



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 • OCTOBER 24, 2023

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	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Commissioner	Present	
Tim Schubert		Present	

II. MEETING MINUTES

1. Planning and Zoning Commission - Regular Meeting - Oct 10, 2023 7:00 PM

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

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 411 E. Glencoe Avenue

RESULT:	CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Eric Friedman, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER:	Patrick Noonan, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota, Schubert
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh

2. 1835 N. Laurel Drive

SU-000071-2023 - 1835 N. Laurel Drive

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on October 5th, 2023 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Proof of Ownership**
2. **Petitioner Email**
3. **August 9, 2022 ZBA Materials**
4. **Site Plan**
5. **Public Notice**

Mr. Bradshaw outlines the request and explains that the petitioner is proposing to install a 4-foot privacy fence in the front yard, with a 13-foot setback and landscaping. The fence would transition to a 6-foot solid wood fence to enclose a portion of the required front yard, with a 22-foot setback and continue into the interior side yard. He further states that a portion of the proposed fence that abuts E. Aster Avenue will have a minimum setback of approximately 13 feet from the front line, with landscaping. The new fence would replace an existing front yard fence which is set back approximately 6 inches from the Aster Avenue property line. The request is a special use to permit a fence in the required front yard.

Sworn in petitioner: Dennis Galang - 1835 N. Laurel Dr.

Mr. Galang states he is requesting this Special Use to provide added security for his family and privacy. The requested fence would also deter pedestrians from using his yard as a short cut. He states he will provide landscaping along the fence line. He originally requested a 6' High with an 8' set back a year ago, but due to concerns from surrounding neighbors and at the suggestion of the Village Council, he adjusted his request to a 4' fence with a 13' set back.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks what the landscaping will look like.

Mr. Galang explains that he would be providing shorter plants at 4' high or less. He has not made a final selection at this time.

Chairman Wood asks if he can elaborate further the need for privacy.

Mr. Galang states that pedestrians cutting through his front yard is a safety issue for his family. There are bedrooms at the front of the house and the foot traffic is unsettling for his family. The fence would provide added security.

Chairman Wood inquires if there is a lot of pedestrians that walk in that area.

Mr. Galang states that there are many walkers in the evening and throughout the day.

Commissioner Fedota asks if he considered attaching the fence at the northeast corner of the house instead of the northwest corner.

Mr. Galang states that the location is requested because of the added privacy around his child's bedroom window, which is near the northwest corner of the house.

Commissioner Fedota questions whether the 4' fence would provide the added security.

Mr. Galang states that the original request was 6' but due to the concerns from surrounding properties he adjusted to 4' which would still provide additional security.

Further discussion ensues regarding the location and height of fence. Staff provides further clarification.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the 4' fence will be solid wood or will there be gaps to see through.

Mr. Galang states it will be solid wood.

Commissioner Schubert asks if there will be a gate and the location.

Mr. Bradshaw refers to the site plan and identifies the gate location.

Chairman Wood asks if there are photos for the proposed fence.

Commissioner Friedman notes that the packet provides a different style of fence than what is presented.

Mr. Vyverberg clarifies the original special use request and the revised request at this time. He further explains the packet information to clarify the fence and height.

Commissioner Fedota asks for code clarification as to what is the front yard for this corner lot.

Mr. Vyverberg states the code defines the front yard as the narrowest frontage on a corner property. In this case the narrowest frontage faces Aster. This is considered the properties front yard.

Mr. Bradshaw provides further information regarding the request and states that Community Services and Engineering reviewed and no issues were identified.

Commissioner Fedota asks if there is any update on the neighbor's opposition from the July meeting.

Mr. Vyverberg states that post cards were mailed and signs were posted as required and he has not received anything from surrounding properties. He further states that from a code perspective the fencing code allows for the replacement of an existing fence. If the house were to sell, it would require a special use because of the fence in the front yard. He notes that there is a

portion of the existing fence that fell down due to deterioration and it extended within .6 feet of the property line. Within the requirement that you would have to keep the same style of openness and it can't be any taller. If the petitioner wanted to replace the existing, our code would allow it without a special use request.

Sworn in Resident: Greg Antoniou 855 E. Aster Ave - Represents his mother, Nancy Antoniou (property owner).

Mr. Antoniou states that they are confused as to why this petition is getting revisited. It went to Village council over a year ago. There has not been any correspondence since then and he is aware of the new request because of the posting of signs and the post card that was received recently. He states that they are still not in favor of this request. He states that the aesthetics of the fence is not appealing and the fence design cutting into the front yard would look ridiculous. He further states that they have an issue with any 6' high fence going past the front of their home which is 31' from the sidewalk. It will be unsightly and will take away from the vista and the village integrity as a whole. He points out other homes in the neighborhood and notes that other houses that have a 6' fence stops at the front of the adjacent neighbor's home, which it should. The proposed fence will be installed down the middle of their sight line. He understands the privacy issue and notes that a corner lot will have privacy issues just because of the location.

Commissioner Kolososki asks if the existing landscaping is on his property or the petitioners.

Mr. Antoniou states that the landscaping is on both sides of the fence.

Chairman Wood asks staff to refer to site plan and clarify the transition location from the 4' to 6' fence.

Commissioner Friedman asks the petitioner if the house is 31' from the sidewalk. Mr. Antoniou confirms that it is.

Commissioner Friedman clarifies that property lines are 1' off sidewalk - which would indicate that the fence stops at 6' - 30' feet from the property line - it would be 31' from the sidewalk which would match the front line of his house. He states the existing fence is currently at 4'.

Mr. Antoniou states that is correct. Not opposed to 6' fence stopping at the front of the home. Opposed to the fence going into the front yard. He notes it would be the only house on the street to have this feature.

Commissioner Kolososki states it is a unique situation and the improvement would clean up the area.

Mr. Antoniou states that the existing conditions are overgrown and unkept now, and wonders if the new landscaping plan would be any different.

Commissioner Friedman states the landscaping plan would be required during

the fence permit process.

Mr. Vyverberg confirms that in conjunction with the fence permit the petitioner would have to submit a landscaping plan that would be reviewed as part of the permit. The landscaping would have to be in place for the final inspection to be approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioner is proposing to expand an existing fence to enclose a portion of the Subject Property's required front yard. The Petitioner has worked to revise the initial site plan for the fence to add the transition to a 6-foot solid fence along the shared eastern property boundary. The addition of landscaping along the fence line, between the fence and the sidewalk, should provide an effective buffer and should not destroy the existing vista in the area.

Staff understands that there are comparable front yard fences in the area and that the Petitioner's property contained a non-conforming fence, with a minimal front yard setback. However, all of the examples that were compiled by the Petitioner are existing non-conforming fences with smaller setbacks from the lot line, and are without landscaping. Previously, the Zoning Board of Appeals unanimously recommended approval of the petition. The Village Council remanded the request back to the Petitioner and Staff to further review the proposed fence placement. Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Planning and Zoning Commission. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval, then Staff recommends the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Site Plan and Fence Elevations submitted by the Petitioner, Dennis Galang, except as said plans may be changed to conform to the Village's Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Commissioner Friedman states that the transition down to a 4' fence height is an appropriate request. The existing fencing being replaced is old and in poor condition and the neighborhood would be better for a new fence in place of the old.

Commissioner Fedota states a fence beyond the brick line of the structure would break the continuity and is not in favor of the request.

Commissioner Kolososki states that based on the 4' height, it would not be a

hazard and feels it would add to the aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Friedman states that the new fence would be replacing what has been there for 30 years and is old and deteriorated. He also states there are homes in the neighborhood that have a fence in the front yard up to the property line. He notes that they are chain-link fences and they are aesthetically different than the proposed. The replacement fence is less invasive to the property line compared to the surrounding existing chain-link fences.

Chairman Wood states she appreciates the neighbor attending and providing insight to his objection. She states there should be no line of site issue since it tapers down. She does have concern about the fence tapering down into the front yard but the property is unique. She further states there would not be a public health, welfare, or safety issue and it would not have a negative impact on the value of the surrounding properties. She states she would be in favor of it.

Chairman Schubert states that the petitioner has made concessions to his original request and revised the plan from 6' fence transitioning to 4' fence in light of his neighbors' concern. The 4' transition addresses the site line concern and states he would be in favor of this request.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 6-1. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday, November 13, 2023.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [6 TO 1]
MOVER:	Eric Friedman, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER:	Patrick Noonan, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Schubert
NAYS:	Fedota
ABSENT:	Roth-Wurster, Cavanaugh

3. 170 S. Greeley Street

SU-000072-2023 - 170 S. Greeley Street

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on October 5th, 2023 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Special Use Application**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Topographic Survey**
5. **Site Plan, Floor Plan & Elevations**
6. **Public Notice**

Mr. Bradshaw provides background on the request and states the petitioner is proposing to construct a new garage addition to the south side of the existing residence. He states that the addition would be set back 4 feet from the adjacent side lot line. The petitioner would also be constructing a new deck off the rear of the residence which would be located in the floodplain.

Sworn in petitioner: David Korshak (father of homeowner) - 304 N. Schiller St & Kristy Korshak (property owner) - 170 S. Greeley St.

Mr. Korshak states the existing garage was in the floodplain. They originally were going to repair but it was in poor condition and collapsed. Per code, a new garage can't be constructed in the floodplain. The new plan is to attach the garage to the south side of the home. It would be set back 4' from the lot line instead of the required 5'. He states the existing deck is also in poor shape and is requesting to replace with a new deck. The existing deck is in a floodplain and as per code, a new deck can be constructed in the floodplain as long as it is open underneath. He states the neighbor to the south has no issues with the request.

Chairman Wood asks if there have been any issues in the past with the deck in the floodplain.

Mr. Korshak states that there has never been a water issue in the yard. The deck would be raised and open as required.

Mr. Kolososki confirms that it would be replacing an existing deck.
Mr. Korshak states that is correct.

Chairman Wood asks how the size compares.

Mr. Korshak states that it would remain the same size as existing. The only

change is the garage - taking the original detached garage and pulling it forward to attach to the home.

Commissioner Friedman asks if there is also an addition being constructed behind the garage.

Mr. Korshak states that the garage addition with a bump out.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the home addition is in the floodplain

Mr. Korshak states it is not.

Mr. Bradshaw refers to the topographic survey and states the floodplain wavers at the rear of the existing residence.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the garage space is still functional with the bump out from the chimney.

Mr. Korshak states that the bump out lines up with the back of the chimney and although it will be a tight fit, is hoping there is enough room when pulling in the garage.

Commissioner Schubert asks if a walkway is planned and will the existing landscaping be removed for construction.

Mr. Korshak states that there is no walkway planned and the landscaping will be removed to allow for the addition.

Mr. Bradshaw provides further information and states the property abuts Salt Creek to the west and the rear yard is almost completely encumbered by the floodplain. The width of the lot is 64 feet and the required side yard set backs are 5 feet. The proposed additions would not encroach into the rear of front yard setbacks. He states that comparable floodplain relief was granted to 156 S. Greeley Street to construct a shed in the floodplain. Community Services, Fire Prevention and Engineering reviewed. Community Services and Fire Prevention had no issues. Engineering requests a site plan to show the grades in the rear and side yards to show the location of the base flood elevation with respect to the structure. They also stated the deck must be correctly anchored and needs to remain open underneath, no skirting.

Commissioner Friedman asks who has jurisdiction of the floodplain.

Mr. Bradshaw states FEMA has jurisdiction of the floodplain but Village Code permits deck to be constructed in the floodplain if Special Use approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioner is proposing to replace a detached garage, which has been demolished, with a new garage attached to the south side of the existing residence. The new garage would be outside of the floodplain, however, the reconstructed the deck in the rear yard would remain within said floodplain. The subject property has a substandard lot width of 64 feet, which encumbers the

ability to construct a standard 2-car garage that meets code for the required side yard setback.

Regarding the proposed deck, it would be a replacement of the existing deck off the rear of the residence in generally the same location. Additionally, the Village Engineering department had no issue with the deck location within the floodplain, and the new site plan is an improvement upon the previous encroachment into the floodplain. Ultimately, the proposal should not cause injury to the value of the other properties in the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Uses subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Uses shall substantially conform to the Site Plan, Floor Plan, and Elevations submitted by the Petitioner, David Korshak, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Chairman Kolososki states that there would be no issue for this request as the floodplain issues have been addressed.

Chairman Fedota states the 1-foot request is not a problem and it would be a great use of the land.

Chairman Friedman states that the homes are on a curved street and adjacent homes are not aligned with each other which helps to alleviate some of the concerns for the 1-foot request.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday, November 13, 2023.

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

4. 157 W. Northwest Highway

SU-000074-2023 - 157 W. Northwest Highway

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on October 5th, 2023 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Special Use Application**
2. **Plat of Survey**
3. **Floor Plan**
4. **Business Plan**
5. **Public Notice**

Mr. Bradshaw provides background for this request and states the petitioner is proposing to open a tobacco and vape shop to sell tobacco products and accessories. Requesting a special use to permit a tobacco shop at subject property.

Sworn in petitioner: Salmin Omer & Saleh - 157 W. Northwest Highway, representing the business owner, Ali Omer.

Saleh states they would like to open a tobacco shop. They would sell unique items such as cigars, e-cigarettes, cigarettes and chips. He states that have another smoke shop business in Park Ridge.

Chairman Wood asks if either of them would be working at the Palatine store. Salmin states he would.

Chairman Wood asks if they would be selling CBD Products.

Saleh states that CBD products would be sold only if the community requests those products. Initially they would offer a small limited selection.

Chairman Wood notes that it is part of the submitted business plan.

Commissioner Kolososki asks what type of snacks would be sold.

Salmin states there would be a small cooler for water or Gatorade and miscellaneous snacks such as candy bars and chips.

Commissioner Fedota asks what type of signage they would install.

Saleh states that they would be utilizing stickers on the windows for advertising their product line.

Chairman Wood asks if their Park Ridge store has any issues with customers smoking or vaping outside the store or on the property.

Saleh states they do not, and would not, allow their products to be used on the property.

Chairman Wood asks how long the Park Ridge store has been in business.
Saleh states they have been in business for 4 months.

Chairman Wood asks what the hours would be.
Saleh states it would be 10am-10pm.

Commissioner Friedman asks if minors would be allowed in the establishment.
Saleh states minors would not be allowed and signage would indicate that. They also have a POS system to scan IDs for age eligibility.

Commissioner Fedota questions the visibility at the window area.
Saleh states that customers passing by can see in at the windows but from parking lot, but they would not be able to easily see all offered products due to the signage. No products are marketed or displayed in the windows.

Commissioner Schubert asks if products would be behind the counter and what would be in the open area.
Saleh states they would have shelving units selling miscellaneous products like ashtrays and unique items to the business in the open area. All other products would be behind the counter.

Chairman Wood questions the CBD products that may be sold.
Saleh states that the products have not been established at this time and would be based on customer requests.

Mr. Bradshaw provides additional information regarding the property and identifies the existing businesses in the center. He states that the Palatine Police Department reached out to the Park Ridge Police Department and they stated there have been no issues identified with the business. Parking requirements would not change with the proposed use. Community Services, Fire Prevention and Police all reviewed and no issues were identified.

Commissioner Schubert asks if the CBD products would fall under the tobacco license.

Mr. Bradshaw states CBD is not an illegal substance. It is legal and there is no situation where it would be prohibited for sale in the Village. Palatine Police would get involve and investigate if there were any specific complaints about certain products.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioner is proposing to open a tobacco shop in a multi-tenant shopping center. The Petitioner is aware that the sale of drug paraphernalia with the intent to use it for a controlled substance is prohibited. Furthermore, the Petitioner

currently operates another tobacco shop in Park Ridge with no identified issues. The submitted business plan for the new shop states that all customers will be asked present a valid form of identification for all purchases. The parking requirements would not change with this use. Ultimately, the use should not cause substantial injury to the value of the surrounding properties. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the requested Special Use with the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Business Plan and Floor Plan submitted by the Petitioner, Ali Omer, except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Commissioner Cavanaugh states it would be a good use of the space. Notes there is not many of these stores in the area and would serve a need.

Commissioner Schubert states the space may have been a smoke shop previously.

Mr. Bradshaw states that most recently it was MedTest, Inc. and has been vacant since 2021.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday, November 13th, 2023.

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

5. 874-920 N Quentin Road

FPD-000062-2023 - 874-920 N. Quentin Road

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on October 5th, 2023 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Engineering Plans**
2. **Elevation**
3. **Architectural Elevation**
4. **Representational Floorplan**
5. **Carriageway Landing Landscaping**
6. **Typical Lot Exhibit**
7. **Final Plat of Subdivision - Carriageway Landing**
8. **Preliminary Planned development review materials**
9. **PPD Conditions - approved by Village Council Dec**
10. **Public Notice**

Mr. Vyverberg states it originally was reviewed by the Plan Commission in November of 2022 for a Preliminary Planned Development. It went to village council in December of 2022 and received approval. Mr. Vyverberg provides the Site plan that was approved and states that the 920 N Quentin Road property was not a part of that initial review. The final plan development request is incorporating the 920 property and seeking a preliminary and final plat of subdivision to allow a 6-lot, 13-unit development.

Sworn in petitioner: CJ Johnson, Latitude Building and Development LLC - 1239 Williamsburg Ln., Crystal Lake, IL

Mr. Johnson explains that they have added 3 units on Poplar and believes it will compliment the subdivision. He refers to the Site Plan and states that they have adjusted the plans to include 2 entrances, set backs are suitable and the rear yard set-backs have been addressed.

Mr. Kolososki asks if the units will be slab on grade.

Mr. Johnson states they will have full basements.

Mr. Schubert notes that Lot 1 has the patio deck at the side of the unit. He questions if all lots will have this feature.

Mr. Johnson states that there are 2 units that have extra room on the side and they've added a screen porch to those two units only. No other units will have this feature.

Mr. Vyverberg states the petitioner has worked with the surrounding neighbors

through the process. The plans provide a 45-foot rear yard setback to the east. Potential buyers would have options to customize their plan with either an open deck, screened porch or patio, but a 45-foot setback would be maintained.

Commissioner Kolososki asks if all of the lots would have the same floor plan. Mr. Johnson confirms that they would have the same floor plan.

Chairman Wood asks where guest parking is located and will there be an HOA. Mr. Johnson states guest parking is at the front of the property and identifies on the Site plan where those spaces are located. He further states that there would be an HOA for maintenance.

Commissioner Friedman questions the driveway locations and the entrance to the property. He also asks if the entrances are planned to be right in and right out.

Mr. Johnson states the county would determine if they would be right in and right out.

Further discussion regarding site plan details, snow removal, garbage pickup and the retaining walls. Mr. Johnson clarifies and states snow removal will be pushed both ways, there will be protection at retaining walls and it will be Palatine scavenger company for garbage pickup.

Commissioner Bettenhausen questions the flare driveways shown on the plan.

Sworn In: Civil Engineer, Mike Anderson - Hager Engineering - 100 E. State Parkway, Schaumburg, IL

Mr. Anderson states the drawings show the driveway flares where it meets the public street. The flared driveways are not shown at the interior driveways. He explains that the flared driveway at the public street is to benefit the driver that may be coming in at a faster speed and require more room to turn. He stated that interior flared driveways could be incorporated if it is determined it would be needed.

Commissioner Friedman asks if there has been any auto turn study on the property for fire trucks or waste vehicles.

Mr. Anderson states the entrances coming in off Quentin are 24' wide, which is a standard commercial width driveway.

Commissioner Friedman questions the turn into the 15' driveway.

Mr. Anderson states the turn is suitable.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the 15' drive lane would accommodate cars and SUV's.

Mr. Anderson states they expect a low amount of traffic and a 15' driveway should be sufficient.

Questions regarding lighting on the property, sidewalks from driveways to front door, fencing and flow control.

Mr. Johnson states lighting on units would be provided, sidewalks are planned, the fencing would be at 6' and flow control would be to the North.

Commissioner Schubert questions the guest parking at the last lot on the North end. He asks if there is there any concern on the last driveway for a 3-point turn-around and is there a code for a minimum required distance for a turn-around?

Mr. Vyverberg states the petitioner is showing a presence of a turn around and a bump out on the north side of the parking space. The engineer did not raise it as an issue or a concern. If the plans need to be deeper or wider, the engineer can address.

Mr. Anderson states there hasn't been a detailed evaluation but if it helps to have another extension to the west of the house they could incorporate.

Commissioner Cavanaugh questions the drive aisle and asks if the traffic plan for the interior subdivision would just travel north and exit at the north entrance and entering would be at the south.

Mr. Anderson states they would not be limiting the direction of traffic.

Commissioner Cavanaugh questions the parking spots and notes that it would be one per unit.

Mr. Johnson clarifies that there are also 2 spots per driveway.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks if additional spots could be added.

Mr. Johnson states that more parking would be less room for the proposed berm.

Mr. Vyverberg provides additional information and states that although the initial plan did not include the property at 920 Quentin Road. There were requirements in the conditions that easements were provided to that property. He refers to an aerial photograph and states the property has 4 curb cuts onto Quentin Rd. The petitioner and the proposed plans worked with the village engineer and staff to reduce the number of curb cuts. He further provides information regarding storm water and states the infiltration trench on the west side was increased to accommodate the additional 920 property. All of the utilities are proximate and available within the area. The final architectural plans are consistent with the Preliminary Planned Development. The units will range in size from 1600 to 2500 square feet. The landscaping plans include parkway trees, foundation plantings and a landscape feature along Quentin. It also includes arbor vitae along the western boarder.

This did go through the process and final engineering plans are conditionally approved and community services conditionally recommended.

Commissioner Friedman questions the northern driveway aligned with the residential driveway. Was it the village engineers intent to keep the driveways as far apart as possible on the parcel?

Mr. Vyverberg states they did not have direction from the Village Engineer. There are 4 existing curb cuts. From a planning stand point, having one on the north and one on the south as opposed to the 4 previous existing cuts would work better for this development.

Commissioner Friedman notes that it seems it should be between lots 4 & 5 and at lots 1&2. Ultimately, the village engineer would decide.

Resident: Julie Picchiotti - 939 N. Franklin Ave.

Ms. Picchiotti states she has no concerns regarding the planned development. Her concern is regarding the traffic on Poplar. She would like a traffic sign to slow traffic or to warn of hidden driveways.

Commissioner Fedota questions if there are any parking restrictions on Poplar St.

Mr. Vyverberg states there are parking restrictions on Poplar St. Any placement of a sign would be subject to the traffic engineering committee. This issue was raised at a meeting a couple of weeks ago and states the police department has done selective enforcement in the past.

Resident: Nanette Harris 825 W. Poplar St - Concerns regarding traffic on Poplar Street. Agrees that signage would be helpful. Is pleased with the development plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed Final Planned Development and Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision would complete the Preliminary Planned Development approval, with the incorporation of the 920 property. The proposal represents a unified development and does not leave a fragmented property adjacent to an inline development plan. The expansion of the Poplar Street right of way, removal of the retaining wall along Poplar Street, and the proposed regrading of this area will improve the roadway at Quentin Road.

As was the recommendation at Preliminary Planned Development, Staff believes that the proposed plan is of an appropriate density and offers a transition from the higher density development to the north and the larger single-family lots to the west. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Final Planned Development and Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision for the property at 874-920 N. Quentin Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. The final architecture, elevations, engineering, and landscaping plans shall substantially conform to the Studio 23, Haeger Engineering, and Karlstadt plans, except as such is either Village recommended for amendment or changed to conform with Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The Final Engineers Estimate of Probable Cost shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.

3. Engineering review fees shall be submitted, pursuant to the Code requirements in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
4. The Final Engineering Plans and Plat of Subdivision shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
5. The HOA declarations shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.
6. All required extra agency permits shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
7. A \$130,000 (\$10,000/unit) Planned Development Letter of Credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
8. A Public Improvement Letter of Credit for 115% of the EEOPC amount as determined by the Code requirements, shall be submitted in manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
9. The final landscaping, parkway tree placement and screening plan, along with the final tree preservation plan shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and Village Engineer.
10. Cash in lieu of sidewalks will be required for the Poplar Street frontage.
11. A construction management plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning 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.

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

Commissioner Fedota Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Cavanaugh.

DELIBERATIONS:

Commissioner Kolososki states that petitioner has worked well with the neighbors. The site may be snug, but it works.

Commissioner Fedota states that the plan is a workable and good solution.

Chairman Wood states that the plan is a good plan, likes the duplexes and fills a need. Neighbors' concerns have been addressed.

Commissioner Friedman has concerns regarding the access driveways on Quentin for multifamily use without Quentin being properly designed with turn lanes or accommodations for the traffic coming in. Also concerns regarding 15' road width. He states that those concerns can be addressed. The project itself is a good fit and although he has concerns, he supports and states it is a good use of the property.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday, November 13, 2023.

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

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

No previous items have gone to Village Council but there will be (3) items on the agenda for the November 14th meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT