R2 zoning would be more appropriate for the property's size. He emphasizes that the primary reason for

this request is to address drainage issues that are causing problems in his basement. By using permeable pavers, he aims to improve the drainage on the property and mitigate these issues effectively.

Michael Stephanidis (238 S Benton St, Palatine), sworn in as the contractor for the paving project, explains the current drainage issues on the property. He describes the existing horseshoe drainage system, noting that the property drains toward the back of the house, where two window wells are located. The driveway is currently an impervious surface that slopes toward the house, exacerbating water issues. Additionally, the property is enclosed by a fence, leaving no alternative route to divert water effectively. He mentions that a sump pump has been used in the window wells as a temporary solution.

Mr. Stephanidis outlines his plan to install permeable pavers, explaining how this method would mitigate the drainage problem. The installation would allow water to seep into the ground instead of flowing toward the house, alleviating the issue. He also highlights that extending the patio would further aid in diverting water away from the house.

He states that he consulted with the village engineer, George, who initially assumed the property was zoned R2. However, the property is zoned R1, which permits only 35% lot coverage. By rezoning to R2, the homeowner would have a more appropriate lot coverage allowance, aligning with the proposed drainage solution. The engineer agreed that the rezoning and the installation of permeable pavers would be beneficial to address the homeowner's issues effectively.

Commissioner Kolososki inquires whether Mr. Stephanidis has experience installing this type of paver system.

Mr. Stephanidis confirms that he has and provides additional details about the installation process, explaining how the permeable pavers will help mitigate the drainage issues by allowing water to filter through the surface and be absorbed into the ground rather than pooling near the house.

Commissioner Kolososki then asks if the village engineering department requested a grading plan for the project.

Mr. Stephanidis replies that no grading plan was requested by engineering.

Commissioner Kolososki further questions whether alternative solutions for addressing the yard's drainage problems were considered.

Mr. Stephanidis explains that addressing the driveway drainage by running a system to the street would be prohibitively expensive. The proposed method, involving permeable pavers and patio extension, is a cost-effective and practical solution that will resolve the drainage issue efficiently.

Commissioner Schubert asks for details about the proposed pergola.

Mr. Stephanidis explains that the pergola is a prefabricated kit, not part of the drainage plan, and is not located on the patio area.

Commissioner Schubert inquires if the pergola will be enclosed.

Mr. Stephanidis confirms that it will not be enclosed.

Commissioner Schubert questions whether runoff from the pergola's roof could lead to drainage issues near the house.

Mr. Stephanidis responds that the pergola will be installed below grade, with the surrounding pavers forming part of the permeable system to manage water runoff.

Commissioner Schubert asks if the pergola will be a permanent structure.

Mr. Stephanidis confirms that it will be permanent and measures 12x12 feet.

Chairman Wood asks whether the area around the pergola will utilize permeable materials.

Mr. Stephanidis confirms this, noting that the pavers surrounding the pergola will be permeable and that water from the roof will drain into the system.

Chairman Wood asks if the pergola will have concrete piers.

Mr. Stephanidis confirms that it will.

Commissioner Schubert inquires if there will be any raised landscaping along the patio.

Mr. Stephanidis states that no raised landscaping will be added, as they do not want to obstruct water flow. He explains that the water drains naturally from west to east, with a swale between his property and the neighbors'.

Chairman Wood asks if the neighboring property has any drainage issues.

Mr. Stephanidis says he is not aware of any.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the water drainage issues stem from rainfall on the driveway that flows back toward the house.

Mr. Stephanidis confirms that this is the case and reiterates that the proposed permeable paver system is designed to resolve this issue effectively.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that the current R1 zoning designation dates back to when the property was platted in 1966 and annexed into the village in 1972, at which point it was zoned R1. He notes that the lot size is comparable to other properties in the surrounding area.

He states that he is not aware of any other drainage issues in the vicinity and supports the use of permeable pavers as a viable solution for the property's drainage concerns. Furthermore, he believes the request to rezone to R2 is reasonable and appropriate.

Mr. Vyverberg emphasizes that stormwater concerns are not unique to this property and that the village engineer has raised no objections to the proposed plan.

Commissioner Friedman inquires whether there are specific gazebo requirements regarding the separation distance from the residence and whether the proposed placement complies with regulations.

Mr. Vyverberg confirms that the gazebo placement complies with current codes, noting that requirements have been updated, and the structure meets all necessary standards as shown in the plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The R-2 rezoning request would bring the Subject Property closer into conformance underlying setbacks and bulk standards. As noted, all of the existing substandard qualities of the Subject Property are legal non-conformities. The R-2 zoning would also align with the surrounding R-2 lots. The Petitioner proposes to increase lot coverage while utilizing permeable pavers to mitigate drainage concerns and address existing issues. Nevertheless, the rezoning to R-

2 diminishes the amount of lot coverage relief necessary and reflects the anticipated type of relief for lot coverage improvements to an existing property. The Village Engineer has reviewed the proposal and does not have any stormwater management concerns in the immediate area.

The rezoning to R-2 would comply with the current minimum lot size requirement for the R-2 district (pre-1958 platting) of 5,400 square feet and represents a typical platted R-2 lot size from both this era and area of the Village. Given the existing conditions and the absence of stormwater management concerns, Staff recommends approval of the Rezoning and Variation, subject to the following condition:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the site plan submitted by the Contractor, Michael Stephanidis, Natural Innovations Landscaping, except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village's Codes and Ordinances.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Schubert made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Noonan.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Schubert: States that rezoning to R2 makes sense as it aligns better with the lot size. Commends the project as a valuable addition to the property, noting that it will help address water drainage issues without causing problems for neighboring properties.

Chairman Wood agrees, observing that the property is currently zoned differently from neighboring lots, which were platted nearly 100 years ago. Notes that the proposed zoning is a practical solution to address setbacks and drainage concerns, and expresses support for the request.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on February 3rd, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Schubert, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Patrick Noonan, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Schubert
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh, Fedota

2. 249 E. Palatine Road

SU-000135-2024 – 249 E. Palatine Road

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on December 26, 2024 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application
2. Plat of Survey
3. Proposed Renovation Plans
4. Site Plan
5. Real Estate Disclosure
6. Public Notice

Background:

Mr. Vyverberg indicates that the Petitioner is requesting a Special Use and Variation to permit the continued operation of a 2-unit multi-family dwelling at 249 E. Palatine Road. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting Special Use to permit a non-conforming multi-family (duplex) dwelling (3-units or less) for which legal documentation indicating that the dwelling conforms to the Zoning Ordinance cannot be provided. Variation to permit a non-conforming multi-family (duplex) dwelling that has not been in continuous operation since January 1, 1987. Variation to permit lot coverage to be 80%, instead of the maximum permitted 45%. As an existing condition, the lot coverage is approximately 69%.

The subject property is zoned R-2 Single Family and was part of the Prairie View Addition to Palatine subdivision in 1927. The existing residence was improved as a two-family duplex and detached 2-car garage.

Sworn in petitioner: Bhaskar Malhotra – 40 Shenandoah Circle, South Barrington, IL – Owner

Mr. Malhotra explains that he purchased the home in 2022, noting that it was vacant and in poor condition at the time. Shares that the home was previously used as a duplex, with separate residents on the first and second floors, each having its own kitchen and utility boxes. Clarifies that the basement, accessible only from the first floor, will be used exclusively for storage, as the ceiling height is unsuitable for conversion into living space and would not meet Code.

Commissioner Wood asks whether the property was recently used as a duplex. Mr. Malhotra explains that the home has been vacant for some time and that he does not have information on when it was last used for this purpose.

Commissioner Wood inquires about the presence of two separate entrances. Mr. Malhotra confirms that there are two entrances but notes that they do not meet current code. Adds that his remodeling plans will address this issue and mentions that he has hired an architect for the project.

Chairman Wood asks if the garage at the rear of the lot will be demolished. Mr. Malhotra confirms that the garage will be removed to extend the driveway, providing additional parking spaces and creating room for a turnaround. Explains that this will prevent vehicles from having to back out onto the busy street in front of the house.

Chairman Wood asks staff about the parking requirements for multi-housing duplex units.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the requirement is two spaces per unit, totaling four spaces.

Chairman Wood inquires if the four parking spaces can be provided without increasing the lot coverage.

Mr. Malhotra emphasizes that removing the garage and creating a turnaround is the best solution for safety, as it eliminates the need for vehicles to back onto the busy road.

Commissioner Friedman asks for clarification on the egress or access to 2nd story unit.

Sworn In: David Bus – 109 Ginger Court -Rolling Meadows, IL – Architect for project

Mr. Bus explains that the access to the second-floor unit will be via a rear stairway. The existing side access is non-conforming, and the new rear stairway will meet code requirements. The first-story unit will also have access through this newly constructed stairway at the back of the building.

Chairman Wood asks if there will be any exterior improvements. Mr. Bus confirms there will be, most notably the new stairway, front porch, siding, and windows.

Commissioner Schubert asks if there is one entrance from the rear patio deck. Mr. Bus confirms that is correct, and adds that there are already two electrical meters and panels, two kitchens, and separate entrances existing within the home.

Commissioner Schubert inquires if the tenants will have access to the basement. Mr. Malhotra states that only the first floor will have access to the basement.

Commissioner Schubert wonders if additional bedrooms could be added in the basement.

Mr. Malhotra clarifies that the basement is not conforming for living space and the space would not meet the Code requirements.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks about the width of the driveway. Mr. Bus states that it will remain 12 feet wide, the same as the existing driveway. He adds there will be a small strip of green space between the driveway and the house, and they are proposing a new curb along the east property line to divert rainwater runoff toward Palatine Road.

Commissioner Bettenhausen comments that the yard is being paved over and the turnaround area seems larger than necessary and asks if it can be reduced in size to reduce lot coverage.

Mr. Bus explains that the civil engineer designed the turnaround to provide the

smallest amount of pavement while allowing adequate space for traffic flow. While more green space could be incorporated, this design is the most effective solution for accommodating four parking spots and the turning radius.

Chairman Wood inquires if the tenants will be responsible for maintaining landscaping.

Mr. Malhotra confirms that he will maintain the landscaping, as the landlord/owner of the property.

Chairman Wood wonders if there are any known drainage issues at the property.

Mr. Malhotra states he is not aware of any drainage issues. He notes the current property is dilapidated, and he plans to bring it up to code.

Commissioner Friedman asks about the stair system and the driveway, if units will have their own bins and where waste management will be stored.

Mr. Malhotra states each unit will have its own garbage cans.

Mr. Bus adds that there is storage space for trash bins and room for air conditioning units

Commissioner Kosoloski notes that the plans show the removal of an exterior tank and asks what it was used for.

Mr. Bus responds that it is a mystery, as the tank is currently filled with water, and he is unsure

Mr. Vyverberg states that in 1997, the Village adopted a Code Amendment and process to recognize legally created duplexes and triplexes, which are located in single-family residentially zoned properties. These are non-conforming multi-family properties of 3-units or less, which provides a special use to reestablishment of the use within a single-family residential district. The home was originally constructed as a duplex. The property to the west is zoned R-3, but the structure is similar circumstance, albeit with a different zoning classification. The petitioner is going through the appropriate process to request the use as a duplex, as was originally constructed and approved. The plans include improving the property's interior and proposed lot coverage of 80%, while higher than typical, would provide the required parking.

Chairman Wood asks if parking can be established, without exceeding the 80% lot coverage.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the civil engineer prepared the plan, which were reviewed by the Village Engineer. The plans could be further refined through the permitting process. The zoning entitlement plans are not in a final form.

Chairman Wood clarifies that the property is currently zoned R-2 for single-family homes. Asks if a new multi-family dwelling is allowed in R-2.

Mr. Vyverberg states that a new multi-family use would require rezoning or a planned development process. The current example is also allowed for existing multi-family structures. He adds that there are existing multi-family homes in the village in zones that typically don't allow that. This home was lawfully built and allowed as a duplex and identified in the 1997 amendment as an existing multi-family use in a single-family residential district.

Chairman Wood asks about the difference between a special use and variation for a non-conforming property. Is it addressing the same issue?

Mr. Vyverberg explains that the request is for a special use, and the variation is because they are unable to demonstrate continuous operation since 1987. He

notes the property was originally approved and constructed as a two-unit structure with two kitchens.

Commissioner Kolososki asks if the basement would require a permit if used as living space, and if parking requirements would change. Mr. Vyverberg states that the basement would not be allowed as living space under the proposed special use, as it is designated for storage and any use would be in violation of the Special Use approval.

Mr. Schubert asks if a storm drain would be required. Mr. Vyverberg states that a drainage plan is part of the requirement and reviews the proposed conditions.

Commissioner Friedman expresses concern about the safety of the remodel, noting that there is only one entrance for each unit. He mentions that the front porch is no longer an entryway and may be confusing for first responders. Mr. Vyverberg assures that Fire Marshal reviewed the plans and the building would have to be sprinklered. Any other matters would be addressed during the permit process, but there were not other specific issues raised during the zoning review.

Sworn In: Phil Yoder - 255 E Palatine Road –

Mr. Yoder states that he appreciates the curb along the driveway, but it doesn't address the existing flooding issue. He indicated that he does not have an issue with the use, but is concerned about stormwater. There is an existing catch basin at the corner of Glenwood Street and Palatine Road, but it doesn't handle the existing drainage. The water has crested the curb multiple times, with waves reaching his stoop, which is 30 feet away from the street. It's not runoff from the property, but rather additional impervious surfacing that has diverted water into the storm system, which he is concerned cannot accommodate it.

Commissioner Schubert asks if the runoff is coming from the parking lot across the street.

Mr. Yoder states that is true and the Park District added mulch, which contributes to the overflow. The Park District also installed a catch basin on the north side of Palatine Road.

Mr. Yoder adds that the ground surrounding the house keeps getting elevated due to the organic matter that continues to blow onto the property. He mentions a manhole in the street, but does not believe that it is intended for drainage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Mr. Vyverberg indicates that the Subject Property was developed and utilized as a duplex, within the Village for many years. As part of the 1997 text amendment to allow multi-family uses (up to 3 units), to pursue a special use to allow, the Subject Property was listed and identified as being a duplex and known legally non-conforming use. Additionally, as the home was legally established and utilized, as a duplex, the Code allows for a process to maintain the previously allowed use of the property. Also, the properties directly west are both zoned and utilized for multi-family residential uses.

Although the home has been unoccupied, the proposed renovations are not

expanding the underlying density and the required sprinkler system and engineering renovations should improve the existing circumstances. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

- . The Special Use and Variations shall substantially conform to the architecture plans prepared by Acbo Architects dated 9/11/2024 except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village's Codes and Ordinances.
 - . A final drainage plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer, in conjunction with the build permit application. As a component of the drainage plan, the hard surface parking area will be required to drain to Palatine Road. The existing storm dry well shall be inspected and must be verified to not be connected to the public sanitary sewer. As part of the building permit submission, verification that the water service from the public water main to the home is not lead or galvanized must be completed. If the home is found to have a lead or galvanized water service it shall be required to replace the water service from the public water main up to the water meter.
 - . If the home does not currently have overhead sanitary sewer, the sanitary sewer in the building shall be converted to overhead sewer. The Sanitary ejector pump shall be inspected/reconstructed to remove any footing drains from connection to the home's sanitary sewer.
4. Any proposed work within Palatine Road ROW, will require an IDOT permit.

Mr. Vyverberg addresses the resident, stating that the village engineer and Petitioner's consultants will be contacted to discuss the concerns. Staff will also consult with Mr. Yoder accordingly.

Commissioner Noonan asks if an additional condition should be added to address the drainage issue.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the existing conditions require that final plan must be approved by the Village Engineer.

Commissioner Bettenhausen inquires whether the width of the parking area can be part of the discussion.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the PZC can amend or add conditions to the request as part of the deliberations and the final site plan and impervious plan must be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Schubert expresses concerns regarding access to the basement area and potential misuse of the space. Also raises concerns about egress and access to the second-floor unit.

Chairman Wood states that she is in favor of the project. She likes the idea of renovating the property and making it a safe home for two families. She appreciates that the owner is local and will be present to maintain the property. Commissioner Kolososki suggests that engineering should explore other solutions for the impervious surfaces. However, he notes that the project will be a nice improvement to the dilapidated home.

Chairman Wood requested that the PZC review the request into (3) separate approvals.

Commissioner Schubert made a motion to approve and Commissioner Kolososki seconded the Special Use to permit a non-conforming (duplex) for which legal documentation indicating that the dwelling conforms to the zoning ordinance cannot be provided. The Planning and Zoning Commission summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0.

Commissioner Noonan motioned to approve and Commissioner Kolososki seconded the Variation to Permit a non-conforming multi-family (duplex) – dwelling, which has not been in continuous operation, since January 1, 1987. Summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0

Commissioner Noonan motioned to approve and Commissioner Schubert seconded the Variation to permit the lot with the Lot Coverage to be 80% Summarized that this request has been approved with a vote of 4-2 (Bettenhausen, Wood)

This item will tentatively go to Village Council February 3, 2025

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Schubert, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Robert Kolososki, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Schubert
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh, Fedota

3. 1572 N Rand Road

SU-000144-2024 – 1572 N. Rand Road

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on December 26, 2024 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

- . Application
- . Site Plans
- . Business Plan
- . Real Estate Interest Disclosure Plan
- . Certificate of Publication
- . Business Plan

Background:

The Subject Property (2 separate lots) is zoned B-2 (general business) was annexed in 1996, with a lot area of approximately 0.92 acres. The current use contains a restaurant with a drive-thru and a vacant lot in the rear. The Petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing building and construct a drive-thru only coffee shop - 7 Brew. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting a Special Use to permit a restaurant, with a drive-thru.

Sworn in petitioner: Chris George – 2650 N Southport Avenue, Chicago, IL

Mr. George, the petitioner, represents Who Brew LLC, the franchisee for 7 Brew Coffee. The request is for a special use permit to allow a restaurant with a drive-thru on a property zoned B-2. He outlines the proposal for a 7 Brew Coffee with double drive-thru lanes, including a 501 SF main building and a 238 SF cooler and dry storage area.

He describes the business model, emphasizing a non-traditional service experience where employees use iPads to take orders directly at car windows. This approach focuses on speed, high energy, and a fun, friendly environment. A sample menu is provided, showcasing a beverage-only concept. The proposed hours of operation are 5:30 AM to 10 PM on weekdays, extending to 11 PM on weekends. The business will employ one full-time employee and 40 part-time employees, with an expected daily volume of 750 orders and 1,100 customers. He discusses the plat of survey and surrounding properties. Plans include installing an 8-foot-high fence along the west side of the property to create a buffer between the commercial site and adjacent multifamily properties. He notes the removal of a non-conforming billboard currently on the property as part of the project.

In presenting the site plan, he discussed the 510 SF main building, the 238 SF cooler and dry storage structure, and the use of existing access drives. The

double drive-thru accommodates 24 stacking spaces, and there are 11 parking spaces. Both exceed code requirements.

Mr. George explains how walk-up customers are accommodated in the drive-thru system. Sliding doors on both sides of the building will direct walk-up customers to a designated service location, with team members assisting, as needed. He also presents renderings and elevations of the building, noting that signage will comply with allowable limits.

Commissioner Schubert asks why the cooler and dry storage is separate from the building.

Mr. George states it is a corporate standard. It was moved outside the building to allow for an additional service station inside the building.

Commissioner Schubert asks if the public is allowed inside the building. Mr. George states there are no seats; the interior is designated as the kitchen area.

Commissioner Schubert inquires about allowing restroom use inside the building. Mr. George states he would need to check with the village, and if required, they would accommodate.

Commissioner Schubert asks where the garbage is located. Mr. George shows the location on the site plan.

Commissioner Schubert requests clarification on the buffer area. Mr. Vyverberg states there would be a landscaping maintenance and screening requirement.

Chairman Wood clarifies the business hours and raises concerns about traffic issues in and out of the business, noting it is a busy area. She asks how this issue will be addressed.

Mr. George states that traffic concerns have been discussed. He explains that the spaces and drive-thru are designed to accommodate the expected number of cars and assures they will work to address any issues if they arise.

Chairman Wood asks about the plans for Parcel 2. Mr. George states it will remain green space. He mentions that engineering has reviewed it and explains that it will be used for volume control requirements. Parcel 2 will remain impervious, and both parcels will meet MWRD stormwater management standards.

Commissioner Bettenhausen requests clarification on the fence installation. Mr. George refers to the plat of survey and identifies the location of the fence installation.

Commissioner Schubert asks if the billboard will be removed, and Commissioner Friedman asks if that includes the monument sign.

Mr. George confirms that the billboard will be removed and will not be replaced.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks how employee safety will be addressed, particularly under weather conditions.

Mr. George explains that employees will have access to heaters, jackets, and potentially warming huts. Employees will rotate throughout the day, typically working part-time in four-hour shifts.

Mr. Vyverberg further states that the billboard will be removed as part of the recommendation, and he has been working with the petitioner and property owner on this matter. He confirms that the proposal complies with the code in the B-2 district and addresses the queuing impact on Rand Road. Should it become

an issue, the petitioner has committed to resolving it promptly. Mr. Vyverberg mentions that Staff visited the Naperville location and observed effective traffic management of customers, with fluidity in staffing and routing. He also notes that the existing restaurant previously has a drive-thru that was approved, as a component of the use.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks if the billboard removal includes the post and foundation.

Mr. Vyverberg reviews the condition for billboard removal, which is part of the staff recommendation and indicates that it must be completed in a manner acceptable to the Village, which would include the base.

Commissioner Friedman asks about the cooler structure and dry goods storage, questioning whether these are auxiliary or ancillary structures to the primary building and whether their location on the side of the building is compliant, as such structures are typically at the rear.

Mr. Vyverberg confirms that the proposal does not conflict with any village codes or planning and zoning standards, at this stage of review.

Commissioner Schubert comments that the concept is unique and integral to the brand's identity, noting that it has been incorporated into their design standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed drive-through use and coffee shop is consistent with both many of the surrounding uses in this area of the Rand Road corridor and the current drive-through restaurant. The proposed site plan meets or exceeds all of the Village's minimum zoning requirements. As an existing circumstance, there is a billboard on the subject property, which dates to annexation from unincorporated Cook County and that the property owner has agreed to remove. Additionally, there is approximately 90 feet of greenspace from the adjacent residential lots to the west. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the plans prepared by Toth & Associates submitted 11/12/2024, floor plan and elevations prepared by Veritas Architecture and Design dated 8/29/2024 and the business plan submitted by the Petitioner, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The traffic directional signage plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
3. The final landscaping plan and shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
4. A MWRD permit shall be required or a permit determination letter stating that a MWRD permit is not required. Cash in Lieu of Detention fee, as outlined in Section 8.08 of Appendix B of the Village Code of Ordinances, will be required if the MWRD does not mandate detention.
5. IDOT Permit will be required if any work is within the right of way of Rand Road.
6. As a condition of the Special Use review, the property owner shall effectuate the removal of the existing billboard in the southeast corner of the property, along Rand Road, no later than 12/31/2027 in a manner acceptable to the Village. The removal will include both any necessary permitting and site restoration, also in a

manner acceptable to the Village. Any existing billboard lease rights regarding the billboard shall also not be extended past the 2027 deadline.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Schubert Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Noonan.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kolososki states that, aside from the anticipated traffic issue, he likes the concept.

Chairman Wood comments that the proposal makes sense for the area, noting the inclusion of many stacking spaces and expressing hope that traffic does not back up. She acknowledges that this is the only potential negative consequence but trusts that the petitioner will work to mitigate it. She concludes that she is comfortable with the request.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on February 3, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Schubert, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Patrick Noonan, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Schubert
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh, Fedota

4. 660 N Hicks Road

SU-000126-2024 – 660 N Hicks Road

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on December 26th, 2024 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

- . Application
- . Business Plan
- . Site Plan
- . Public Notice
- . Group Exhibit – Letters of Support

Background:

Mr. Vyverberg indicated that the Subject Property is zoned Planned Development and is part of the Renaissance Subdivision. It follows the B-1 requirements for permitted and special uses. The current uses, within the Subject Building, include a mixture of office, medical, and home interior services.

The Petitioner is proposing to purchase and convert the existing office building to accommodate both the existing Grow Music School and to open a partnering Montessori Academy, within the same building. Per the submitted floor plan, there will be 2 rental units outside of the scope for the Montessori and Music School. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting a Special Use to permit a Montessori School at the subject property.

Sworn in petitioner: Mallory Miller, Grow Montessori Academy

Ms. Miller explains that she presented another location to the Planning and Zoning Commission in October and has since been searching for a suitable property to accommodate her business. She states that the building is a standalone structure and she plans to utilize the existing space for classrooms and music rooms, while maintaining two rental tenant spaces. She further explains that the Montessori school would initially accommodate 60 students across two classrooms, operating from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m., with the music school running from 3:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. The Montessori school would start with six employees, expanding to nine, while the music school would start with three employees. She highlights the parking lot as a significant advantage, featuring a circular drive and 42 parking spaces that can support the operations, along with a fenced-in playground area.

Chairman Wood asks if the current tenants will remain in the building. Ms. Miller states that the tenants will not stay, except for the two office spaces. She explains that she will assume their leases, and they will remain, until her school grows, at which point the school will take over those spaces and come back to the Village to amend the Special Use.

Commissioner Schubert inquires about additional acoustic sound barriers for the music rooms. Ms. Miller states that the music rooms currently have sound barriers, which will continue to be used, as they specialize in teaching classical piano. She assures that sound will not be an issue.

Chairman Wood requests further clarification regarding the music room.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks if the circular driveway and parking lot will accommodate the anticipated expansion. Ms. Miller confirms that it will and explains the planned drop-off and pick-up procedures.

Chairman Wood asks where overflow parking will be located during special occasions. Ms. Miller suggests that the library could serve as an option.

Commissioner Schubert asks if the fencing will extend to Hicks. Ms. Miller states that a 4-foot fence will be installed in that area, along with a garden.

Commissioner Friedman asks about any landscaping plans for 1st Bank Drive. Ms. Miller responds that there is no landscaping plan for that area (right-of-way).

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks about the color of the fence. Ms. Miller states that it will be a solid 6-foot dark brown fence.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the building is a standalone structure and the petitioner will have full control over all the units. While the space will not be fully utilized initially, the business plan indicates that it would be, as the business grows. He notes that a special use amendment will be required in the future. Referring to the site plan, he provides additional details on the fencing and mentions that there will be outdoor functionality for the recreation area. He concludes that the parking is appropriate for the proposed use.

Sworn In: Mary Stupin – 429 E Pebble Creek Drive

She indicates that she lives across Hicks Road from the location and is in support of project and look forward to the addition to the area. She is not concerned about any noise from the music.

Sworn In: Andrew Mars – 1151 Paddock Drive.

He states that he has been working with Mallory in finding a property to fit the needs of the school. He believes that this is a good solution for Palatine and her business and supports the request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioner proposes to establish a Montessori school, within in the Renaissance Planned Development. While the Planned Development primarily operates as an office park, it does include an existing daycare and exterior outdoor area, south of the Subject Property. The proposed location is situated on the northern edge of the Renaissance Development and features a dedicated parking lot, with an entrance/exit directly off N. Hicks Road. The site includes over 42 available parking spaces, which should minimize traffic impacts, in addition to the school's queueing and start time plans.

The Montessori School and the proposed Music School will operate during different hours, further mitigating any potential traffic concerns on Hicks Road.

Given these considerations, the proposed use is not expected to cause substantial injury to the value of surrounding properties. The outdoor areas would ultimately be components of the Planning and Zoning Commission's review and Village Council's determination. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use and Variation shall substantially conform to the Site Plan, Business Plan, and Floor Plan submitted by the Petitioner, Mallory Miller, except as such plans may be change to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. Any final traffic directional signage or pavement markings for a one-way drive aisle, or pick-up and drop-off locations, shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
3. The final fencing plan and landscaping plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Kolososki Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Schubert.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Schubert states that the proposed use and location for the business is excellent. The plan looks good and the driveway and pick-up system are great. He believes there will be no negative impact, praising the business plan, the use of the building, and the safety of the area.

Commissioner Kolososki agrees and supports the plan.

Chairman Wood also agrees, noting that office space is in less demand and alternatives like schools are needed. The growing arts sector is a great fit for the building. While she has concerns regarding the direction of traffic, pavement markings, landscaping, and fencing, she acknowledges these will be submitted to the village for approval. She appreciates the business staying in the area.

Commissioner Friedman recalls issues from the previous request regarding the play area and basketball area but notes that these are not concerns in this request. However, he expresses concern about the busy traffic on 1st Bank Drive and the gate on the proposed fence, which could be opened to retrieve balls or play equipment. He emphasizes the importance of ensuring that activities are offered in a safe manner, with trained staff on hand.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on February 3, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Robert Kolososki, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Tim Schubert, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Schubert
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh, Fedota

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

There will be (3) Items on the Agenda for the 1/28/25 Meeting

The Banquet space on Dundee Rd was not approved by the Village Council

V. ADJOURNMENT