



# 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 • JUNE 28, 2022

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

### I. CALL TO ORDER

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

### II. MINUTES APPROVAL

1. Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting - Jun 14, 2022 7:00 PM

**Ms. Roth-Wurster made a motion to approve the minutes of June 14, 2022; seconded by Mr. Pirog**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Cindy Roth-Wurster, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	John Pirog, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczyk, Pirog
<b>ABSENT:</b>	McGinn, Cavanaugh

### III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 1070 N. Cardinal Drive

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on June 13, 2022 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/ Site Plan
4. Existing Conditions
5. Fence Elevation (sample)
6. Neighbor Consent Forms
7. Public Notice

**Sworn in staff: Ms. Lyn Bremanis and Mr. Alex Bradshaw**

**Sworn in the petitioner: Ms. Marta Brzostowski 1017 N Cardinal Dr**

Ms. Brzostowski stated they currently have a picket fence around the property that is old and not in good condition. She stated they want to replace with a private solid 6ft white fence for privacy. Ms. Brzostowski stated the picket style allows trash from street to enter her yard. She explained the fence is important for privacy to be able to sit in the yard and enjoy quiet. She spoke to the standards stating it won't destroy the vistas because it will be nicer than the old one and will not distract from the overall appearance of the community. Ms. Brzostowski stated they put in a new driveway and looking to update property and make more comfortable.

Mr. Pirog asked if any other homes have a 6ft high fence.

Ms. Brzostowski stated the other corners do referring to aerial to show 2 other houses.

Mr. Pirog pointed out they still have to clean garbage outside the fence.

Ms. Brzostowski agreed stating they will keep it nice with landscaping.

Ms. Roth-Wurster clarified they are replacing in the same location just changing style.

Ms. Brzostowski answered yes.

Ms. Wood referred to the existing conditions slide and pointed out the fence looks in good condition. She asked why the 6ft solid would enhance the area.

Ms. Brzostowski explained the fence would block visibility of their stuff in yard. She pointed out the neighbors submitted consent letters and are happy with the new fence.

Mr. Luszczak asked staff why they need relief.

Mr. Bradshaw explained they are replacing the fence in the same place but changing from 4ft to 6ft. He explained it is pre-existing non-conforming. He further explained the only way to replace without relief is to replace with the same height and style.

Mr. Bradshaw gave a brief overview explaining the proposed fence will remain setback 10ft with existing landscaping to remain. He stated the proposed fence abuts the 20 foot front yard of 1070 E. Olde Virginia Rd. He stated the petitioners have received letters of consent from all four directly adjacent property owners. Mr. Bradshaw pointed out the property across Cardinal Drive from the Subject Property, 1071 E. Cardinal, has an existing non-conforming six (6) foot solid fence that is setback approximately 13 feet from the side lot line abutting Olde Virginia Rd. He stated it is not uncommon in the area to see these type of fences in these locations. Mr. Bradshaw stated Community Services and Engineering have reviewed and had no issues.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked about the distance between the fence and sidewalk in the slide.

Mr. Bradshaw spoke to the other properties in the area having similar fences approx. 13ft off line.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Petitioners are proposing to replace an existing 4-foot open style fence with a 6-foot solid fence. The proposed fence will be in the exact location as the existing fence, which is set back approximately 10 feet from the side property line that abuts Olde Virginia Road. Said property line also abuts the side lot line of the front yard of the adjacent lot to the north. Per Code, the required setback is 20 feet. The Petitioner has received letters of consent from all four directly adjacent property owners, including 1070 E. Olde Virginia Rd (directly north).

The existing landscaping between the existing fence and the side lot line abutting the street will remain to provide an effective buffer. Ultimately, Staff did not identify any negative impacts the proposed fence would have on the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use with the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevation plan submitted by the Petitioners, Jacek and Marta Brzostowski, 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.

**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 it meets all besides enhancing the appearance. He pointed out the neighbors are ok with it and there are others

in community.

Ms. Roth-Wurster agreed with Mr. Pirog. She stated it is not too close to street and there was a fence there before and had no line of site issues.

Ms. Wood agreed with Mr. Pirog. She pointed out Staff and the neighbors feel it's acceptable and there are other homes in area with similar fences.

**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 July 11, 2022**

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

## 2. 433 N. Stark Drive

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on June 13, 2022 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. Site Plan
5. Fence Elevation (sample)
6. Letter of Consent 441 N Stark Ave
7. Public Notice

**Sworn in petitioner: Ms. Amanda Hall and Mr. Jeremy Hall 433 N. Stark Drive**

Ms. Hall stated they want to fence around their back yard. She explained it would be 6ft along the north property line transitioning to 4ft picket scalloped fence to sidewalk and back up to their house. She stated they are in a unique situation based on their house faces Middleton Ct but legal front yard is Stark Dr. but because of shape primary portion of yard is in the northwest corner of lot. Ms. Hall stated the fence will be ascetically pleasing, provide privacy and contain the pets and kids. She stated Stark is high traffic from high school so this will provide a buffer. She stated they originally intended the privacy all around but decided to compromise and go with picket to help with site lines but still help with containment. She stated there will be landscaping along sidewalk. Ms. Hall pointed out if put at 30ft it would not give much of a back yard.

Mr. Pirog asked what area requires the relief.

Mr. Bradshaw explained any front yard fence needs relief. He referred to the site plan slide and marked the area in question.

Ms. Hall explained they wanted to do privacy fence a bit past setback line to neighbor's tree because you can see into their family room from the sidewalk.

Ms. Wood asked if site plan slide is correct.

Ms. Hall answered yes.

Mr. Pirog clarified the fence is on lot line.

Ms. Hall answered yes pointing out there are other homes similar and will landscape to make look nice. She pointed out they have a small yard and want to maximize space for kids and dogs.

Mr. Bradshaw gave a brief overview stating the subject property is zoned R2 with a 30ft front yard setback. He stated the proposed fence will be setback 3 feet from the front property line abutting North Stark Drive with landscaping between the proposed fence and property line. He stated the proposed fence abuts the 30

foot front yard of 441 N. Stark Drive. Mr. Bradshaw stated the petitioners are aware of the front yard line of sight impact questions raised by Staff (for the portion of the 6-foot fence), and have presented consent from the adjacent neighbor at 441, 448 & 436 N. Stark Drive. (submitting 448 and 436 as additional exhibits)

Mr. Pirog asked where the 6ft fence is going.

Mr. Bradshaw referred to site plan slide to show location of fence.

Mr. Pirog asked what requires a special use.

Mr. Bradshaw explained everything that is within the front yard.

Ms. Wood asked if community services changed their concern when they changed to 4ft picket fence.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the line of site concern is still there but the petitioner received consent from that neighbor.

Ms. Wood submitted into record the additional consent letters as exhibit C.

Mr. Pirog asked if the line of site concern was for driving or walking.

Mr. Bradshaw explained it would be for 441 N Stark Dr. and the sidewalk in front and back that curves around the bend.

Mr. Pirog asked if it would be 4ft all around could it alleviate the line of site issue.

Mr. Bradshaw stated it potentially could.

Discussion on location of 6ft fence.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked if line of site is only with 6ft privacy.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the 4ft is less of a concern for staff.

Ms. Wood asked how it will transition.

Mr. Bradshaw explained it goes from 4ft -6ft. He stated there was not a lot of line of site issue with current driveway so staff is not concerned with 4ft.

Ms. Wood clarified Community Services still has concern.

Mr. Bradshaw answered, that is correct.

**Sworn in Mr. Richard Murray 648 E Stark Dr**

Mr. Murray pointed out there are a lot of fences in neighborhood but most are setback more. He stated he knows that makes their yard small but thinks this will change the look of neighborhood.

Mr. Pirog asked staff if they know of other homes with fences that are that close to lot line.

Mr. Bradshaw answered there is no list but they can be existing nonconforming to the current zoning code.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Petitioners are proposing to construct a 4-foot open style fence in the required front yard of the Subject Property. The proposed fence will be set back approximately three (3) feet from the required front property line that abuts N. Stark Drive. Said property line also abuts the side lot line of the front yard of the adjacent lot to the north. Per Code, the required setback is 30 feet. Although it is not required, the Petitioner has proposed landscaping between the existing fence and the front lot line abutting the street, which will provide an effective buffer.

Staff identified a potential line of sight question for the property directly to the north (441 N. Stark Drive), abutting the required front side yard of the Subject Property. If the proposed fence plan were amended to maintain a 4-foot fence through the entire front yard (30 feet), Staff would have recommended approval. Staff did not identify any other negative impacts the proposed fence would have on the overall appearance of the surrounding neighborhood.

Therefore, Staff recommends Action at the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals for the proposed Special Use. If the Special Use is approved, Staff recommends the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevation plan submitted by the Petitioners, Ms. Hall and Jeremy Hall, except as said plans may be changed to conform to the Village's Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood asked about the recommendation to amend to 4ft in the front yard. Mr. Bradshaw explained if the transitioned was pushed back an additional 10ft to meet the 30ft line staff would recommend approval referring to the site plan slide to show location.

Ms. Hall explained the primary reason to push the privacy beyond the setback is for safety and privacy. She explained people from the sidewalk can see directly into their house.

Mr. Pirog asked where the family room is.

Ms. Hall referred to existing conditions slide to explain it is by the sliding glass door between the chimneys by patio.

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

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

**DELIBERATIONS:**

Mr. Luszczak stated he sees the need for the privacy. He stated the 6ft doesn't make a difference with the curved street.

Mr. Pirog stated he is hesitant because there are no other homes that have fence. He stated he understand the privacy issue, but that's an issue with other

homes as well.

Ms. Roth-Wurster expressed concern with the line of site issue.

Ms. Wood stated fences are not common so it gives you pause but thinks it would be ok. She stated the line of site gives pause but the petitioner has tapered down so that's an improvement. She pointed out it is just the 10ft that gives the line of site concern. Ms. Wood stated she can't approve something that would be a safety issue.

**Aye: Luszczak**

**Nay: Roth-Wurster, Pirog, Woof**

**Motion failed 1-3**

**Mr. Pirog made a motion to deny the proposed Special Use; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster**

**Ms. Wood summarized that this request has not met the standards and was denied by a vote of 3-1. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on July 11, 2022**

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

## 3. 32 S. Kerwood Street

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on June 13, 2022 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. Public Notice

**Sworn in petitioner: Ms. Dona Martin 32 S Kerwood Street and John Pancorvo contractor 12 W College Dr.**

Mr. Pancorvo explained homeowner recently bought the house. He referred to the existing conditions slides to show the paver steps off back door leading to an unsafe loose-gravel patio. He explained the original plan was to follow the outline of the existing stone coming out a little farther into back yard being approx. 640sqft. Mr. Pancorvo stated zoning flagged the permit submittal for percentage of impervious surface which was over due to lot being smaller. He stated they shrunk the patio to approx. 331sqft. He stated the main reason for the request is to make the unsafe patio more stable. He referred to the existing conditions slide to show the orange marks to show proposed new dimensions. Mr. Pancorvo stated they are hiring a professional landscaper to landscape around and the proposed patio for a nicer look and to be safer and it won't negatively affect drainage of neighboring properties. He stated the patio is not visible from the front. He stated they have obtained letters of consent from neighbors.

Mr. Pirog asked if the reduced size is big enough.

Ms. Martin stated she would have liked it bigger to fit all the chairs but main issue is the loose gravel is not safe.

Mr. Pirog asked if loose gravel does not count on coverage.

Mr. Bradshaw states loose gravel is not considered as impervious surface.

Mr. Luszczak asked if they considered pavers.

Mr. Pancorvo explained regular pavers are impervious and permeable pavers are higher cost.

Ms. Wood asked if letter of support were submitted.

Ms. Martin stated they were already submitted.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked about water issues.

Ms. Martin answered, no.

Mr. Pirog expressed concern that the size is not adequate.

Mr. Pancorvo explained they tried to appease to staff and get her the safe patio she needs.

Ms. Wood asked about the letters.

Mr. Bradshaw explained they were attached to the site plan he listed the 3 addresses that submitted.(30,38,& 23 S Kerwood)

Ms. Wood asked if it would have to be re-noticed to make bigger.

Mr. Bradshaw answered, yes.

Ms. Martin stated the notice went out with the original size request.

Discussion on the size of proposed patio.

Mr. Pancorvo stated it will be a decent size patio. He stated the pictures don't show it clearly. He stated no one will fall off the patio.

Mr. Bradshaw gave a brief overview stating the subject property is zoned R-2 and annexed into the Village in 1869. He stated the existing lot is nonconforming in lot area with the surrounding lots being comparable in size, and most had rear patio areas. Mr. Bradshaw stated the existing lot coverage is approximately 48% (3,200 sf) which exceeds the maximum 45% lot coverage by 207 sf. And the new patio will add approximately 331 sf to the total existing lot coverage, bringing the total proposed lot coverage to approximately 54% (3,531 sf). Mr. Bradshaw explained the Code requires a standard Variation to permit an increase in the lot coverage to 54% (3,531 sf) instead of the maximum 45% (2,993 sf), being a difference of 538 sf. He stated Community Services and Engineering have reviewed and Engineering has one comment requiring all excavated material to be removed off site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Petitioner is proposing to construct a new concrete patio to replace an existing crushed gravel patio. Staff agrees that a concrete patio would be significantly safer more accessible than the crushed gravel. The Subject Property is smaller than standard R-2 Zoned residential properties, and the proposed patio has a smaller overall footprint than the existing. With that said, Staff has not identified any potential negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Variation, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the site plan submitted by the Petitioner's agent, John Pancorvo, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Villages Codes and Ordinances.
2. All excavated material must be removed off site in a matter acceptable to the Village Engineer.

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

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

**DELIBERATIONS:**

Ms. Roth-Wurster spoke to the standards stating reasonable return improving a gravel patio into a concrete patio would make a difference in the home. She stated when looking at lot coverage water issues are the concern but Engineering has reviewed and that's not the case. She stated this will be safer and won't be seen from the street.

Ms. Wood spoke to reasonable return and uniqueness with smaller lot. She stated there is a patio there now, and they are making it smaller and won't be seen from the front yard. She stated she thinks the standards have been met.

**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 July 11, 2022**

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

## 4. 110 N. Benton Street

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on June 13, 2022 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

**Petitioner's Exhibits:**

1. Application for Variation
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey
4. Site Plan
5. Elevations
6. Public Notice

**Sworn in the petitioner: Mr. Chris Curry Representative of Archadeck of Chicagoland 395 W Northwest Hwy**

Mr. Curry stated they are proposing to demolish the existing deck and build new deck that encroaches into the setback. He explained with the yard layout this is the only way to make good yard space. He stated it won't alter the locality and will allow more functional use of the yard and increase the value of property.

Ms. Wood asked about the variation for the existing deck.

Mr. Bradshaw explained the existing deck received a variation for setback relief was given in 1996.

Ms. Wood asked if this is bigger.

Mr. Curry explained the new deck is approx. 237 sq.ft.

Ms. Wood asked how much bigger the new deck is.

Mr. Curry stated they are demoing approx. 175sqft and the new one is approx. 236 sq.ft.

Ms. Wood asked if they just want a bigger deck.

Mr. Curry explained they are adding the lower area to add more functionality to use in backyard.

Ms. Wood asked staff about lot coverage percentages.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the existing is approx. 57% and they are increasing to approx. 58%.

Ms. Wood asked if they were approved previously for the 57%.

Mr. Bradshaw answered, yes.

Mr. Bradshaw gave a brief overview stating the subject property is zoned R2 single family and annexed into Village in 1869. He stated it is a substandard lot with approx. 4350 sqft. He stated the existing lot coverage is approximately 57% (2,499 sf) which exceeds the maximum 45% lot coverage by 540 sf. Mr. Bradshaw stated the petitioner is proposing to reconfigure the deck adding

approximately 20 sqft to the overall lot coverage. He pointed out the existing deck was granted setback relief in 1996 and this setback will be maintained. He stated Community Services and Engineering have reviewed and have no issues.

Mr. Pirog clarified the setback is maintained and asked where the increase is. Mr. Bradshaw referred to existing condition to show area of removal and expansion.

Ms. Roth-Wurster clarified there are differences in the existing and proposed elevations.

Mr. Bradshaw answered, yes.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Petitioners are requesting to replace and reconfigure the existing deck off the rear of their home. At 57%, the property currently exceeds the maximum lot coverage (45%) as the existing deck received a Variation in 1996 for setback relief, and was approved prior to lot coverage regulations. As the proposed deck will maintain the previously granted setback, Staff believes it will not alter the essential character of the area.

The proposed deck will further increase the overall lot coverage that already exceeds the maximum permitted. The Village Engineer did not identify any storm water management issues with the Subject Property. However, the Subject Property size is substandard and creates a hardship for the homeowner, restricting improvements to the lot.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the requested Variation, subject to the following condition:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the site plan submitted by the Petitioners, Randy & Rebecca Poznan on 5/19/2022, except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village's 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. He stated the deck is currently in place not increasing distance to the property line. He pointed out the uniqueness with the substandard lot size.

Ms. Roth-Wurster agreed with Mr. Pirog. She stated it is unique circumstance and won't alter character of neighborhood. She stated Archadeck does a nice job and it will allow better use of deck. She stated there is no water issues so is less concerned with lot coverage.

Ms. Wood spoke to the reasonable return and uniqueness. She stated it is a slight increase in lot coverage and no issues in past with storm water. She stated she thinks the standards have been met.

**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 July 11, 2022**

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

## 5. 619 E. Dundee Road

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on June 13, 2022 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. Elevation
7. Public Notice

**Sworn in the petitioner: Mr. Alton Klein director of Design and Entitlements for Kids Empire 620 Arrow Highway California**

Mr. Klein stated Kids Empire is an indoor playground for kids 12 and under. He referred to slides to show proposed play equipment. He stated they do not offer drop off services and required parents to be with children at all times. Mr. Klein stated they sell only prepackaged food. He stated during birthday parties they will contract with local bakery and pizzeria to provide those items. He explained these items will be provided on demand because they will have no storage facility for them. He stated these type of facilities are in demand for children to play in a safe area. Mr. Klein stated they currently have 35 parks open and design and operate within the realm of the local jurisdictions public health and welfare with the considerations of their guest public safety and health. He stated they have employees on site to monitor child safety and clean every night. He stated they would not cause injury to property values. Mr. Klein referred to slide to show location next to Hobby Lobby and stated they will have no music outside.

Ms. Wood pointed out there is a lot of parking so there is no concern. She stated there is a lot of seating that takes up a lot of the floor plan. She asked about parents being required to stay for birthday parties.

Mr. Klein stated they don't want to be in a daycare use. He stated the parents are responsible for their own children even during parties.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked if this size is standard.

Mr. Klein explained their locations range in size. He spoke to other venues they have. He agreed there are many tables but stated they never get to capacity.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview of the business plan including hours and staff and guest occupancy. She stated the parking plaza is well over parked. She stated Community Services, Environmental Health and Fire Prevention have all reviewed and did not identify any issues. Ms. Bremanis referred to the existing conditions slides to show conceptual sign and location.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed business is occupying a vacant space in the Deer Grove Shopping Center. This use is compatible with the other retail, service, and restaurant uses that presently occupy the shopping center. The proposed use should not alter the essential character of the locality. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the floor plan and business plan prepared by the petitioner dated 04/30/2022, except 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 stated it is a good use of property. He stated he likes that parent have to stay for safety issues.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated it meet the standards. She pointed out they have a lot of locations and there are no parking issues.

Ms. Wood stated the standards have been met. She stated there is a need for indoor recreation facilities 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 July 11, 2022**

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

**IV. COMMUNICATIONS**

**V. ADJOURNMENT**