



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MAY 26, 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 Kevin Cavanaugh, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Stephen Fedota, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Eric Friedman, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Patrick Noonan, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Rodney Bettenhausen, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Robert Kolososki
ABSENT :	
ARRIVED :	

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. 5-12-2026 PZC Draft Minutes

Commissioner Bettenhausen moved to approve the minutes of May 12th, 2026 - Commissioner Kolososki seconded the motion. Motion approved by Voice Vote

RESULT:	APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE
MOVER:	Bettenhausen
SECONDER:	Kolososki

AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 649 W. Revere Lane

1. Special use to permit a rear yard setback of 34 feet, instead of the minimum required setback of 40 feet in the R-2 zoning district.

SU-000261-2026 – 649 W Revere Ln

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on May 7th, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Special Use Application**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Site Plan**
5. **Elevations**
6. **Public Notice**

Background:

Mr. Auer provides background and states the petitioner is requesting a Special Use to allow a 275 square foot sunroom addition to the rear of the principal structure. The request includes relief for a rear yard setback of 34 feet instead of the minimum required 40 feet in the R-2 Single Family zoning district.

Sworn in petitioner: Dhaval Parekh – 649 W Revere Ln

Mr. Parekh states he is proposing to construct a three-season sunroom addition at the rear of the home for recreational purposes. He explains the addition would extend approximately six feet from the rear of the house, resulting in the requested setback relief. He states the proposed sunroom was designed with assistance from TimberBuilt Sunroom Company, who also prepared the submitted plans. The structure would be built on piers and measure approximately 13' x 16', with a width of approximately 17 feet east-to-west.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether the petitioner has spoken with neighboring property owners.

Mr. Parekh states he has spoken with the surrounding neighbors and there were no objections or concerns expressed.

Chairperson Wood references the site plan and notes there do not appear to be any line-of-sight concerns related to the proposed addition.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks whether the property has experienced any drainage or water issues, noting the structure would be built on piers.

Mr. Parekh states there have been no water issues on the property. He notes the property has good elevation and explains the proposed sunroom would include gutters directing water toward the side of the house.

Mr. Auer provides additional information regarding setback standards within the R-2 zoning district and identifies several nearby properties that previously received zoning relief for reduced rear yard setbacks. He states the proposed addition does not exceed the bulk, lot coverage, or height standards of the R-2 district. He reviews the surrounding area and notes that some nearby properties were developed under prior regulations, resulting in existing setbacks that do not meet current standards.

Commissioner Schubert asks whether the 28-foot setback at 639 W. Revere Lane is due to the angle of the lot.

Mr. Auer confirms that the lot configuration contributes to the reduced setback. He reiterates that the proposed addition at 649 W. Revere Lane would maintain a 34-foot setback from the rear lot line.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner is proposing to construct a "three seasons" room to the rear of the principal structure. The proposal does not conflict with area and bulk standards of the R-2 Single Family Zoning District. Staff identified a number of properties in the surrounding area that were granted setbacks below the minimum required 40 feet. Staff has determined that the proposal is consistent with the character and qualities of surrounding properties. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the plans prepared by Dhaval Parekh, dated 04/09/2026, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

Commissioner Noonan Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Cavanaugh

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kolososki states the addition fits the site nicely, works well within the yard space, and has a low roof pitch. He states the additional space would be beneficial for the family and is in favor of the request.

Commissioner Friedman states the proposal is a one-story addition and does not create the full vertical bulk of a larger structure. Although the setback reduction is notable, he feels the footprint and open design prevent it from appearing overly bulky or heavy.

Chairperson Wood states the request is reasonable and appropriately sized. She notes the addition does not extend across the entire rear of the home and states a three-season room is a desirable feature. She further states the proposal does not create any concerns related to public health, safety, welfare, or injury to neighboring properties and finds the standards have been met.

Chairperson Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 9-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday June 15th, 2026.

RESULT:	APPROVED BY ROLL CALL
MOVER:	Noonan
SECONDER:	Cavanaugh
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

B. 100 E. Wood Street

1. Special use to permit a fence in side yard abutting a street, where the side lot line of the side yard abutting a street abuts the side lot line of a front yard of an adjacent lot.
2. Variation to not include landscaping between a fence in a side yard abutting a street, and the abutting street.

SU-000262-2026 – 100 E Wood Street

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on May 7th, 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 Plan**
5. **Fence Elevation**
6. **Public Notice**

Background:

Mr. Auer provides background and states the petitioner is requesting a Special Use to allow a 4-foot tall fence in the side yard abutting a street, along with a variation to waive the landscaping requirement.

Sworn in petitioner: Brandon Naser, Owner – 100 E Wood St

Mr. Naser states he and his family moved to Palatine in 2024 and describes the neighborhood as very friendly and active with dog walkers. He states they recently welcomed both a new puppy and a new daughter and have experienced situations where dogs on loose leashes have entered their yard. He also notes that delivery drivers occasionally leave packages at the rear door because the backyard is open and accessible. He states the proposed fence would help minimize conflicts between passing dogs and his puppy, provide additional safety and privacy for his family, and help keep wildlife out of the yard.

Mr. Naser notes that he revised the original proposal to reduce the overall length of the fence. He states there is existing garden landscaping, shrubs, and flowers along the side of the home and explains the fence would primarily enclose the rear grassy area for family use and recreation.

Mr. Auer states revisions were made to the plan to reduce the width of the proposed fence line. He notes there were no changes to the location or fence style and states the fence would remain the same distance from the lot line and continue to meet the criteria for Special Use review. Mr. Auer identifies the proposed fence location on the submitted site plan.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether the petitioner intends to fully enclose the backyard area.

Mr. Naser states they are still deciding whether the rear yard would be fully enclosed. He explains they are considering either continuing the wood fence, replacing the existing partial fence entirely, installing a smaller decorative fence, or utilizing additional vegetation.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether the fence could be aligned farther back toward the house and driveway rather than remaining close to the sidewalk.

Mr. Naser states that option was initially considered; however, he notes the sidewalk partially encroaches onto the property and he does not want to lose additional usable yard area. He states the proposed fence would be approximately one foot from the sidewalk.

Chairperson Wood asks for clarification regarding the Benton Street side setback and how close the fence would be to the sidewalk.

Mr. Auer explains the sidewalk encroaches approximately 2.5 feet into the property in that location. He states the proposed fence would be set back approximately 6 inches from the sidewalk, resulting in an overall setback of approximately 3 feet from the property line.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks why the sidewalk encroaches into the property.

Mr. Auer states the condition is the result of older lot configurations and historic sidewalk construction and describes it as a unique site condition.

Commissioner Kolososki asks what impact there would be if the fence were moved an additional foot away from the sidewalk to provide more separation.

Commissioner Fedota asks why the fence cannot align directly with the side of the house.

Mr. Naser states he is attempting to remain consistent with other properties in the neighborhood and identifies nearby properties on Benton, Elmwood, and Forest that have similar fence-to-sidewalk conditions. He states many of those fences are located approximately 6 inches to 1 foot from the sidewalk. He further explains the Village landscaping requirement would require vegetation at least 36 inches high between the fence and sidewalk, which he believes could create additional line-of-sight concerns. He states he is attempting to find a reasonable compromise and notes that if the fence must be moved farther inward, they would comply.

Mr. Auer provides additional staff analysis regarding the request. He states the proposal consists of a 4-foot tall open-style fence along Benton Street, where the side yard abuts the front yard of an adjacent property, thereby requiring Special Use approval. He presents the fence elevation and revised site plan with the reduced fence width.

Mr. Auer states staff reviewed nearby properties with similar configurations and identified varying setbacks and fence styles throughout the area. He notes that most approved fences in similar locations are set back a greater distance from sidewalks to minimize the potential for damage to persons or property.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether the comparable properties reviewed by staff also involved sidewalks encroaching into private property.

Mr. Auer states that most of the surveyed properties did not involve that condition.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster references another fence approval on Benton Street involving a historic home and asks whether that request also required relief.

Mr. Auer confirms that it did.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner is requesting approval of a Special Use application to allow for a 4-foot tall open-style fence in a side yard abutting N. Benton Street, with a proposed 3-foot

setback from the Benton Street property line. Staff evaluated corner-yard fences (abutting a front yard) located in the surrounding area. Among them, the fences have some variation in design (setbacks and fence height). Setback less than one foot from the sidewalk, the proposed fence is generally inconsistent with the fence setbacks in the surrounding area. To minimize damage to persons or property, the majority of approved fences are set back at a reasonable distance from the sidewalk. Staff believes that the proposed setback of 6" is inconsistent with the majority of observed fences. Staff is recommending that the setback between the fence and sidewalk be increased (corresponding with condition #2). Therefore, Staff is recommending action at the discretion of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval of the project, Staff recommends the following conditions be included:

- 1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the plans prepared by Brandon Naser, dated 04/30/2026, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
- 2. The setback for the proposed open-style fence shall be increased from the property line, with the site plan revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
- 3. The fence gate will open only to the inside of the residence.

:

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether the petitioner would be agreeable to approval of the request if the Commission required the fence to be moved back approximately two feet or another acceptable distance, rather than aligned directly with the house.

Mr. Naser states he would not want to proceed with the project if the fence had to align fully with the house, as it would eliminate approximately eight feet or more of usable yard space.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks Mr. Auer whether the prior Benton Street fence approval also included a landscaping variation.

Mr. Auer states he is unsure, noting that prior approvals varied by application.

Commissioner Cavanaugh notes the Benton Street property includes vegetation on the inside of the fence but not on the sidewalk side.

Commissioner Noonan requests clarification regarding Condition #2 of the staff recommendation and asks whether the final setback determination would be resolved between the petitioner and the Director of Planning and Zoning.

Commissioner Friedman states the recommendation can be modified by the Commission and discusses possible revisions to the recommended conditions.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether a revised setback requirement of two feet would become part of the recommendation forwarded to the Village Council.

Mr. Auer confirms that it would.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether changing the setback requirement would alter the nature of the petitioner's original request.

Commissioner Friedman explains that staff recommendation conditions may be modified by the Commission as part of the motion.

Commissioner Schubert states the record should clarify that any revised setback would be measured relative to the sidewalk rather than strictly from the property line.

Mr. Auer states the condition can be revised to specify the exact setback distance from the sidewalk or lot line.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether a setback of two to three feet from the sidewalk would be acceptable to the petitioner.

Mr. Naser states he would need to better visualize the revised layout before committing to a specific distance.

Commissioner Cavanaugh states the Commission is attempting to balance the petitioner's needs with neighborhood consistency and overall safety considerations.

Mr. Auer states staff believes a minimum setback of approximately one foot from the sidewalk would be more consistent with surrounding properties and neighborhood character.

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

-

-

Commissioner Cavanaugh Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Noonan

-

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cavanaugh proposes modifying Condition #2 to require the proposed open-style fence to be set back between one and three feet from the sidewalk, with the final site plan to be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and Zoning.

Commissioner Fedota requests clarification regarding how the revised setback would be measured, noting the sidewalk alignment shifts along Benton Street.

Mr. Auer states the revised condition would establish a minimum required setback distance from the sidewalk.

Commissioner Cavanaugh states the petitioner appears mindful of project costs and notes that staff identified several comparable fence conditions within the surrounding neighborhood. He states the proposal is generally consistent with the character of the area and does not present safety concerns. He further states the request represents a reasonable investment in the petitioner's family and property.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster states corner lot fences require careful review and consideration. She states the proposal addresses health, safety, and welfare standards and notes she likes the proposed fence style. She adds that moving the fence slightly farther from the sidewalk would improve comfort and visibility for pedestrians and dog walkers while still allowing the petitioner substantial use of the yard.

Commissioner Friedman addresses the request to waive the landscaping requirement and states that, due to the visibility and safety considerations associated with the location, approving the variation to remove landscaping meets the minimum standards. He states the open-style fence already addresses the primary safety concerns.

Chairperson Wood states the lots in the area are smaller and the property is located on a busy corner. She states she understands the petitioner's desire for additional privacy and safety and notes the proposed fence is not a solid board-on-board design. She describes the request as reasonable and states the modified recommendation appropriately balances the petitioner's needs with public safety considerations related to the sidewalk area.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 9-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday June 15th, 2026.

RESULT: APPROVED AS AMENDED TO MODIFY CONDITION #2 TO REQUIRE THE SETBACK FOR THE PROPOSED OPEN STYLE FENCE BE INCREASED TO A MINIMUM DISTANCE BETWEEN ONE AND THREE FEET FROM THE SIDEWALK, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ZONING

MOVER: CAVANAUGH

SECONDER: NOONAN

AYES: Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki

NAYES: None

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Joseph McArthur – Lot 20, Highland Meadows Subdivision – Ward 1 – 6006 Highland Drive, Palatine (Rolling Meadows address)

Chairwoman Wood confirms the property referenced by Mr. McArthur is located in Rolling Meadows.

Mr. McArthur states his comments are not related to a property currently before the Commission. He references prior testimony provided under oath at a Village Council meeting regarding property located at 951 S. Benton Street and states he previously questioned ownership of an easement on the property. He states he appealed the meeting minutes and submitted materials to the Public Access Counselor for review.

Mr. McArthur states he believes the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD) owns the easement in question and references a court judgment which, according to him, created a permanent flood control easement owned by MWRD. He further discusses what he describes as easement encroachments affecting the property.

Mr. McArthur states the Village of Palatine entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the Park District and Cook County in 2006 related to the Euclid bike path. He states the easement holder is MWRD and alleges the bike path encroaches upon his property without authorization or compensation. He references provisions of the agreement regarding termination by competent authority and states he considers himself a competent authority regarding the matter.

Chairperson Wood asks when the events referenced took place.

Mr. McArthur states the matter is ongoing. He further alleges the Village is not complying with court-ordered drainage obligations and references stormwater outfalls, EPA reports, and alleged violations of the Clean Water Act. He states he has participated in onsite meetings with Village and MWRD officials regarding the matter.

Mr. McArthur further alleges the Village expanded right-of-way areas without due process or compensation and states the bike path was installed without proper authorization. He also references alleged dumping activities on property associated with Harper College and states portions of the property are subject to permanent MWRD easements. He states he has provided supporting documentation to the Village and notes the matter has been ongoing for approximately two years.

Mr. Auer interrupts and states the matters being discussed are outside the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission and offers to meet with Mr. McArthur following the meeting.

Commissioner Friedman asks Mr. McArthur to clarify the address involved and confirms the jurisdiction is within Palatine.

Chairperson Wood states she understands Mr. McArthur wishes to place the comments on the public record; however, the issues raised are outside the authority and jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She advises him to continue working directly with Village staff regarding the matter.

Mr. McArthur states he intends to continue appearing before the Commission until the matter is resolved. He states he wants his land restored and the wetlands returned to their prior condition. He continues discussing MWRD easements and related documentation.

Chairperson Wood reiterates that the Commission’s authority is limited to zoning matters such as Special Uses and variations.

Mr. McArthur continues discussing alleged dumping activities and the bike path installation on the property without compensation.

Chairperson Wood states the Commission does not have the background, authority, or jurisdiction to address the matter and again advises Mr. McArthur to continue working with staff. She acknowledges his desire to have the matter reflected in the public record.

Commissioner Friedman reiterates that the Planning and Zoning Commission does not have jurisdiction over the matter and asks when the bike path was installed.

Mr. McArthur states the bike path was installed on August 15, 2006.

Mr. McArthur states he intends to run for Mayor of Rolling Meadows and hopes to resolve the issue. He states he has learned a great deal through the process and reiterates concerns regarding flooding and placement of the bike path.

Mr. McArthur concludes by stating, “Teamwork makes the dream work.”

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

COMMUNICATIONS BY MR. AUER:

- FPD-000258-2026 - 4-20 SLADE STREET CROSSING WAS APPROVED AT VILLAGE COUNCIL
- SU-000228 & SU-000227-2025 - 560 & 630 S HICKS ROAD WAS APPROVED AT VILLAGE COUNCIL
- A MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 9TH, 2026. THERE WILL BE 3 ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

VII. ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED TO ADJOURN - 8:30PM

RESULT:	APPROVED TO ADJOURN BY VOICE VOTE
MOVER:	FEDOTA
SECONDER:	NOONAN

AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None