



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MAY 12, 2026 AT 7:00 PM

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

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wood Called the Meeting to order at 7:05PM

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT :	Planning & Zoning Commissioner Jan Wood, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Cindy Roth Wurster, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Tim Schubert, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Stephen Fedota, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Rodney Bettenhausen, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Robert Kolososki
ABSENT :	Planning & Zoning Commissioner Kevin Cavanaugh, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Eric Friedman, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Patrick Noonan
ARRIVED :	

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RESULT:	APPROVED
MOVER:	Rodney Bettenhausen
SECONDER:	Robert Kolososki
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

A. Draft PZC Minutes - 04/28/2026

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 4-20 E. Slade Street

1. Planned Development Amendment to permit a raised exit landing, with stairs providing access to the yard and a patio on the west side of the property of Lot 1 (4 E. Slade Street); and

2. Special Use for a fence in a side yard abutting the street, which abuts the side yard of a front yard of an adjacent lot at Slade Street Crossing;

FPD-000258-2026 – 4-20 E Slade St – District #6

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on April 23rd, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Lot 1 Plans – Fencing & Landing**
4. **Fence Elevation**
5. **Slade Street Planned Development Files**
6. **Public Notice**

Background:

Mr. Auer provides background and states the Subject Property was previously approved as a five-lot single-family residential Planned Development. Four of the lots have been developed with single-family homes, while Lot 1, located at the northeast corner of E. Slade Street and N. Plum Grove Road, remains vacant. The petitioner is proposing a 4-foot tall picket-style fence along the Plum Grove Road frontage of the lot, set back approximately 3 feet from the western property line. Although the proposed fence height, setback, and openness would typically be permitted through a standard building permit review, the Zoning Ordinance requires Special Use approval because the fence is located within a side yard abutting a street and adjacent to the side lot line of a front yard.

Mr. Auer further states the petitioner is also requesting a Planned Development Amendment to revise the approved architectural plans for Lot 1 to allow for an approximately 84 square-foot patio on the west side of the home, along with a raised exit landing and stairs providing access to the yard within the side yard abutting the street.

Sworn in petitioner: Greg Rose – GWR Builders -47 N Bothwell, Palatine, IL

Mr. Rose states the existing subdivision is a Planned Unit Development with four homes already constructed. The petitioner is proposing to build a ranch-style residence that fits within the required setbacks and overall parameters of the development. He states the request is for a minor amendment to the Planned Development to allow a deck and patio within the side yard setback area. He further explains the petitioner is requesting a 4-foot tall picket-style fence located approximately 3 feet from the sidewalk at the front of the home, extending along the

sidewalk and back toward the garage. Mr. Rose states the patio and landing are not covered structures.

Chair Wood asks whether the request is primarily for safety purposes related to children and dogs, and Mr. Rose confirms that it is.

Mr. Rose states the Planned Development does not permit larger 5- or 6-foot fences and they are attempting to work within the existing parameters of the ordinance.

Commissioner Kolososki asks about the distance between the curb and the proposed fence. Mr. Rose states the setback would be a minimum of approximately 7 feet, increasing to approximately 9 to 10 feet moving north along the property.

Commissioner Schubert asks whether gates are proposed. Mr. Rose states there would definitely be a gate at the rear of the fence and potentially one near the front.

Mr. Rose states the footprint of the proposed home, excluding the garage, is identical to the other homes previously constructed within the development. He notes the request is not related to the size of the home, but rather the fencing, patio, and stair landing, which are outside the original Planned Development approvals. He further states the home will be a raised ranch design.

Chair Wood asks about the proposed height difference between the new home and the neighboring residence to the east. Mr. Rose states the proposed home would be approximately 8 feet shorter than the adjacent home and would provide a good visual transition along the busy roadway.

Commissioner Kolososki asks whether the attic space would be used for storage and whether roof trusses are proposed. Mr. Rose states the home would be stick-built and acknowledges the attic could potentially accommodate an additional room in the future, although no such plans are currently proposed.

Chair Wood asks whether the neighboring property owners had been contacted regarding the proposal. Mr. Rose states the neighbor to the east had been spoken with regarding the request.

Commissioner Fedota asks about the size of the proposed patio. Mr. Rose states the patio would measure approximately 7 feet by 12 feet. He further states the landing extending from the house would project approximately 4 feet, with a 42-inch by 42-inch landing and full-width stairs leading to the patio area.

Mr. Auer provides additional information regarding the request and explains the petitioner is seeking an amendment to a previously approved Planned Development. He reviews the requirements associated with the Special Use request and provides clarification regarding the proposed fence and deck improvements. Mr. Auer states Staff does not anticipate the proposal would create adverse impacts on the surrounding properties or area.

Staff Recommendation:

The Village Code requires Special Use review for the proposed fence, as the side yard abutting a street for Lot 1 abuts the side lot line of the front yard of the property to the north. With the proposed height and openness of the fence and the approximately 37- foot setback from the shared property line, there should be no impact upon that property. Additionally, the proposed style and height are directly comparable to other fencing in the established neighborhoods around the downtown area within the Village. The proposed architectural modifications for the patio and existing landing on the west side of the home, while an amendment from the approved final Planned Development, also maintain the overall development's characteristics. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Planned Development Amendment and Special Use for the proposed 4- foot tall picket-style fencing, subject to the following conditions:

1. The final architectural plans shall substantially conform to the Lot 1 plans date 2/10/26, except as such plans shall be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The fencing site plan and elevation shall substantially conform to the fencing site plan, dated 3/17/26, except as such plans shall be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances

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

Commissioner Schubert Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Roth-Wurster

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Schubert states this is the final piece of the puzzle at the Slade Street crossing development. He states it is nice to see the last home being developed and believes the proposal will complement the existing homes while improving the functionality of the property with the porch and deck improvements. He notes the use of the side yard will be beneficial and states the proposed 4-foot fence style is common in the area, low in height, and does not create a safety concern. He believes the request meets the required standards and will be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster agrees the request meets the applicable standards and states the proposed fence style is a popular feature within the downtown area that fits the character of the neighborhood. She believes the proposal will be a nice addition to the development.

Commissioner Kolososki states the development has been well done from beginning to end.

Chair Wood states there were initial concerns from neighbors during the original development process, but the homes have turned out very nicely and have enhanced the appearance of the area. She states the proposal will continue to add value to the neighborhood and believes nearby residents should be pleased with the final result. She notes the requested changes are modest in nature, will not negatively impact property values, and the proposed fence is not an overreach. She believes the request meets the required standards.

Mr. Auer states the proposal meets the standards for corner yard fencing and would not adversely impact neighboring properties.

Chair Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday May 18th, 2026.

RESULT:	MOTION APPROVED BY ROLL CALL
MOVER:	TIM SCHUBERT
SECONDER:	CINDY ROTH WURSTER
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

B. 315 W. Johnson Street

1. Preliminary Planned Development to permit a new 4-unit townhome building.

PPD-000016-2026 – 315 W. Johnson Street – District #2

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on April 23rd, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Site, Floor & Elevation Plans**
5. **Public Notice**

Background:

The Subject Property, at approximately .5 acres, is currently vacant and zoned R-2 Single Family Residential. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a 4-unit townhome development. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting: Preliminary Planned Development to permit a 4-Unit Townhome Residential Development

Sworn in petitioner:

Janusz Luterek, J Darien Corp – 2265 Inverrary Rd. – Inverness, IL –
Owner/Developer

Bobby Taylor – Warren Johnson Architects – 19 N. Greeley Street – Palatine, IL

Ms. Taylor presents the proposal for a new two-story building containing four townhouse units. She states each unit would contain approximately 2,366 square feet of habitable living space, in addition to unfinished basements, and would include a private driveway, front entrance walkway, patio area, open living and dining area on the first floor, attached garage, and second-floor bedrooms with loft space. She reviews the proposed exterior materials and light/dark color scheme and states the building materials are intended to complement the surrounding area and nearby development to the east.

Chair Wood comments that the proposal would be a nice addition to the street and asks about the landscaping and fencing plans, noting there are currently many overgrown trees and vegetation on the property.

Mr. Luterek states the development would be managed through a homeowners association and some trees would be removed and replaced with new landscaping and trees, including additional plantings along the east side of the property. He states there may also be privacy fencing installed toward the rear yards.

Chair Wood asks whether the arborvitae along the front of the property would remain.

Mr. Luterek states they would like to preserve them if possible, although it is still under consideration. He notes a large tree on the side of the property would need to be removed. He also states new bushes would be planted along the east and west property lines.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks whether the existing creek on the property would be impacted.

Mr. Luterek states additional engineering review would still be required before any final determinations are made.

Chair Wood asks about the fencing plans.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether the fencing would serve as a perimeter fence or individual fenced areas for each unit. Mr. Luterek states the fencing would extend toward the rear of the property and all fencing would be privacy fencing.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks about the proposed fence height. Mr. Luterek states the final fence height has not yet been determined.

Chair Wood asks Staff for clarification regarding fencing requirements.

Mr. Auer states there is a 50-foot easement associated with the floodplain area and fencing cannot impede drainage or floodplain function. He notes there are no anticipated conflicts at this time, but the submitted documentation remains preliminary in nature. Engineering staff will conduct further evaluation upon submittal of final engineering plans.

Commissioner Fedota asks about the setback between the parking area and the eastern property line and notes there does not appear to be a proposed barrier other than a privacy fence.

Mr. Auer reviews the site plan and states the proposed development meets the required setback standards.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether landscaping or screening would be required within that setback area, noting the parking appears very close to the property line.

Chair Wood asks additional questions regarding the proposed driveways.

Mr. Auer states landscaping islands are not currently required for this type of planned development or multifamily configuration under the ordinance. Auer continues to state that fencing is included on the site plan and may reduce impacts from vehicle lights.

Additional discussion occurs regarding lighting and the potential for vehicle headlights to shine into neighboring windows.

Mr. Luterek states privacy fencing should help address those concerns.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks about rear yard topography and the existing land conditions.

Mr. Luterek responds regarding the site conditions.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether basement flood elevations have been evaluated.

Mr. Taylor states additional topographic information is still needed.

Chair Wood states anything located within the floodplain would need to be identified and addressed.

Mr. Auer confirms that is correct.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether consideration was given to adding additional bedroom windows for cross ventilation and views.

Mr. Taylor states additional windows were not proposed because the units primarily face north and south.

Mr. Auer provides additional information regarding the surrounding area and proposal. He states the project consists of townhomes on a vacant half-acre parcel with a proposed 44-foot driveway configuration. He reviews the proposed setbacks and states they exceed the minimum zoning requirements and are compatible with surrounding properties and density patterns in the area. He states the proposed materials are compatible with surrounding development and existing utilities are available. Engineering staff reviewed the preliminary plans and did not identify significant concerns. He further states the proposal is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision for the area and does not exceed maximum height requirements.

Commissioner Fedota asks about sidewalks within the area and notes they are not shown on the proposal. He also expresses concern regarding the arborvitae near the driveway and the length of the proposed driveway, noting the possibility of multiple parked vehicles.

Mr. Auer states the setbacks are compatible with surrounding properties, and agrees that driveways would allow for multiple vehicles. He states landscaping would be modified as necessary and any visibility concerns related to driveway access would be addressed during final review.

Commissioner Fedota expresses concern regarding the long driveway and visibility near the arborvitae plantings.

Chair Wood agrees the concern should be noted.

Commissioner Fedota states neighbors across the street could potentially be viewing numerous parked vehicles and questions whether the rear setback area feels constrained compared to the typical 30-foot setback within the R-3 District.

Mr. Auer states the intent was to align the setbacks with surrounding development patterns.

Commissioner Fedota clarifies he is not specifically requesting revisions but suggests consideration be given to shifting the building farther forward to allow for additional rear yard space.

Commissioner Kolososki asks whether there would be a homeowners association.

The petitioner confirms there would be a homeowners association, and Commissioner Kolososki notes parking limitations could potentially be addressed through HOA regulations.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks whether sidewalk plans would be reviewed further.

Mr. Auer states sidewalk improvements would continue to be reviewed during final engineering and permit review.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster also expresses concern regarding line-of-sight visibility.

Mr. Auer states Staff anticipates any sidewalk or visibility concerns must meet the standards established by Public Works review and addressed during final plan review.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner has provided sufficient preliminary land use information to complete the Preliminary Planned Development review. The size of the lot would also support the proposed number of dwelling units, and the overall parking provided exceeds the minimum code requirements. Additionally, the proposed residential density is within the allowances of the zoning code and is comparable to other non-single-family residential developments in the vicinity of the subject property. The proposed architectural plans are comparable to several of the surrounding developments. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:

1. The final architectural and material elevation plans shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village and in coordination with the attached submitted plans (Warren Johnson Architects, INC.), except as such plans shall be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The Final Engineering Plans and Final Engineer's Estimate of Probable Cost shall be submitted and revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning.
3. If required, a Public Improvement letter of credit or appropriate security shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
4. A Planned Development letter of credit shall be submitted in the amount of \$40,000 in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
5. 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.

6. Recording fees in the amount of \$300 shall be submitted.
7. A construction management plan indicating the proposed material delivery routes and contractor parking areas, shall be submitted to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning.
8. Fencing may be permitted within designated easements or buffer areas, provided it does not impede drainage or access. No fencing of any kind shall be permitted within the Regulatory Floodway. All proposed fencing shall be clearly shown on the final engineering plans for review and approval.
9. The Regulatory Floodway shall be shown on final engineering plans in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
10. The southwest (SW) corner of the subject property contains a designated Regulatory Floodway. In accordance with Village regulations, no alterations to the land, including grading or filling, shall be permitted within this area. The Floodway boundary shall be clearly delineated on all site and engineering plans and labeled as a Non-Disturbance Zone.
11. All required extra agency permits shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether HOA requirements are included within the current specifications.

Mr. Auer states those details would be addressed during final review.

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

Commissioner Fedota Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Kolososki

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kolososki states there are still several details that should be reviewed further, but he believes the proposal is a nice project for the street and fits well with the townhouse developments across the street. He states the dimensions should continue to be evaluated but believes it would be a good addition to the area. He also notes the creek limits development options on the property.

Commissioner Fedota states the proposal fits with the overall plan for utilizing the property and believes the architectural design is attractive. He notes there are still issues related to screening and landscaping that should be addressed, but overall he

believes the request meets the applicable standards and is a good solution for the property.

Chair Wood states the recent developments in the area have been positive additions to the street and notes the property has remained overgrown and undeveloped for some time. She believes redevelopment of the property would improve the surrounding area and neighboring properties. She states the proposal generally fits the area and multifamily development is appropriate for the location, although some concerns still need to be addressed.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster states that for a preliminary plan, she believes the proposal is of high quality. She compliments Warren Johnson Architects on the design and states she likes the layout with the lower-level living space opening toward the rear yard. She notes additional window considerations can still be addressed during final review.

Commissioner Fedota states he hopes the development does not feel overly constrained and notes the property is a large piece of land. He reiterates concerns regarding the amount of fencing proposed and maintaining openness within the deep rear yard areas.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday June 1st, 2026

RESULT:	MOTION APPROVED BY ROLL CALL
MOVER:	STEVEN FEDOTA
SECONDER:	ROBERT KOLOSOSKI
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

- C. Text Amendments to the Village of Palatine Zoning Ordinance, Appendix A - Article 10 (Residential Districts)

2026-892B – Text Amendment

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on April 23rd, 2026

Petitioner's Exhibits:

- 1. Proposed Text Amendment**
- 2. Public Notice**

Background:

Mr. Auer provides background and states this item is revisiting a text amendment item previously discussed on 4/14. The proposed amendment addresses the side yard abutting a street setback requirements in the R-1B zoning district. Staff identified that the majority of R-1B lots are not compliant with the current setback (35') or proposed amendment (4/14/26) for a 30-foot corner yard setback. Based on that review, the proposed amendment has been revised to establish a 20-foot setback, which would bring a large majority of properties into compliance.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether there is any data indicating how many of the existing nonconforming lots resulted from prior hearings versus pre-existing conditions.

Mr. Kolososki notes that these are *not* large-lot, "Inverness-style" properties, but rather smaller residential lots that developed under different conditions.

Commissioner Fedota asks what the typical lot size is in the R-1B district.

Mr. Auer responds that the intent of the R-1B zoning standards, as confirmed in prior Village Council discussions and minutes, was established for anticipated future development patterns.

He notes that the newly proposed R-1A and R-1B standards were adjusted to reduce setbacks in order to better align with existing lot configurations and development feasibility.

Commissioner Fedota expresses concern that the amendment could lead to unintended consequences if not carefully controlled.

Mr. Auer responds that the area consists of smaller residential lots (compared to traditional R-1 zoning) and that the intent is to allow reasonable use of those properties without negatively impacting surrounding neighborhoods. He states the amendment is not intended to enable oversized or incompatible development.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether broader changes are being contemplated.

Mr. Auer reiterates that the proposal is limited in scope and is intended to address compliance issues while maintaining neighborhood character and existing development patterns. Further discussion occurs regarding the text amendment and its implications.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Text Amendments to the Village of Palatine Zoning Ordinance, Appendix A — Article 10 (Residential Districts), as outlined.

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

Commissioner Schubert Made a motion to approve subject staff’s conditions; seconded by Commissioner Kolososki

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Roth-Wurster states there is no crystal ball to determine how this amendment will ultimately affect R-1B properties. She notes that approximately 90% of existing homes do not currently comply with the existing standards, and expresses concern about the broader implications for features such as fencing and similar improvements.

Commissioner Noonan states the proposed change is a significant adjustment but indicates trust in staff’s review and believes the revised standard is the most reasonable approach.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether limiting the amendment to R-1B is appropriate and questions the recommendation from professional planning staff, noting that while he may have questions, he generally relies on staff expertise in zoning matters.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster adds that in reviewing other developments, particularly on corner lots, there are already established sidewalk and setback conditions that should be considered in the overall analysis.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 6-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday June 1st, 2026.

RESULT:	APPROVED BY ROLL CALL
MOVER:	TIM SCHUBERT
SECONDER:	ROBERT KOLOSOSKI
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

No One Came Forward

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

2240 N Rand Road - Logistics Planned Development for trucking company was approved at Village Council Meeting on 5/11/2026

951 S Benton - Planned Development was approved at Village Council Meeting on 5/11/2026

Next Planning & Zoning Meeting is anticipated for 5/26/26 with two items on the agenda

VII. ADJOURNMENT

RESULT:	APPROVED TO ADJOURN AT 8:30 PM
MOVER:	CINDY ROTH-WURSTER
SECONDER:	STEVEN FEDOTA
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None