



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

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

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES • OCTOBER 12, 2021

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Brent Larson	Commissioner	Absent	
Cindy Roth-Wurster	Commissioner	Present	
Jan Wood	Commissioner	Present	
Jerry Luszczak	Commissioner	Present	
Theodore McGinn	Commissioner	Absent	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Absent	
John Pirog	Commissioner	Present	

Staff present: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting - Sep 14, 2021 7:00 PM

Ms. Roth-Wurster made a motion to accept the minutes of September 14, 2021; seconded by Mr. Luszczak.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Cindy Roth-Wurster, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jerry Luszczak, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson, McGinn, Cavanaugh

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 237 W Helen Road

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 27, 2021 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Variation
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey/ Site Plan
4. Pictures submitted by Petitioner
5. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioner: Mr. Mark West 237 W Helen Rd

Mr. West explained his driveway is 2 cars wide by garage and at the apron by the street. He stated because it is narrower in the middle he runs over the grass and sometimes blocks the sidewalk. He explained his parents live with them and has 2 daughters and has to move vehicles around to avoid running over grass. Mr. West stated it would be nice to have the extra path to exit. He stated they will redo the apron to make it look nice.

Mr. Luszczyk clarified the width at the apron will remain the same.
Mr. West answered yes.

Ms. Wood clarified the goal is to have the driveway line up with the garage.
Mr. West answered yes explaining they want to align with apron and garage adding approx. 6ft. He pointed out the proposed driveway will be setback from the house to allow for the 2 existing window wells and leave a planting area. It will be adding approximately 6ft by 75ft. He spoke to drainage and how he redirected his gutters to pop up drains.

Mr. Pirog asked about the driveway sloping.
Mr. West stated it is less now. He stated both him and his neighbors have gutters running to pop up drains.

Ms. Wood asked about flooding issues in neighborhood.
Mr. West stated not much since the Village added the storm water drainage pipe down Helen toward creek.

Ms. Wood asked if it is common for driveways to line up with garage.
Mr. West yes stating a lot of them do pointing out the property kiddy corner widened theirs before they sold. He explained his lot is different because it very narrow.

Mr. Pirog asked if it is an abnormal lot bringing the percentage so high
Mr. West answered yes referring to aerial to show how narrow it is compared to

the other homes in neighborhood.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview explain the lot width is smaller being 57.9ft wide. She spoke to the uniqueness being when they built the garage and addition in 2004 lot coverage was not a requirement. She further explained this work has put them over the allowed lot coverage but because lot coverage as not contemplated in code at the time they did not need relief.

Mr. Pirog asked if garage was more than a garage being so large.
Mr. West stated it is 4 car garage being 2 car tandem.

Mr. Pirog asked why this is needed now.

Mr. West explained he would have done when they did addition but didn't have the money. He explained widening the driveway will allow for easier access rather than having to move vehicles or run over grass.

Mr. Pirog asked why there are so many cars in driveway if they have a 4 car garage.

Mr. West explained there are 2 cars, a truck and motorcycles in the garage. He stated their family previously had a car business and likes to restores cars and stores them in the garage.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked staff if they are aware of any other properties at this percentage.

Mr. West stated most lots are larger than his.

Ms. Bremanis stated she is not aware of any.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioners are requesting to expand with width of the driveway at the subject property. At 51%, the property currently exceeds the maximum lot coverage (45%) as the addition and garage expansion, which were approved in 2004 that included relief for setback and total accessory structure square footage. At that time it also increased the total lot coverage to approximately 51% although this was prior to when the lot coverage requirements were added to the zoning ordinance in 2007. Staff believes the proposed driveway extension will not alter the essential character of the area, as total width of the driveway meets the maximum width. The proposed driveway extension will further increase the overall lot coverage that already exceeds the maximum permitted. However, the Village Engineer did not identify any specific storm water management issues related to the Subject Property or surrounding area.

Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the Zoning Board of Appeals recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the Site Plan submitted by the Petitioner, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village of Palatine Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood asked about ordinance and how lot coverage percentage was not looked at in 2004.

Ms. Bremanis explained the 45% lot coverage wasn't adopted until 2007.

Discussion on the difference of what was allowed in 2004 and current.

Ms. Bremanis stated if this driveway was proposed in 2004 it would be allowed without relief because it meets all other standards.

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

Mr. Luszczyk made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Wood.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Luszczyk stated they have a 2 car garage and the curb is set to 2 car so they are just extending to garage so doesn't see any issues.

Ms. Wood stated they are not over generous with lot coverage being careful of the neighborhood and the effect it will have on it. She stated it is in essence 6% increase at this time and makes sense to line up with garage. She stated it should not have a negative impact and aesthetically will look better. Jan spoke to the unique circumstance with size of lot and addition being approved when lot coverage was not in effect.

Mr. Luszczyk pointed out the sewer system was improved and there are no issues with flooding.

Ms. Wood stated the Village Engineer has reviewed and had no issues.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated she lives close to area and thinks it makes sense to have driveway widened. She spoke to the standards stating she does not think they made a good case for reasonable return. She spoke to the timing of the request pointing out if they would have requested in 2004 it would not have been questioned. Cindy upon review has initial pause and concern but knows area well and is leaning toward accepting.

Mr. Pirog stated he thinks the percentage is too high. He stated the aerial doesn't show any other properties that close to lot coverage. He stated he understands the narrowness but thinks 57% is too high.

Ms. Wood stated she thinks it will aesthetically look good.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated she thinks driving over grass looks bad and this will make it look nicer. She pointed out the Village Engineer has reviewed and the increase is not enough to cause issues with flooding.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 3-1. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on October 18, 2021.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [3 TO 1]
MOVER:	Jerry Luszczak, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jan Wood, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak
NAYS:	Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson, McGinn, Cavanaugh

2. 327 W. Northwest Highway

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 27, 2021 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Special Use
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey
4. Business Plan
5. Floor Plan
6. Public Notice

Sworn in staff: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

Sworn in the petitioner: Ms. Corey Raymond manager, Ms. Debra Heuer owner 46 E Palatine Rd

Ms. Raymond explained they are looking to relocate their current dog grooming business. She explained they need to move because their current landlord filed for liquidation bankruptcy so are now on a month to month lease and the current building has not been maintained. Ms. Raymond stated they have been in business for 4 years and would like to stay in Palatine.

Ms. Wood asked about the business plan and the noise related to the dogs. Ms. Raymond explained they have had 2 previous locations and never had noise complaints nor had any issues with current neighbors. She pointed out the proposed space is an addition so the one wall is cinder block so they won't disturb the neighbor. Ms. Raymond stated they offered to put sound block on the other wall to not disturb the other neighbor (a fitness personal training facility) but was told they are not concerned.

Ms. Wood asked if they spoke to training neighbors.
Ms. Raymond answered no but the real estate agent did.

Ms. Wood asked how many animals they would see in a day.
Ms. Raymond stated they would see approx. 18 spread out throughout the day. She stated they will have 3 full time groomers.

Ms. Wood asked what the max amount of dogs at one time.
Ms. Raymond stated maybe 10 at the busiest.

Mr. Pirog asked where they would walk the dogs.
Ms. Raymond stated they don't explaining it is a drop off and pick up business. She stated they keep the dogs on average for 3-4 hours, with all being kenneled when not being actively groomed. She explained they clean up accidents and have dumpster in back.

Mr. Pirog asked about day care.

Ms. Raymond answered they only provide grooming services not daycare or boarding.

Ms. Wood pointed out their old location was not next to any businesses and asked about the noise level during grooming.

Ms. Heuer explained the dogs that bark they get out as quick as possible.

Ms. Raymond stated they were next to a law and tax service office and they never had any complaints.

Mr. Pirog asked if there are cases where dogs play together.

Ms. Raymond explained they are all separated unless siblings of same house.

Ms. Wood asked how many dogs per day.

Ms. Raymond stated approx. 18.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview explaining they are relocating into a shopping plaza that is zoned B2. She referred to the floor plan slide to show the layout of the building. She spoke to the business plan and the hours of operation. Ms. Bremanis explained they require 4 parking spaces but the lot is over parked so there is no issues. She stated Community Services and Fire Prevention have reviewed and had no issues. Ms. Bremanis stated the Village is not aware of any complaints on their current business at the previous location.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioner is proposing to operate a dog grooming business at the Subject Tenant Place. The Subject Property has adequate parking for the proposed use, and the Petitioner is relocating an existing location in Palatine. This would be occupying a current vacant tenant space and the proposed use should not have a negative impact on the surrounding properties. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Business Plan and Floor Plan submitted by the Petitioner on 8/30/21, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

Mr. Pirog made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Pirog spoke to the standards stating he thinks they are met and beyond. He spoke to the unique circumstance with the current landlord filing for bankruptcy. He stated it won't alter the locale being a drop off business and should give a boost to the area.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated the standards have been met. She pointed out they are a long time business in Palatine who know what they are doing and good to keep in Palatine.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 4-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on October 18, 2021.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	John Pirog, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Cindy Roth-Wurster, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson, McGinn, Cavanaugh

IV. COMMUNICATIONS**V. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Motion to Adjourn

RESULT:	MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Cindy Roth-Wurster, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jerry Luszczak, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, Pirog
ABSENT:	Larson, McGinn, Cavanaugh

