



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 • OCTOBER 18, 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	Present	
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 - Jun 21, 2022 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED AS AMENDED [6 TO 0]
AYES:	Dwyer, Noonan, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
ABSTAIN:	Williams

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 101 W. Palatine Road and 2-12 S. Brockway Street - Preliminary Planned Development to allow an 18-unit apartment building and roof tenant amenity area.

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on October 3rd, 2022 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Architectural Plans
2. Preliminary Planned Development Application
3. Plat of Survey
4. Legal Notice

Sworn in Staff: Mr. Vyverberg

Sworn in Petitioner: Mr. Tinaglia & Mr. Vu Trieu (Northshore Development Group)

Chairman Dwyer opens the meeting and explains this meeting is regarding the Preliminary Planned Development approval to construct a new 3-story, 18 unit apartment building located at the corner of W. Palatine Road & S. Brockway Street. The 3-story apartment building will have an inset amenity area on top of the roof, which includes a trellised outdoor resident space.

Mr. Tinaglia explains that the initial concept that was prepared for this area was taller, bigger, and denser and had less parking. With guidance and direction from Staff, the new plan should meet the requirements of the downtown guidelines. The Subject Property is 132 x 132 - approximately 17,500 square feet. He presents a preliminary plan for a 3 story bldg. with 1st floor enclosed parking that will contain 34 parking spaces, including 2 handicap parking spaces. The first floor will also include the lobby area, an amenity space in the northeast corner of the building, the elevator lobby, stairwells and a trash room. The first floor is basic parking use and the lobby/amenity space. The 2nd and 3rd floors consists of nine two bedroom apartments on each floor, with either a one bath or two bath option. He also explains that the plan includes a trellis roof-top patio area for residents to gather or barbeque. He provides a preliminary vision for the building and displayed brick samples to view. The concept is to provide a modern version of an old building, which will fit the culture of the surrounding area.

He further states that apartment buildings have become very popular, due to the fact that individuals no longer want to provide large down payments or have mortgages. They would like to relocate, without being tied down to one property for 30 years. He states that people are attracted to luxury apartments with nice

amenities. He also explains that the garage and main entrance will face Brockway Street. The entrances are planned at the Brockway Street location, due to the traffic on Palatine Road. He addresses the site plan and shows that they plan the building to be set back 5 feet south of the property line. This will provide added safety, but will also allow landscaping improvements.

Mr. Kolososki asks what the dimension is from the lot line to the curb.

Mr. Tinaglia states that he is not sure about the dimension but speculates it is about 10'.

Mr. Kolososki comments that the sidewalk is a great idea. He states that it would be nice to have a recess at the front for a spacial view.

Mr. Tinaglia states that the plans address the problem and have it recessed at the south and west, to protect the rights of the neighbors. To recess it at any other locations reduces the square footage.

Mr. Kolososki states that he likes the open air garage and feels he has done a nice job on a tough site.

Mr. Friedman states that the nature of the open air garage is largely supported by the large openings on the 2 facades that face neighboring properties. He inquires whether his proposal will hinder others to develop their properties.

Mr. Tinaglia states that this would not be an issue.

Mr. Bettenhausen inquires if there is any room for bicycles.

Mr. Tinaglia refers to the plan and states that there are areas within the plan that could accommodate storage areas for bicycles. He states that visitors could be accommodated with an area for bike racks and is confident that if it is a requirement, they could accommodate.

Mr. Bettenhausen inquires about further amenities such as a gym and laundry facilities.

Mr. Tinaglia points to where the gym is expected to be constructed and states that laundry facilities are in each unit.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks if the roof top will have any type of lighting or recessed lighting for evening events.

Mr. Tinaglia explains that lighting could be hung from the trellis and columns. He also explains the intentions of the roof top area and states that there would be patio pavers for outdoor furniture, gas grills, fire pit area with seating to accommodate the urban lifestyle.

Mr. Friedman inquires if there is any accessible restrooms for this area.

Mr. Tinaglia states that there is no restrooms planned for this area and confirms that restrooms are only available in the private units.

Mr. Friedman inquires about 1st floor 10' public utility and drainage easement on the south side of the property. Asks if anything runs through there that would impact the development.

Mr. Tinaglia states there is not.

Chairman Dwyer asks for the dimensions of the elevator.

Mr. Tinaglia states the elevators are code compliance and is not a freight elevator. The stairways are also code compliance and would be able to accommodate larger structures.

Chairman Dwyer questions what the expected monthly rent would be for these units.

Mr. Tinaglia states that the expected rental range would be approximately \$2500 to \$3000 per month.

Further discussion ensues regarding the trash room and the number of totes that will be supplied.

Mr. Friedman inquires if there will be recycling and would it have its' own designated trash chute.

Mr. Tinaglia states there would be a separate 9x18 trash chute.

Further discussion regarding the parking lot design and confirmation that the parking lot would be 24 wide for some of the drive aisles and parking spaces would be assigned by unit. Most units will be assigned two spots but there will be a couple of units with one designated spot. Parking garage will have security cameras.

Mr. Vyverberg discussed plan related items. Currently zoned planned development. Majority of surrounding properties are also zoned planned development. He states that the site has been vacant for the past couple of years. He also provides photos of the surrounding area.

Mr. Vyverberg talks about the initial Downtown design guidelines, which were approved in the late 90's and updated in the early 2000's. Most recently, a new TOD plan was adopted in 2016. He also discussed surrounding buildings and their height and dimensions. Mr. Vyverberg provides a utility plan for the area. He discusses the density plan and states that Staff is comfortable with the proposed density. He provides a parking analysis for the property and states that the provided parking is comparable to and exceeds the parking for other similar developments in downtown Palatine. He talks about the availability of nearby public parking in the area that allows 3 hour and overnight parking. He also provides information on the parking dimensions for similar downtown developments.

Mr. Friedman asks about the parking stall depth and asks for clarification on the depth of the stall space.

Ben clarifies the measurement of the stall depth space is 18 feet.

Mr. Friedman asks if staff has had any conversation with the developer regarding the lack of any public amenity at ground level. Transit Orient Development (TOD) plan does not suggest this property site be fully residential. It was recommended as a mixed use development and feels this is very important for this location. He points out the developer is very involved in other communities and wonders if he or his board would support a provision to this intersection within the business district without some sort of a public amenity or retail space at ground level. He points out that this is a parking lot and residential use for a long time to come. It seems to be against the original plan.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that staff recommendation for the site is consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines. The plans address the guidelines and with the breakup of the elevations, creates a visual interest in the building.

Chairman Dwyer inquires if there is a typical floor plan for the units.

Mr. Tinaglia states there is a pencil copy on his desk. They haven't spent the

money to lay out the floor plan and are waiting on approval of the preliminary planned development before they move forward with additional drawings. He also addresses Mr. Friedman concerns about the planned usage for this property. He states that having useable space for the residents versus retail space that may take a long time to fill, in his opinion, is a better plan.

Mr. Friedman references the Architectural plans and inquires if breaking up elevations for visual interest may be further addressed as the majority of the facade is a flat plane with shallow balconies tacked on. Was anything looked at to enliven the façade?

Mr. Tinaglia states they focused on the pedestrian scale on first floor. The drawings for the upper floors reflect a horizontal line so that the building wouldn't look so vertical. The proposed building is not a very long building. The intent at the first floor was to keep the pedestrian scale interesting and keep the second and third story not too high, which would enable to see there is more to the building than the flat wall.

Chairman Dwyer inquires about mechanical equipment on roof and the potential noise.

Mr. Tinaglia states there will be 18 mechanical units on roof and their plan would be to enclose the units and have buffer landscaping surrounding them.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Subject Property was contemplated for redevelopment within both the Downtown Land Use Guide and the 2016 TOD plan. It is also consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines. The proposed architectural plans not only address the Guideline requirements, but also break up the elevations to create visual interest in the building. With comparable materials and height for the surrounding developments, Staff also believes that the proposed building is compatible with the other recent Downtown development projects. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The development shall substantially conform to the architecture plans prepared by Tinaglia Architects, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.**
- 2. The Final Engineering plans Engineer's Estimate of Probable Cost will be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer. Planning Review fees, based upon the finally accepted EEOPC shall be submitted a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
- 3. The Final Architectural Plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Community Development Director. This shall include the final rooftop amenity area plans and the architectural fencing plan around the exterior parking stalls.**
- 4. The Plat of Consolidation shall be prepared in a manner acceptable to the**

Director of Planning and Zoning and the Village Engineer. This would include the vacation of the 10-foot public utilities and drainage easement on the south side of the property and referenced on the ALTA survey, dated December 13, 2019 by MM Surveying Company.

5. At the direction of the Village Engineer, all extra agency permits shall be submitted.
6. Review fees, based upon the finally accepted EEOPC shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
7. The Final Landscaping shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
8. 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.
9. A Planned Development Letter of Credit in the amount of \$180,000 - (\$10,000/unit, per Article 14 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
10. An approved NFPA 13 automatic sprinkler system will be required for the parking garage, P.C.O. 7-40.2.
11. 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. Fedota questions the lighting on the roof top and asks if they would need to comply with the light spillage ordinances.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the site plan shows it would be inset and final plans would have to be reviewed and comply with village codes.

Mr. Friedman confirms that today's meeting is for preliminary review only and there would be Final Plan Review if this Preliminary is approved.

Mr. Vyverberg confirms that this hearing is to seek preliminary planned development. He states that if the Preliminary Plan Review is recommended to approve, it would then go to council for their approval. If the Preliminary Plan is approved by council, it would then go back through the entire process for Final Planned Development.

Chairman Dwyer reminds the board that the Preliminary Planned Development is important because the Final Planned Development meeting will only address whether or not all of the conditions have been met.

Chairman Dwyer asks if the petitioner agrees to meet all conditions. Mr. Tinaglia agrees to all conditions.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to accept; seconded by Mr. Bettenhausen

Chairman Dwyer made a motion to close the public hearing.

DISCUSSION:

Chairman Dwyer states that he believes it looks to be a nice development.

Mr. Fedota states that the parking issue has been addressed and points out the public parking across the street is a benefit. He believes it is a good use for the space.

Mr. Fedota states that he still has concerns that it is not an appropriate Mixed Use Development as called for by the TOD.

Chairman Dwyer summarized the request was accepted by a vote of 5-2. This will tentatively go to Village council on Monday 11/7/22.

Communication:

Mr. Vyverberg provides updates on two approved projects. The 4- lot subdivision on Kenilworth Avenue and the Missner Development projects have been approved by the Village Council. He also states that the Proposed Text Amendments are being reviewed by Village Council and will send a summary, as soon as available.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [5 TO 2]
AYES:	Dwyer, Noonan, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
NAYS:	Williams, Friedman

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. ADJOURNMENT