



# VILLAGE OF PALATINE

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

## PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES • NOVEMBER 15, 2022

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

### I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dennis Dwyer	Chairman	Present	
Patrick Noonan	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Teri Williams	Plan Commissioner	Excused	
Eric Friedman	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Plan Commissioner	Present	

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Plan Commission - Regular Meeting - Oct 18, 2022 7:00 PM

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Dwyer, Noonan, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Williams

### III. PUBLIC HEARING

### IV. CASE STAFF STATEMENTS

1. Preliminary Planned Development to allow a 9-unit (4 duplex units and 1 single unit) residential development at 874-912 N. Quentin Road

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing for Case #22-50 that was published in the Daily Herald on October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Preliminary Eng - Site Development Plan Rev 3
2. Preliminary Elevations
3. Draft 1<sup>st</sup> Floorplan Duplex Units
4. Eng - Grading - Existing Conditions Survey
5. Eng - Plat of Survey
6. Representational Elevation for material style - not proposed colors
7. Preliminary Duplex landscaping plan and landscaped buffer - west side of property - Carriageway Landing
8. Project Narrative
9. Preliminary Planned Development Application
10. Legal Notice

#### **Sworn in staff - Mr. Vyverberg**

#### **Sworn in Petitioner - CJ Johnson**

Mr. Johnson explains that he is proposing a 9-Unit residential development at 874-912 Quentin Road. It will be ranch-style units with separate driveways to the units and additional guest parking within the development. He states that he has met with the neighbors, adjacent to the proposed development, to discuss the project. They have been working on slight modifications to the preliminary plan to address their concerns regarding the rear yard setback.

Chairman Dwyer requests specifics regarding engineering and grading.

Mr. Vyverberg provides a summary of the property and reviews the previous requests for this vacant property. He presents a zoning map and aerial of the current property conditions at 874-912 Quentin Road.

He provides a site plan and references a contour map of the existing grading conditions. He presents preliminary elevations, with grading. Mr. Vyverberg states the village engineer reviewed the conceptual and preliminary engineering plans did not identify anything initially at the preliminary planned development. The final Village Engineer comments and recommendations will come through Final Planned Development, moving forward. Final engineering would be completed if preliminary planned development is approved. Volume control is required as part of the watershed management ordinance requirements (MWRD).

Chairman Dwyer asks if water detention would be at the south end of the property.

Mr. Vyverberg states that volume control is required (MWRD). Detention is not required, but the village has the right to impose if needed. The Final Engineering plans are not required, at this time. At this time, there are no known instances of historic structural flooding in the area. It could be a circumstance where only volume control would be required and a separate detention would not be required by the village.

Mr. Vyverberg clarifies the curb cuts for this property and explains that the preliminary plan identifies two unified curb cuts. Petitioner and their engineer also identified additional parking within the development for off street parking. He explains that each unit has two car garages, two parking spaces available on the driveway pad and 9 guest spaces throughout the development.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that utilities and infrastructure are existing and the new proposed development would tie into the existing. The water line is on the east side of Quentin and sanitary and storm are available, proximate to the subject property.

Mr. Vyverberg presents a preliminary floor plan and elevations and explains the design plan and style. He discussed the preliminary landscaping plan and states that arborvitae would be used for screening of properties to the west. If any existing trees could be maintained, they would be included in the conditions for the final landscaping plan.

Mr. Friedman inquires whether the village would apply any monotony code to this type of development.

Mr. Vyverberg states that it would be considered.

Mr. Johnson talks about the plan and the variations to each building and explains that all of the colors would be maintained.

Mr. Fedota questions the entrances and inquires the reason for 2 separate drives.

Mr. Johnson explains that the intent was to allow for privacy and deter traffic from flowing through the development. Each curb cut serves its' own set of buildings.

Mr. Kolososki states it is also a solution for snow plowing. Snow would be plowed into the area separating the two streets.

Mr. Bettenhausen questions the construction of the volume control detention pond.

Mr. Johnson explains it would be covered and would be like a French drain.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks about the outlet for the pond.

Mr. Johnson states it would be sized as per the engineer requirements.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks if any landscaping is proposed for the east property line along Quentin.

Mr. Johnson states the area will be buried and landscaped and a preliminary plan has been submitted.

Mr. Kolososki asks if the roof peaks would be consistent.

Mr. Johnson states that the grade difference would cause some slight differences but, generally, they would be.

Mr. Vyverberg reads two opposing resident letters that were received via email and reads them into the proceedings.

Chairman Dwyer requests confirmation from Mr. Johnson that the concerns will be addressed. Mr. Johnson confirms that they would be.

Sarah Murphy, resident of 925 N. Franklin Avenue is sworn in.

Ms. Murphy states that her concern is the minimal 40' set back and the reduction from the original 60' set back that was envisioned. She states that a minimal set back will have an impact on their homes and the loss of privacy. She requests that the developer work to maximize the rear set back and the height of the development. Ms. Murphy states her home is the closest to this development and a 40' set back only gives a 90' door to door distance to the residences. Ms. Murphy provides examples of other developments and their setbacks which are significantly higher. Ms. Murphy asks for two conditions to be considered. One is to maximize the rear setback and the second is to consider the elevation of the units which is 10-12' above their homes.

Chairman Dwyer asks Mr. Vyverberg to clarify the minimum setback for R2.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the minimum setback for R2 is 40'.

Mr. Friedman asks Ms. Murphy what her set back is.

Ms. Murphy states it should be a 50' set back but is closer to 48'.

Resident: Christine Lagosia, resident of 835 N. Franklin Avenue is sworn in.

Ms. Lagosia states her concern regarding the grading. She is concerned that improper grading would cause flooding to her home. She also is concerned about any retention ponds for this development and states that any type of pond would be a danger. Ms. Lagosia cites a tragedy in Elk Grove Village that she witnessed and ultimately was a law suit. She also believes setbacks allow for any errors after foundations are poured and an increase in the setback would cover these types of errors.

Mr. Johnson states that there will not be a retention pond and there will not be a pool of water. There may be a detention pond but this will be determined once final engineering is completed. He reiterates that there will not be a retention pond.

Chairman Dwyer states there will be volume control on the property and there may be water puddling after a storm.

Resident - Julie Picchiotti, resident of 939 N. Franklin Avenue is sworn in.

Questions the elevation of the subject property and the impact it will have on her house. She would like a better understanding as to whether there will be water

drained to her property.

Mr. Johnson states that they are required to pitch any water drainage onto the subject development and water will not drain to any surrounding properties.

Mr. Fedota asks if decks are an option for the new development property.

Mr. Johnson states that no deck structure will encroach into the 40' setback.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Since its incorporation into the Village, the Subject Property has maintained a variety of land uses. Given its direct adjacency to single-family residential uses on along the west side of the property and multi-family uses directly across Poplar Street, an identified land use for the property has not been established, notwithstanding the unimplemented memory care use. The proposed density is appropriate for the land use and the plans would reduce the number of existing access points to the site. With an established parking ration of 5 spaces/unit, Staff does not have any existing parking concerns with the proposal. Also, the height of the ranch-style homes, should not impact the surrounding residential properties.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:

1. **All extra agency permits shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
2. **The Engineers Estimate of Probable Cost (EEOPC) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
3. **Review fees, based upon the finally accepted EEOPC shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
4. **The Final Architectural Plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Community Development/Planning and Zoning, including the final material quantities and distribution.**
5. **The Final Engineering Plans shall be submitted and revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
6. **The Final Landscaping Plan shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. The plan should review the ability to maintain any of the existing healthy trees within the property.**
7. **A Public Improvement letter of credit in an amount of 115% of the approved EEOPC, for said public improvements, shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
8. **A Planned Development Letter of Credit in the amount of \$90,000 - (\$10,000/unit, per Article 14 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.**

- 9. If required, a Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning. As determined by the Village Attorney, the HOA declarations shall be submitted and revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.
- 10.A construction management plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and the Village Engineer and shall outline the proposed development schedule and identify the material delivery routes and proposed parking areas for the contractors, in conjunction with the building permit application submission.

**Mr. Noonan made a motion to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Kolososki.**

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Noonan states that the petitioner has utilized the property.

Mr. Fedota states it is a reasonable development and is a good use of the land.

Mr. Kolososki states that the petitioner, Mr. Johnson, appears to have done his homework and the ranch style quad homes would be ideal for this property.

Chairman Dwyer states that they have taken into consideration the resident's concerns and has been cooperative in addressing their concerns.

Mr. Friedman asks if they would want to add the set back to the conditions.

**Mr. Noonan made a motion to accept Case #22-50 with a rear setback increase. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Mr. Kolososki**

**The motion was unanimously approved.**

**Chairman Dwyer summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This will tentatively go to Village Council on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022.**

**Communication:**

Village Council reviewed the proposed apartment complex at Brockway and Palatine Rd and was unanimously approved.

Plan Commission meeting will possibly be cancelled for 12/6/22 and anticipates a 12/20/22 meeting.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Dwyer, Noonan, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Williams

**V. COMMUNICATIONS**

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**