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 ● AUGUST 6, 2019

Village Hall - Council Chambers **Regular Meeting** **7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Conrad Hansen	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Dennis Dwyer	Chairman	Present	
Jane Robins	Plan Commissioner	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	

Staff present: Ms. Katie Rivard

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Plan Commission - Regular Meeting - Apr 16, 2019 7:00 PM

   Mr. Noonan made a motion to approve the minutes of April 16, 2019; seconded by Mr. Friedman.

RESULT:	**ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Eric Friedman, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 1150 W. Euclid Avenue - Lexington Lakes

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on July 22, 2019 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Aerial
2. Plat of Survey - Existing Conditions
3. Boundary and Topographic Survey - Existing Conditions
4. Site Plan
5. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision
6. Site Data Table
7. Preliminary Engineering Plans
8. Existing Utilities Map
9. Architectural Plans
10. BSB Memo 01-25-2019
11. Parking Exhibit
12. Preliminary Landscape Plan
13. DDS Landscape Narrative 07-03-2019
14. Tree Preservation Plan
15. Proximity Exhibit
16. Auto-turn Exhibit
17. Future Land Use Map
18. Petitioner's Request for Future Land Use Map Amendment
19. Zoning Variance Summary
20. PPD Application
21. 03-05-19 PC Minutes
22. Public Notice 08-06-19

Sworn in petitioners: Thomas Burney - Attorney representing the Petitioner
Nate Wynsma - Lexington Homes
Elke Anstaat -BSB Design
Sharon Dickson -Dickson Design Studio
Timothy Burda - Haeger Engineering

Mr. Burney handed Ms. Rivard the affidavits to satisfy the public hearing notice requirements. He spoke to the previous request heard back at the March meeting explaining they worked with staff to address the concerns. Mr. Burney explained Staff recommended several conditions and they agree to follow all.

Mr. Wynsma stated he will focus the attention on the changes that have been made addressing staffs and the neighbor's comments. He went through the slides including the aerial to show location between Peregrine Lake to the Northeast, Peregrine Lakes East to East, Weber to the West and Harper College to the South. Mr. Wynsma spoke to the site plan slide showing the previous and

current plans pointing out the changes including changes to the entrance and configurations of buildings and roads to Euclid, potential conflicts with driveways, overall density, infrastructures including some retaining walls and setbacks. Mr. Wynsma explained in order to address some of these concerns they changed the road configuration and entry, eliminating all conflicts with driveways. He pointed out the site is constrained by the lake to the north and east and having adequate setbacks from adjacent properties and the road. Mr. Wynsma spoke to the former plan consisting of 30 units referring to the project comparison table.

Mr. Hansen asked about the "adequate" setbacks to the east.
Mr. Wynsma explained the original plan had a minimum setback of 30 ft. and the new plan has a minimum of 45 ft. He further explained the difference in footprints of different unit's ranging from 45-61 ft. compared to Peregrine Lakes minimum being 27 ft. Mr. Wynsma stated they designed so there are no above ground encroachments explain every home will have an at grade patio.

Mr. Wynsma gave a brief summary stating the previous plan had 7 buildings and the new has 5 with the total unit count going from 30 to 26. He spoke to the building material going from stone accents along the base to 100% masonry on the entire first floor on all 4 sides. He stated the driveway length went from 20 ft. to a minimum of 22 ft. Mr. Wynsma stated the guest parking remains the same even though the count went down. He pointed out the rear setback was 30 ft. minimum but changed to 45-61 ft. He referred to the auto turn slide explaining prior to final engineering it must be approved by the Fire Department. Mr. Wynsma referred to the slide to show the difference in the footprints indicated by the dash lines of each models. He referred to the parking slide to show it is identical to Peregrine Lakes East. He referred to the proximity plan view slide to show the more gradual grade slope and more landscape buffer. He pointed out Peregrine Lakes have decks and patios in the setbacks. Mr. Wynsma referred to the proximity elevation slide to show the difference between their elevation heights to Peregrine. He spoke to the architecture changes including all four sides now being brick and siding colors showing options of colors and layouts from all sides of the buildings. He went through the floor plan slides to show layouts of different unit options and spoke to pricing being mid $400,000-$500,000. He spoke to the design element comparison comparing Peregrine Lakes to Lexington Lakes.

Ms. Sharon Dickson - DDS Design Studio - Landscape Architect
Ms. Dickson stated they revised the landscape plan for the current site plan referring to the slides to explain what each color represents. She explained they will have a range in diversity of species dealing with texture, and seasons of interest taking in to account the architecture. She stated the detention will be naturalized and managed by the HOA to help with storm water management. Ms. Dickson spoke to the additional screening along the north south access to provide more screening between the neighbors. She spoke to the privacy screening, additional landscaping and entrance monument along Euclid Avenue pointing out the size has remained the same but the facade material of the monument has changed to match the bricks on the homes. Ms. Dickson referred

to the Landscape Plan slide to show typical foundation layouts. She pointed out it is similar to what was presented before just modified to match the now reflected architecture and site plan.

Sworn in staff: Ms. Katie Rivard

Ms. Rivard gave a brief overview of the request going through the slides including:

- Existing conditions
- Proposed site plan comparisons showing the changes made to the number of units, density, setback, driveway lengths, and guest parking
- Architectural plans showing the changes to the brick which now meets the Chapter 6 Code requirements
- Floor plans
- Proximity of existing building pointing out the petitioner showed what it would be if the townhomes were constructed
- Parking exhibit showing the changes to the guest parking location and count
- Engineering explaining the only major changes is addressing the retaining wall setback concerns
- Landscape plans pointing out the 6 ft. vinyl fence is still proposed as well as the monument sign. She spoke to the original proposal for parkway trees and explained Cook County Department of Highway and Transportation has said no parkway trees within 200 ft. from an approaching traffic signal so staff will be recommending the trees be relocated throughout the site. She further explained it this is typical when a parkway tree cannot be accommodated.
- The sign and fence have not changed in size or location.
- Tree preservation plan pointing out they are losing a few more trees with new proposed layout

Ms. Rivard went over the project review summary that was in the packet explaining they have worked with the Petitioner to address many of Staff's concerns throughout several re-reviews including:

- Staff's recommendation for ranch end units has not been addressed
- Guest parking traffic circulation has been addressed
- Architecture has been addressed with quality and design
- Setback has increased between the buildings
- Driveway depths have increased
- Landscaping has not been addressed for foundation plantings and additional parkway trees
- Future Land Use Map - stating staff has not been directed by Village Council to amend the plan at this time
- Engineering's final comment stays the same with possible waiver of the minimum buffer area which is up to MWRD

Chairman Dwyer stated he thinks the Plan Commission should discuss the recommendation for the Comprehensive Plan for the property.

Ms. Rivard referred to aerial to discuss the history of the land use zoning and the years they changed.

Mr. Hansen asked Mr. Burney why this property should be changed to residential when office research generates taxes without adding school children.
Mr. Burney pointed out the property has been available to the market for a long time with no interest of improvement. He stated Mr. Durkin has been trying to sell for a long time. He spoke to the trending development of the area pointing out Mr. Johnson converted the office research at Quentin Road and Euclid Avenue into residential and continued it west. Mr. Burney stated Weber would have been the logical extension but the owner has no interest. He explained this is unique because the land is zoned Planned Development so can't do anything without going before the board for approval.

Chairman Dwyer asked if it is unusual to have a private fire hydrant.
Ms. Rivard answered no.

Sworn in Mr. Kevin Hedrick 1064 W. Bogey Lane, Palatine
Mr. Hedrick asked if the proposed fence at the entrance off of Euclid is still planned.
Mr. Wynsma answered yes.

Mr. Hedrick asked if there was anything planned for the east edge of the property line.
Mr. Wynsma explained there will be landscaping mostly evergreens.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if the fence runs on the entire east property line.
Ms. Rivard explained staff has recommended a fence on the eastern property but at this time it is not shown on plan

Sworn in Ms. Peggy Bandemer 1056 W. Bogey Lane, Palatine
Ms. Bandemer asked if the fence will run all along the east side.
Chairman Dwyer asked Ms. Bandemer what her preference is.
Ms. Bandemer stated she would prefer a fence.

Chairman Dwyer stated landscape after a few years could be a lot more attractive than a fence.
Ms. Bandemer explained people cut through their yards.

Mr. Hansen asked who the people who are cutting through are.
Ms. Bandemer explained they are people off of the bike path.
Discussions on where are the people go once they cut through.

Sworn in Ms. Pat Loftus 1029 W. Bogey Lane, Palatine
Ms. Loftus stated they have not answered why the zoning should be changed. She spoke to the corridor off Euclid Avenue between Quentin Road and Weber being upscale. She expressed concern with the proposed plan being tight with not enough extra parking.
Ms. Rivard referred to the site plan slide to indicate the guest parking locations.

Ms. Loftus asked how many spaces are in the off area parking in the back.
Ms. Rivard referred to the site plan slide to show the amount and location of the spaces.

Ms. Loftus stated she thinks the units will detract from the existing townhomes and is in favor of leaving it the way it is and allowing someone to market it correctly as it is currently zoned.
Discussion on current zoning.

Mr. Noonan asked if the reason to change to residential is because they couldn't get a tenant
Chairman Dwyer stated the trend in the area is residential.

Mr. Hansen asked Ms. Loftus if she is on Bogey Lane.
Ms. Loftus answered yes.
Mr. Hansen pointed out her property was zoned office research and was changed to residential.
Discussion on change of land use of surrounding area and difference between the two properties.

Mr. Wynsma explained the reason they didn't plan for a fence along the east is because it is townhome to townhome with a setback of 70-85 ft. with most on their property line. He stated a fence would detract from the open space. He pointed out the parking ratio is identical between the two communities and the density is at 5.5 units per acre is 1.73 units per acre less than Peregrine Lakes. Mr. Wynsma addressed the upscale concerns pointing out the brick on all four sides and one story elevations that are significant improvements than the properties that back to theirs. He spoke to their price points in the 500's and 600's pointing out they are not an entry level townhome but rather a lifestyle community.

Chairman Dwyer spoke to the fence request prohibiting people cutting through.
Mr. Wynsma stated because the building is abandoned its attracting nuisance. He stated he doesn't think they will cut through once the property is developed pointing out the retaining wall and landscaping that will detract.
Discussion on people cutting though.

Mr. Friedman asked what the purpose and benefit of the fence parallel to Euclid Avenue.
Mr. Wynsma explained the benefit to is to Building 1 to screen the side entry. He pointed out the footprint being the master down entry is on side so this will allow a private entry. Mr. Wynsma spoke to the amount of landscape screening between the landscaping and the monument. He stated the only benefit is it may help with headlights.

Ms. Bandemer asked about drainage plan.
Mr. Wynsma explained the increased separation in the rear yard will allow a more gradual slope and allow more area for a rear yard swale to capture any

drainage with rear yard storm sewer along property that will go up to the detention basin and then to lake.

Mr. Fedota asked if there are public sidewalks along Euclid Avenue.
Ms. Rivard answered yes and there will be partial throughout the site.

Mr. Fedota stated there is no other vinyl fence in the area. He pointed out between the sidewalk, the setback and extensive landscape plan it may be a little "overkill".
Mr. Wynsma agreed speaking to the fence and landscaping stating they would be willing to eliminate if a condition was added.

Mr. Kolososki pointed out the lights from cars leaving Harper would shine on the building so the fence will help.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Petitioner has made significant revisions to the initial plans in order to address many of Staff's concerns and recommendations. The layout of the proposed development has been revised and includes a reduction in the number of units and buildings, increased building setbacks and driveway lengths, and appropriately placed guest parking spaces as well as revised architectural plans that include a style of architecture that conforms to Section 13.02 (e) of the Zoning Ordinance. The Future Land Use Map recommends a continued commercial/business use for this property. Given the recent acquisition of the adjacent Schneider Electric property by Weber Stephens, continued investment in the institutional uses to the south at Harper College, acquisition and development of the property at the northwest corner of Roselle Road and Algonquin Road, Staff has not been directed to change the Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use designation. Therefore, with the plan revisions and site changes, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Plan Commission. If the Plan Commission recommends approval of the proposal, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Preliminary Planned Development shall substantially conform to the Engineering plans prepared by Haeger Engineering dated August 31, 2018 and last revised on June 10, 2019, the Architectural plans prepared by BSB Design, dated April 23, 2019, except as such plans may be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The Plat of Subdivision shall be revised to include the MWRD maintenance requirements language for the detention/volume control and shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
3. The Engineer's Estimate of Cost shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and in compliance with the Code.
4. The Final Landscaping plan shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. This should include additional unit/foundation plantings and additional landscaping on the east side of the property, additional trees planted throughout the site to accommodate the removal of the 6 parkway trees, and an extension of the proposed fence along the eastern property line to provide sufficient screening for Peregrine Lake Estates West.

5. A Final Tree Preservation plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
6. The Final Auto-Turn Exhibit shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Fire Marshal.
7. The required letters of credit and recording fees shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
8. MWRD, IDOT, and IEPA permits will be required.
9. In conjunction with the final Planned Development application process, the Petitioner shall submit construction management plan and schedule in a manner acceptable to the Village of Palatine.
10. A final fencing plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
11. The existing lift station (1200 S. Patrick Lane) shall be evaluated to determine if there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.
12. The maintenance of the detention basin and volume control shall be the responsibility of the Homeowner's Association. As all of the site utilities serve only the development. All maintenance shall be the responsibility of the HOA and shall be documented in the homeowner documents accordingly. This shall remain a condition of Final Planned Development approval.
13. The HOA shall be responsible for maintaining and annually inspecting and testing the private fire hydrants. This shall remain a condition of Final Planned Development approval.
14. Final Homeowners Association Declarations shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.

Chairman Dwyer spoke to condition #11 and clarified if the capacity is not sufficient the Petitioner is responsible for upgrading the station.
Ms. Rivard answered yes.

Mr. Hansen pointed out the punctuation on condition #12.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked since the detention basin and the utilities are referenced in the HOA should the fencing and the retaining walls be included as well.
Ms. Rivard stated this is typically included in the HOA declarations.

Mr. Fedota asked if the Auto Turn Exhibit and approval by the Fire Department would be covered under condition #1.
Ms. Rivard answered yes.

Mr. Hansen asked Mr. Burney if they can and will comply with all staff's conditions.
Mr. Burney answered yes.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if the street will be utilizing the traffic signal on Euclid Avenue.
Mr. Wynsma answered yes.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked about the stop sign that was shown in plans.

Mr. Wynsma explained it was removed.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked about the detention basin emergency overflow.
Mr. Burda explained there will be an overflow in the structure and probably and emergency overflow over the berm.

Ms. Williams made a motion to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Fedota.

DISCUSSION:
Discussion on comprehensive plan whether office research or residential is more appropriate for the parcel.

Discussion on the space being vacant and previous proposals

Mr. Fedota made a motion to amend the Comprehensive Plan to zone the property residential; seconded by Ms. Williams.

AYES: Robins, Fedota, Noonan, Dwyer, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki
NAYS: Hansen, Williams

Chairman Dwyer asked if the land was designated residential what Staff's recommendation would be.
Ms. Rivard explained she can't answer as it was not a component of Staff's review.

Mr. Kolososki stated he see two flaws in the proposed plan including the S curve and the aesthetics with the brick being too dark.
Discussion on the S curve.

Chairman Dwyer pointed out there are a lot of details that need to be ironed out and Staff has conditions that needs approvals from different parts of the Village.

Mr. Noonan asked if the property was deemed residential would they need relief.
Discussion on needing relief.
Chairman Dwyer stated they would need to come through as a PUD because of required variances.

Mr. Friedman clarified the request is preliminary.
Chairman Dwyer explained preliminary is essentially final because we can't add conditions once Village Council approves.

Mr. Noonan clarified there are added conditions to further discuss the fencing.
Chairman Dwyer answered yes.

Mr. Friedman clarified if the Comprehensive Plan is not changed then this vote is null and void.
Chairman Dwyer answered yes explaining the motion is to give Village Council

guidance.

Mr. Noonan agreed with Mr. Kolososki on the S curve.
Chairman Dwyer pointed out it has to be acceptable to the Fire Marshal
Discussion on the S curve.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to approve the proposal with conditions amended by staff; Seconded by Mr. Kolososki.

Mr. Hansen thinks it's a fine plan but doesn't agree with the change in land use.

Chairman Dwyer summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 7-2. This item will tentatively go to the Community and Economic Development Committee of the Village Council on August 19, 2019.

RESULT:	**RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [7 TO 2]**
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Robert Kolososki, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
NAYS:	Hansen, Williams

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rivard stated the next meeting will be August 20, 2019 with 2 items on the agenda.

V. ADJOURNMENT