



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 • JULY 20, 2021

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	

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Plan Commission - Regular Meeting - Jul 6, 2021 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
ABSENT:	Robins

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 1133 N. Grove Avenue

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on July 5th, 2021.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Application
2. Topographic Survey
3. Plat of Subdivision
4. Engineering Plans
5. Public Notice Subdivision
6. Public Notice Vacation
7. Objection email
8. Proof of ownership

Sworn in Petitioner - Mr. Len Kleinjan

Mr. Kleinjan states he is representing the petitioner, Mr. Thomas Herzau, and is a civil engineer. The request is to rezone the subject property for R-1 to R-2 with (3) single family lots that will be 80' to 85' in width. Mr. Kleinjan presents a site plan and confirms lot size for each subject property.

Sworn in Staff: Ms. Katie Rivard

Ms. Rivard provides a background of the request and states that the subject property is approximately 0.89 acres, is one single-family vacant residential lot and the petitioner is seeking to rezone from R-1 to R-2. Petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

1. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision to permit a 3-lot single-family residential development
2. Rezoning from R-1 Single-Family Residential to R-2 Single-Family Residential
3. Vacation of the approximately 40 feet of Coolidge Avenue right-of-way, located directly east of 1133 N. Grove Avenue

Ms. Rivard provides documentation of proposed site plan and confirms lot sizes for each proposed property. She confirms the lots meet all of the bulk and setback requirements. She also states that the subject property is east and adjacent to the unimproved Coolidge Avenue right-of-way and the Village is recommending this area is vacated to the Petitioner as a condition of the Subdivision and Rezoning. If approved by Council, the Village would retain easement rights. She states that the right-of way would push the Subject Property past the 1-acre limit. She also states that the petitioner has indicated he is not interested in the right-of-way. Ms. Rivard explains the engineering requirements.

Discussion regarding the vacation of the Coolidge Avenue right-of-way.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks if the Coolidge Avenue right-of-way to the north and south are already vacated.

Ms. Rivard confirms that it is vacated to the north but not to the south.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks if it can be used for retention purposes.

Mr. Vyverberg is sworn in.

Mr. Vyverberg states that he would have to confirm with the Village Engineer.

Mr. Kleinjan states that the petitioner is not interested in the right-of-way.

Chairman Dwyer asks if the petitioner can refuse the right-of-way.

Mr. Vyverberg states it could be imposed as a subject of the review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

While several of the immediately adjacent properties remain R-1 zoning with larger lots, the proposal is consistent with recent developments immediately north and south of the Subject Property. Additionally, the Subject Properties are located within Northwest Sub-Area, which recommends that lots fronting Grove Avenue (south of North Avenue) be redeveloped within the Village's current R-2 standards. Ultimately, the approval of the Vacation of the unimproved, Coolidge Avenue right-of-way will remain a policy decision for the Village Council. With that being said, Staff recommends approval of the proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall substantially conform to the Plat of Subdivision and the Engineering Plans prepared by Haeger Engineering, dated 04/21/2021 last revised 06/09/2021, except as such plans may be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. A Public Improvement letter of credit or appropriate security deposit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
3. Review fees in the amount of 1.5% of the total project improvement costs (as defined in the Village Code) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
4. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted on Mylar with the required signatures and significantly conform to the Plat of Subdivision prepared by Norman J. Toberman & Associates, LLC.
5. A Plat of Vacation shall be submitted on Mylar with the required signatures in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
6. A Subdivision Improvement Agreement shall be submitted.
7. Recording fees in the amount of \$300 shall be submitted.
8. The Final Engineering Plans and Final Engineer's Cost Estimate shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
9. Cash-in-lieu of detention shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
10. Water recapture fees shall be paid in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer. This amount is subject to change up to the date of the Village Council approval.

11. Sanitary recapture fees shall be paid in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer. This amount is subject to change up to the date of the Village Council approval.

Mr. Friedman asks that the email letter to be read into the proceeding.

Mr. Dwyer reads the objection letter into the proceeding. He asks Mr. Vyverberg to respond to the letter and Mr. Vyverberg explains the Village's position on the request.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Fedota. The motion was unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Fedota states that the adding the right-of-way condition to the approval could be a potential hardship to the developer.

Chairman Dwyer states that the motion to approve can request that the motion be approved without the vacation.

Ms. Williams makes a motion to recommend approval of the Subdivision and Rezoning; seconded by Mr. Noonan. The motion is unanimously approved.

RESULT: RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS] Next: 8/9/2021 7:00 PM

MOVER: Teri Williams, Plan Commissioner

SECONDER: Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner

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

ABSENT: Robins

Ms. Williams makes a motion to approve the Vacation of Coolidge Ave; seconded by Mr. Noonan. Council recommend approval by a vote of 6-2.

RESULT: RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [6-2] Next: 8/9/2021 7:00 PM

MOVER: Teri Williams, Plan Commissioner

SECONDER: Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner

AYES: Hansen, Noonan, Williams, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

NAYS: Dwyer, Friedman

ABSENT: Robins

Chairman Dwyer summarized that the request to Subdivide and Rezone Subject property is unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0.

The second motion to approve the vacation of Coolidge Ave Right-of-Way is recommended to approve by a vote of 6-2.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS] Next: 8/9/2021 7:00 PM
MOVER:	Teri Williams, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
ABSENT:	Robins

2. 874-920 N. Quentin Road

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on July 5th, 2021 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Application
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Detailed Project Description
4. Petitioner Response Letter 04-20-21
5. Combined Drawings
6. Palatine Parking & Traffic Narrative 6-14-21
7. Parking Demand Trips 6-14-21
8. Public Notice
9. Objection Email - Orofino
10. Objection Email - Harder
11. Objection Email - Novak
12. Objection Email - Fluhler
13. Objection Email - Picchiotti
14. Objection Email - Dagan Park Estates
15. Objection Email - Palatine Lake Park Estates HOA
16. Objection Email - Pepper
17. Objection Email - Wippman
18. Objection Email - Murphy
19. Objection Email - Erins Glen THA
20. Objection Email - Olander
21. Objection Email - Schnabl
22. Paper-based Petition Opposing Alliance Dev
23. Letter of Support - Kleiva
24. Willow Glen HOA
25. Objection Email - Harris
26. Objection Email - Hammer
27. Objection Email - Clark
28. Objection Email - Howard
29. Objection Email - Rodell

Sworn in Petitioner's -

Shawn O'Brien - Northpointe Development

Andy Dumke - Northpointe Development

Jay Victor - Vice President of Development for Illinois for Northpointe Development.

Dennis Hansen - Vice President of Lutheran Social Services & Co-Developer

Mr. O'Brien explains that Northpointe Development is based out of Oshkosh, WI. They have developed and managed housing in Wisconsin and Michigan for

nearly 40 years. They've developed over 1,100 units over the past 10 years. Their mission is to provide sustainable housing for communities. They are a highly regarded developer for sustainable housing. He provides a slide show of existing developments that Northpointe developed.

Mr. Hansen talks about his role in the management and development of housing for more than 40 years. He explains that they own and manage over 450 subsidized units and 64 units of market rate for older adults. They are also a nonprofit sponsor on 17 successful tax credit applications since 2014 and provide service coordination for more than 4000 units.

Mr. Obrien states that the subject property consists of 2.5 acres and is proposed for a 58 unit complex with underground parking. He provides a site plan drawing to show a rendering of the building. He explains their plan for the site, construction materials for the building the amenities for the tenants. These would include a playground area, a grill station and balconies for every unit. He provides information on the design plan for the interior units and explains the finishes that would be utilized in each unit.

Mr. Obrien talks about the retaining walls and states it has been designed so that the underground parking would exit onto Poplar Street at this time but can easily be flipped for it to be accessed from Quentin Road.

He explains the tax credits that are being provided from the Illinois Housing Authority and gives a breakdown on how those funds would be utilized. He states that the project would employ local contractors and that all properties are managed by a third party. The project would be built to National Green Built Standards. It is considered a medium density project and the proposed architectural drawing shows the building to be a comparable height to what is in the neighborhood. The project would also be professionally landscaped.

He also explains that this is not a Section 8 housing project but an Affordable housing project. The difference is that rent is based on income. The units are priced affordably and based on the income of the workforce in the area. He states that he believes there is a significant need for this development.

Mr. Hansen adds that they are experienced and would provide service coordinators for tenants to help maintain and provide the needed funding. He states that tenants have to go through a vigorous process to obtain approval for their tenancy.

Mr. Jacob addresses the income levels - rents are not subsidized - they need to qualify their income to be approved for the program.

Mr. Kolososki asks if there is anything in place to help tenants if another pandemic should arise.

Mr. Obrien states that they would do everything in their power to help tenants that have financial hardship but ultimately it is the tenant that is responsible for the rent. He explains that the rent is based on income in a section 8 situation but in section 42 the rent is set and is not adjusted for loss of job.

Mr. Fedota asks how long is a typical lease and Mr. Obrien states it is normally 1 year.

Mr. Fedota asks if leases are reevaluated at the end of the lease.

Mr. Obrien states that they are and explains the formula that rents are calculated. Mr. Fedota asks if the rent is based on Cook County incomes. Mr. Obrien confirms it is based on Cook County incomes.

Mr. Freidman states that the presentation was insightful and appreciates all of the work the petitioner has put into it. He asks how often developments are surrounded by single family homes vs commercial developments.

Mr. Obrien states that many of the projects are surrounded by single family homes and explains that the standard 3 story building with flat roofs, as proposed, usually fit nicely into the neighborhoods and have been quite successful. He also explains that the reason they identified the project location is because of the existing mixed use in the neighborhood which currently consists of single family homes and multi-family housing.

Mr. Freidman asks if there has been a traffic process study. He asks if there are any conclusions on the impact this development would have to the area.

Mr. Obrien states that he doesn't believe it would have an impact. A traffic impact study for this project would be conducted but has not been done yet.

Mr. Bettenhausen inquires about the grading plan and the path going into the garage. He asks if the current driveway path that is shown would accommodate 2 cars going in and out.

Mr. Obrien states that he believes it would accommodate. The plan is preliminary and there is room for changes.

Mr. Dumke also states that these plans are preliminary and would be adjusted if the project were to move forward.

Mr. Noonan asks about services provided and questions if any surrounding residents have been contacted regarding this project.

Mr. Hansen talks about services provided by his organization and Mr. Obrien states that residents have not been polled yet.

Mr. Vyverberg talks about tonight's meeting requirements and reiterates that this meeting is preliminary for land usage. This is going through the process for the 1st time tonight and this is a land usage meeting. The site was previously approved for a memory care facility but that project did not move forward.

Ms. Rivard goes over the site plan and the proposed building development narrative.

Mr. Vyverberg talks about the density concerns for the proposed property and goes over the surrounding property densities. He agrees that there are traffic concerns that relate to Poplar Street.

Mr. Kolososki asks Mr. Vyverberg if he was aware of the drop in the grade from the back of subject property to the existing homes to the west.

Mr. Vyverberg states that there is an approximate 10 point grade differential. It was looked at during the previous approval.

Mr. Friedman asks if he can you confirm how the village measures building height.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the Grade is measured from the foundation line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is concerned with the overall density and massing of the proposed building at this location, which is impactful, given its proximity to single-family residential to the west. While the Comprehensive Plan outlines the future land use of a portion of the development area as multi-family, the Comprehensive Plan recommendation was reflective of the approved memory care/assisted living facility. Additionally:

- The density far exceeds the apartment complex to the north and the other existing multi-family developments in the area.
- The proposed FAR exceeds the maximum allowed in the multi-family district of .5 FAR. The proposed development would require 3.93 acres for the development to meet the minimum lot area/dwelling unit.
- Additionally, there is a sizable grade difference (10 feet) between the proposed building foundation and the single-family residential to the west. Combined with the building height of 36 feet, the building being setback approximately 50 feet from the west property line, the view and impact of this building will be substantial.
- The memory care/assisted living facility was a more passive use, with limited traffic, whereas the proposed development will generate much more traffic.
- With the exception of the storm water detention areas and front yard setback, there is no real open space or community assets to the proposed site plan.
- The access onto Poplar Street could potentially create conflicts and impact the existing single-family residential traffic, as the only ingress/egress to Quentin Road for residences on Poplar, Franklin, and Maple is via Poplar Street. Furthermore, Quentin Road has a maximum speed limit of 40 mph. And, a deceleration lane coming from Quentin Road is not a component of the preliminary plans. Per the Planned Development Design Standards, principal vehicular access points shall be designed to promote smooth traffic flow with controlled turning movements and minimum hazards to vehicular, bicycle and/or pedestrian traffic. The development does not provide any substantive guest parking and the one car queuing area from Poplar Street to the underground parking area, has the potential to create access and turning conflicts.

Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the Preliminary Planned Development

Chairman Dwyer acknowledges that the audience is in agreement with the staff's recommendation. Audience is asked to come forward now with any comments or questions.

Resident - Julie Picchiotti - 939 N Franklin Ave - States she is opposed to the proposed development. Provides letters and electronic signatures of 280 + residents who also oppose. She states that should the project move forward the

residents would like input into the project details. She also states that she is in agreement with the staff that the development should be denied.

Mr. Hansen asks Ms. Picchiotti if they had any ideas what a proper development would be for this area.

Resident - Mr. Picchiotti talks about similar lots located at Hicks Rd that developed single family homes which may be a better fit for this property. He states that the proposal is not an appropriate use of the space and is opposed to the proposed development.

Resident - Nanette Harris - 825 W Poplar - States she is a long time resident of Palatine. Has lived here over 24 years. Opposes the proposed usage of the planned development. Reads letter from her 90 year old neighbor who lives at 901 N Franklin Ave and is unable to attend. Her neighbor also opposes the proposed development.

Mr. Freidman asks Ms. Harris about her reference to the change in neighborhood and asks what her view is out her front door. Ms. Harris states that she faces the 3-story Clayson property with trees and bushes. It's a well maintained area.

Resident - Kathy Cortez - 141 S Fremont - Resident for 32 years - Is in favor of the planned development and feels that it would be a good location for this kind of development. People who struggle would appreciate the Palatine community. This is good affordable housing and states that residents should vote yes for the project.

Resident - Sarah Murphy and husband - 925 N Franklin - Opposes the proposed development. Does not feel this development fits the neighborhood and has concerns regarding the density of the development. States it would have a negative impact on the surrounding properties.

Resident - Adam Nung - 852 N Martin - New resident to Palatine and has lived here for 4 months. Opposes the development due to traffic concerns and construction noise.

Resident - Markus and Grace Orofino - 913 N Franklin Dr. - 3 year resident - opposes the plan development due to the density of the development

Resident - Chris Bonde - 1052 N Glenview Ct - Opposed the plan development due to the density of the development

Resident - Gail Banokis - 1237 W Crooked Willow Ln - Longtime resident - Opposes the planned development

Resident - Robert Lettecci - 998 N Glenview Ct - Opposes the Plan Development and notes his concerns about the play area near the retention pond and density of population.

Resident - Jim Osterhaus - 841 W Willow St - Opposes the Plan Development. Feels he lives in a high income neighborhood and it would impact the value of his property. States he researched affordable housing development managed by for profit developers but Chairman Dwyer states the testimony is not valid since it has no specific information from an appraiser.

Resident - KC Bixby - 917 N Coolidge - Opposes the Plan Development - asks the council about the section 42 program and a question to the developer. Asks how the long grant is locked into the financial

Developer can't answer 1st question -

Would own the project for 30 years - tax credit program is in affect for 30 years.

Patrick states the 1st question is irrelevant and does not have relevance to this meeting.

Resident - Victor Turasa - 839 N Franklin Ave - Opposes the Plan Development. Concerned about drainage.

Resident - John Crow - 996 N Glenview Ct - Opposes the Plan Development due to traffic concerns and density.

Resident - Jill Kessler - 848 N Quentin Rd - Opposes the Plan Development due to density and grade.

Resident - Sandra Clark - 907 N Quentin - States letter was sent to planners and board members and strongly oppose due to density and traffic.

Commissioner Dwyer asked staff to read the recommendations and addresses the issue brought to the table regarding the Fire Truck safely maneuvering at the site. He states that the Fire Marshall auto turn exhibit submitted to determine if there is room to turn.

Mr. Vyverberg - Reads the Staff Recommendations if the Plan Commission recommends approval, Staff would recommend the following conditions:

1. The Preliminary Planned Development shall substantially conform to the Engineering Plans prepared by Vierbicher dated 04/08/2021, and the Architectural Plans prepared by Knothe Bruce Architects dated 01/20/2021 last revised 04/13/2021, except as such plans may be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. A Plat of Consolidation/Subdivision shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
3. The Engineer's Cost Estimate shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
4. The Final Landscape Plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. Additional plantings, such as trees, evergreens and/or arborvitaes shall be installed along the western property line.
5. An Auto-Turn Exhibit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Fire Marshal.
6. The required Letters of Credit and other all fees shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
7. MWRD, Cook County, and NCCSWC permits are required.
8. In conjunction with the Final Planned Development application process, the Petitioner shall submit a construction management plan and schedule in a manner acceptable to the Village of Palatine.
9. In conjunction with the Final Planned Development application process, the

Petitioner shall submit a Traffic Impact Study in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. The developer should anticipate possible road improvements being required for Poplar Road.

10. A final fencing plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
11. The Petitioner shall submit a storm water management and maintenance plan in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
12. The playground location will be reconsidered to provide additional separation from the detention basin.
13. The petitioner shall provide a detailed sign plan for the entire site. Information on the freestanding sign and wayfinding signage for the property shall be provided in the plan.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to close the public hearing and 2nd by Ms. Williams

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Dwyer asks the board members what they thought would make this an acceptable proposal. Density is a problem. Mr. Fedota states the density element is the overwhelming element. Mr. Kolososki states the parking and density is too much.

The Village Lawyer, Mr. Patrick Brankin states that the conversation should be restricted to what is before the council and speculation of alternative solutions should not be addressed at this time.

Mr. Noonan addresses the committee and states that he is related to an objector in the audience but wanted to assure everyone that this would not influence his decision.

Deliberations are concluded.

Motion to Recommend Approval of the Petition - 1-7 opposed

Motion to recommend denial - 8-0

Unanimously recommended to approve denial

This matter will go to Council on Monday 8-9-21.

Communications:

Ms. Rivard states that the Regency Plaza subdivision was approved by village council.

The crematorium request from Ahlgrim Funeral Home was adopted by the council for existing use.

Motion to adjourn by Noonan 2nd by ?

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [0 TO 8]	Next: 8/9/2021 7:00 PM
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Stephen Fedota, Plan Commissioner	
NAYS:	Hansen, Dwyer, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota	
ABSENT:	Robins	

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. ADJOURNMENT