



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 • MAY 15, 2018

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Conrad Hansen	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Dennis Dwyer	Chairman	Present	
Jane Robins	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Patrick Noonan	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Teri Williams	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Eric Friedman	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Plan Commissioner	Present	

Staff present: Mr. Ben Vyverberg and Ms. Katie Romack

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Plan Commission - Regular Meeting - May 1, 2018 7:00 PM

Ms. Williams made a motion to approve the minutes of May 1, 2018; seconded by Ms. Robins.

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

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 366 N. Quentin Road - Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for a 4-lot single-family residential development Preliminary Plan Development to allow a 4-lot single-family residential development

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on April 30, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Public Notice
2. Petition for Hearing
3. Proof of Ownership
4. Preliminary Engineering Plan
5. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision
6. Engineering Narrative from Cemcon LTD dated 2-5-18
7. Plat of Survey

Sworn in Mr. Pat Taylor Central One proposed purchaser, Engineer Mr. Kevin Serafin Cemcon LTD, and Mr. Bill Blacklidge property owner

Mr. Taylor stated he has been working with staff for just under a year. He stated Bill came to him with a plan approximately a year ago. Mr. Taylor explained the difference between that plan and the proposed plan is instead of the 50 ft. right of way and the cul-de-sac with a bulb it was 40 ft. in width and had a little bend. He stated after receiving extensive direction from staff including Fire and Engineering they have come up with a good plan.

Mr. Serafin gave a brief overview of the property and request. He stated the property is 2.7 acres. He stated they have been working on these plans for about a year and have come to the Village with a couple different iterations. Mr. Serafin explained the development will require an easement from the owner to the north to make the cul-de-sac work. He stated they have worked with the fire department and the Village Engineer to come up with a plan that will work. He spoke to meeting the R2 zoning requirements explaining the only variation is the 20ft front yard setback on lot 1. He explained the reason for that is to ask for it in the front instead of the rear in case it is a deeper house. Mr. Serafin explained Mr. Taylor would like to build larger home on lot 1. He spoke to the utility access from Quentin Rd explaining they will connect the water main between the two houses on the adjacent subdivision. He spoke to the storm water management and explained they will accommodate the MWRD ordinance in an underground facility and a sanitary sewer with access from Quentin Rd.

Mr. Hanson asked if they have the easement from the property to the north Mr. Serafin stated Pat has been negotiating, but pointed out it doesn't make sense to get at this point unless this is approved.

Mr. Hanson pointed out if they refuse then the plan is moot.
Mr. Taylor explained they have verbally agreed.

Mr. Kolososki asked if IDOT will have a problem with the private road not lining up with the drive across the way.
Mr. Serafin stated they don't believe so.

Mr. Kolososki asked if that is usually the case to allow the installation of traffic signals
Mr. Serafin explained neither one of the entrances will have enough traffic to generate a signal.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if there is an existing utility easement for the offsite water main.
Mr. Serafin answered yes explaining there is a side yard easement on both houses

Mr. Hanson referred to lot 4 and asked what underground volume control is.
Mr. Serafin explained that is where they would hold their storm water management in an underground container.

Ms. Robins asked how big the houses are.
Mr. Taylor explained they have brochures. He stated he thought this would be a 2 part discussion with this initial discussion focusing on the lots and the second part would include the landscaping and the architecture. Mr. Taylor spoke to Timber Trails which is a 348 unit subdivision that he is currently building in Western Springs. He explained that product is identical to what he is proposing.

Mr. Bettenhausen how far to north property line is the proposed sanitary sewer
Mr. Serafin stated it is approx. 5ft and 6.5 ft. deep.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if it can be built without encroaching onto the northern property.
Mr. Serafin stated they will need a temporary easement from the property to the north.

Sworn in staff: Mr. Ben Vyverberg and Ms. Katie Romack

Mr. Vyverberg summarized the request stating it is an existing lot that is approx. 1.43 acres with 1 single family home currently on it. He stated the petitioner is proposing to install 4 lots with a private cul-de-sac to provide direct access to those lots as proposed. Mr. Vyverberg pointed out the petitioner has indicated that lot one is proposed to be substandard for the front yard setback. He spoke to the roadway easement, which is a requirement identified on the plat. Mr. Vyverberg pointed out parkway trees and sidewalks are not contemplated as part of the proposal due to the nature of the linear format of the lot. Mr. Vyverberg referred to the slide of the general summary of the lots explaining they do meet all the R2 standards. He referred to the slide of Hummel's Subdivision which is directly to the west, noting that they received rear yard setback relief.

Mr. Vyverberg stated existing infrastructure is already present and in place and would be accessed accordingly.

Mr. Dwyer spoke to the setback request for lot 1 and asked if it would be possible to move the building pad back to the south and keep the front yard setback and reduce the back yard setback.

Mr. Vyverberg pointed out that scenario would be dealing with backyard to backyard.

Mr. Fedota clarified the acreage

Mr. Vyverberg stated the total acreage is 1.43

Ms. Robins asked where they would put the snow from a private road

Mr. Vyverberg explained in review of the plans staff, the Village engineer and Fire Prevention have indicated when there is a cul-de-sac that is substandard there are deliveries, garbage pickup and snow removal that the petitioner and HOA will have to determine a plan to resolve. Mr. Vyverberg pointed out there will be a condition added for such upon approval. He stated it would be private snow plow contractors that would do this if approved.

Mr. Hanson asked if the garbage trucks will have to stop on Quentin and back in or is it large enough for the truck to turn around.

Mr. Vyverberg stated the dimensional standard is a 45 radius which is the village standard. He stated there may have to be some maneuvering but they should be able to accommodate.

Mr. Friedman asked if there are requirements for lighting of the private road

Mr. Vyverberg stated that would be a typical standard under the subdivision ordinance whether it is a private or public street.

Sworn in Mr. Gary Heigl 848 W Willow St

Mr. Heigl stated he is against the proposal pointing out he bought a house that backed up to undeveloped land and would like it to stay that way. He stated he is impacted most by lot 1 and does not want the backyard to be changed from 30ft. to 40ft. Mr. Heigl asked what the timetable is if approved.

Mr. Taylor answered as soon as they can get a building permit.

Mr. Heigl asked what the buildable ground level footprint is.

Mr. Serafin explained it is similar to houses that are there approx. 2000-2500 sq. ft.. He stated it depends on the market.

Mr. Heigl asked what the max footprint that can be built based on the setbacks is.

Mr. Serafin explained they have a buildable square footage of approx. 3500 sq.ft. but that's not going to be the size of the house.

Mr. Heigl stated he thinks it is silly to approve without a developed easement.

Mr. Dwyer explained the Plan Commission is a recommending body. He further explained it is not unusual to come before the Village before things are finalized

since upon approval it would be added as a condition.

Mr. Heigl stated it is not a good policy to follow. He stated he would like to know the terms of the easement. Mr. Heigl stated as an abutting neighbor he is against since this is not what he bought into.

Mr. Dwyer asked if the proposed development would conform to R2 zoning and the properties to the south are also R2.

Mr. Vyverberg answered yes.

Sworn in Carol Weill 834 W Willow- abutting lot 2

Ms. Weill agreed with Mr. Heigl. She stated though this may have been in the works for over a year the neighbors haven't known anything about it until they received a yellow post card. She expressed the same concerns as Mr. Heigl because she bought a house with a certain view and now it is changing. Ms. Weill expressed her concern with drainage and stated she hopes the experts ensure the drainage is addressed. She stated she is very opposed and surprised by it.

Mr. Dwyer explained all the grading and drainage would come with final approval.

Ms. Weill stated as it is now there is not adequate drainage.

Mr. Dwyer explained there will be catch basins.

Mr. Blacklidge stated he has lived there since 1983 and when he moved in there were 9 empty acres. He stated he never objected when their homes were built. He stated he never had drainage issues until those homes were built and all the drainage now comes on to his property from their lots. Mr. Blacklidge stated he has never objected for anything for any of his neighbors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

In order to accommodate four lots, the proposed preliminary plans do not include internal sidewalks. In order to meet the minimum private street requirements a road easement is required from the property to the north. And, in order to comply with the dimensional requirements of the cul-de-sac, Lot 1 would require a 20-foot front yard setback instead of the minimum required 30-foot front yard setback. While Staff recognizes the Petitioner's efforts to address the varying infrastructure and zoning requirements, Staff also recognizes that a 4-lot subdivision on the subject property is too much for the site. Staff inquired as to whether the 378 N. Quentin Road lot could be incorporated into an integrated subdivision, but evidently that property owner was not prepared to be a component of the proposal.

Therefore, Staff cannot support the proposed 4-lot subdivision at this location. If the Plan Commission recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The development shall substantially conform to the preliminary plat and engineering plans prepared by Cemcon, excepted as may be changed to comply

- with Village Codes or Ordinances or otherwise amended by conditions following.
2. The current recapture amount is \$14,198.35 (per Ordinance #O-216-05). This amount shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village of Palatine.
 3. The watermain will be required to be looped from Quentin Road through to Chalary Court.
 4. Declarations regarding the maintenance of the cul-de-sac and proposed parking restrictions will be required.
 5. The north side of the proposed road shall be designated as "No Parking Fire Lane" in a manner acceptable to the Fire Marshal.
 6. Sidewalks and parkway trees along the private road shall be incorporated into the site plan in a manner acceptable to the Village of Palatine.
 7. A Cook County Highway Department permit will be required for any proposed work in the county right-of-way.
 8. A fencing, landscaping, and screening plan shall submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning, in order to provide additional screening to the north and west around the cul-de-sac.
 9. Any building not constructed by the Petitioner or identified agent (Pat Taylor) shall receive approval from Village Council prior to the issuance of a building permit. The home shall comply with the Village monotony code requirements and architectural elements.
 10. MWRD permit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
 11. The site plan for Lot 1 shall be revised to comply with the minimum 30-foot front yard setback.
 12. A Planned Development letter of credit in the amount of \$80,000 shall be submitted in manner acceptable to the Village of Palatine.
 13. An engineer's estimate of probable cost shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
 14. A letter of credit in the amount of 110% of the engineer's cost estimate for the public improvements shall be submitted.
 15. Review fees in the amount of 1.5% of the engineer's cost estimate of the total project improvements shall be submitted.
 16. Homeowners Declarations shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney and Director of Planning and Zoning, and shall address the following items:
 - a. The internal road shall and cul-de-sac shall remain private and the Village will not be responsible for maintenance or snow removal. A snow removal and maintenance plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and the Director of Fire Prevention.
 - b. The private maintenance responsibilities of the HOA for the detention and any appropriate plantings within the detention areas.

Mr. Dwyer asked if the petitioner has seen the 16 proposed conditions

Mr. Vyverberg answered he believes so

Mr. Hanson clarified staff is recommending denial.

Mr. Vyverberg answered yes as proposed

Mr. Hanson asked if staff has an alternative plan.

Mr. Vyverberg spoke to property to the north that also zoned R1 single family residential though it is used as an institutional use. He stated one discussion was to incorporate the property to the north along with the subject property to allow roadway movement. Mr. Vyverberg stated the response came back from the property to the north that they were not interested. He spoke to the tightness to site and the concerns related to that.

Mr. Friedman asked about the conditions that require work to be done off-site and if that puts the petitioner on the bind if neighboring properties won't allow access.

Mr. Vyverberg stated if they are unable to get access for the connection to the water main they would have to revise their engineering plans to get from another location. He stated he doesn't know if there is capacity but they will have to figure out prior to coming before the Village for final approval.

Mr. Friedman asked if sidewalks and parkway trees are required on the north side of the private road.

Mr. Vyverberg explained when staff evaluated per the subdivision ordinance requirements we think sidewalks and parkway trees should be a component of this development. He stated as part of the conditions it is up to the petitioner to find a way to do so that is acceptable by the Village

Denis stated for only 4 lots sidewalks seems to be unnecessary.

Mr. Dwyer asked the petitioner if they have seen the proposed conditions

Mr. Serafin answered yes and would like to seek relief from item #11. He stated they would like to keep it at 20 ft.

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

Mr. Kolososki stated based on what we heard they are trying to overload the site and may not be the best use of land. He stated maybe it should be rethought.

Mr. Hanson pointed out if they incorporate the site to the north they can put an additional 4 lots making it a total of 8. He asked if staff feels 8 would work as one unit would it be anymore overloaded.

Mr. Kolososki stated that is if they agreed to and it sounds like they are not willing to go along with it.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out if they are in agreement for the easement for the cul-de-

sac he must have future thoughts for the property

Mr. Fedota expressed his concern with the bulb of the cul-de-sac ends without a sidewalk 30ft from the house to the west. He stated if a car careens off the end it would go right in to that house.

Mr. Dwyer agreed with Mr. Fedota that it is too close to the residential lot
Discussion on cul-de-sac location to the rear yards

Mr. Dwyer stated if the owner to the north would allow the bulb moved north they would not need the setback reduction on lot 1 and would be in complete conformance with R2 zoning which is what is to the south and west of the property. He pointed out the one setback makes it difficult. Mr. Dwyer spoke to the comments on lack of trees and sidewalks but pointed out it is a private road similar to someone's driveway.

Mr. Friedman pointed out condition #8 requires fencing around cul-de-sac to deter driving through.

Mr. Friedman pointed out the house sizes don't seem out of character with the surrounding R2 properties. He stated he understand the concerns to the north but the end result doesn't feel out of character.

Mr. Dwyer agreed it is not out of character with the neighborhood just not necessarily desirable. He stated if it was 2 lots and if they moved the cul-de-sac bulb in a little he thinks it would work.

Mr. Dwyer asked what the north south dimension is on the property to the north.
Mr. Vyverberg stated he believes they are identical.

Mr. Dwyer asked if the road was moved to the north the property would still be developable with the correct lot depths.
Mr. Vyverberg stated one would think.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to approve subject to staff's conditions; seconded by Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out if approved the first condition is that they acquire the easement to the north.

Motion to approve was denied.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to deny; seconded by Mr. Kolososki.

Mr. Dwyer summarized that this request had not met the standards and was denied by a vote of 5-4. This item will tentatively go to the Community and Economic Development Committee of the Village Council on June 4, 2018 or June 11, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [5 TO 4]
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Robert Kolososki, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Robins, Noonan, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota
NAYS:	Hansen, Dwyer, Williams, Friedman

2. Plum Grove Road Michigan Avenue Sub-Area Plan

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on April 30, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Public Notice
2. Michigan Plum Grove Sub Area Power Point
3. Aerial

Mr. Vyverberg explained the reason this plan is before the board is because the Planning and Zoning Department has received conceptual inquiries from developers looking to redevelop certain portions of this area. Mr. Vyverberg explained the intention is to look at the area as a holistically, rather than individually.

Ms. Romack gave a brief overview of the Sub-Area Plan, its history, the current and past development patterns and challenges and Staff's analysis and recommendations. She went through the slides of the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Fedota asked why the lots to the east were not included since geographically and size wise they are similar.

Mr. Vyverberg stated if the Plan Commission would like to recommend staff to expand the area they can do so. He explained in the initial analysis staff focused some of established properties on Plum Grove Road, newer homes on Benton Street and newer subdivision to the south down Michigan Avenue. Mr. Vyverberg further explained the recommendations being made can easily be applied to the properties to the east, but they were not initially included because the focus was on the Plum Grove area.

Mr. Fedota clarified the plan is centering on Plum Grove Road.

Mr. Vyverberg explained how this center location was determined and spoke to the surrounding area zoning.

Ms. Romack restarted the slides showing the zoning in the surrounding neighborhoods. She stated one of the development challenges is that sanitary would have to be installed along Plum Grove Road by future developers of these sites. She spoke to the areas that are lacking sidewalks.

Mr. Hanson asked if all the lots are same size.

Ms. Romack stated they are similar.

Mr. Hanson clarified the New Haven Grove numbers do not correspond.

Ms. Romack stated she may have switched the maximum number with the average number.

Ms. Romack spoke to the overlay of the different subdivisions along the Plum

Grove Road and Michigan Avenue area and how Staff's concept plans would fit. She spoke to staff's "what if" plans for the instance a developer acquires so many lots and what they could potentially do there.

Mr. Hanson asked if we have an ordinance that requires a maximum length of a driveway with a bulb.

Ms. Romack stated it is 500 feet in length.

Mr. Dwyer asked if the subdivisions that don't meet the setbacks received variation approvals as part of the subdivision process.

Ms. Romack answered yes.

Mr. Vyverberg explained the underling zoning controls what the appropriate density, and the zoning standards and setbacks as they presently exist control any reuse or redevelopment of the property. He stated that Staff has no Village plans or design to redevelop any of these properties. Staff is using these examples to present the background and a conceptual picture of a general analysis of what could be developed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is Staff's recommendation that any future development of the Sub-Area maintains single-family residential uses. Staff believes this is not only consistent with the surrounding properties and future comprehensive plan for this area, but also will not negatively affect nearby property owners or property values. Furthermore, rezoning from R-1, R-1A, or R-1B to R-2 is also consistent with recent development setback and bulk standards, which are the most common and least restrictive of the single-family districts, beginning in the early 2000's. Therefore, Staff recommends the Sub-Area remains single-family residential with the following guidelines:

1. All parcels within the Sub-Area should be developed under the Village's R-2 zoning standards. This includes the following standards for all new proposed subdivisions:
 - a. Minimum 75' lot width for interior lots and 85' for corner lots.
 - b. Minimum 9,000 square feet for interior lots and 10,000 square feet for corner lots.
 - c. Variations for rear and front yard setbacks and lot depths could be appropriate if the R-2 standards for lot width and lot size are met. This may be more common for corner lots and cul-de-sac developments.
 - d. Cul-de-sacs and new street systems should comply with the minimum standards of the Subdivision and Site Development Ordinance (Appendix B of the Village Code).
 - e. Integrated road system, where possible.
 - f. Widening of sub-standard streets, when necessary and where feasible.
 - g. Tree preservation, where possible.
 - h. Completion of sidewalk networks in compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Fedota asked what an integrated road system is.

Ms. Romack referred to the slide of the concept plan #1 and explained if someone acquired 2 lots it is how those lots can be integrated with 2 other lots in the future. She further explained integration may not be possible, but if it is possible, that would be Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Friedman asked if there is documentation on what roadways are substandard.

Ms. Romack referred to concept plan #1 slide stating the stretch of Michigan Avenue and Brockway Street within the Sub-Area.

Mr. Friedman asked if the property lines are adequate and if it's just the roadway improvement that is needed. He asked if the condition of making them meet the standards would impose a hardship to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Vyverberg spoke to the first example on Gilbert Road and explained when Annandale Subdivision came before the Plan Commission the northern half of Gilbert Road was vacated. He stated the developer improved the southern half by putting in curb and gutters. He spoke to the vacated right-of-way that currently has sheds and fences and how the roadway will not exist as it is presently approved unless all the properties to the north are redeveloped.

Mr. Dwyer recommended adding on a preference to consolidate many lots together instead of smaller parcels which creates a better situation.

Mr. Hanson stated that is difficult pointing out the property on Quentin Road one property wanted to redevelop and the neighbor was not interested.

Mr. Dwyer clarified it is a preference, not a requirement

Discussion on proposed versus preference.

Ms. Romack went through the slides of support for R-2 zoning, which is the most common and least restrictive zoning for single family residential district.

Sworn in Mr. Doug Sutton 658 S. Benton Street

Mr. Sutton spoke to the location of his property on the east side of Plum Grove Road and asked if they flipped the Fair Oaks Subdivision overlay would there be an easement required on Benton Street.

Mr. Vyverberg explained when a development proposal comes forward they have to manage and perform the development within the area they are putting forth. He further explained if they needed a construction easement they would have to obtain it privately, but ultimately the development would have to be self-contained.

Mr. Sutton expressed their concern is with the referenced wetlands stating the properties along the back do flood. He spoke to the work that was done by Village that minimized it but is concerned if by putting in these homes that the watershed will have to go somewhere. He asked if adequate provision is being planned to handle the additional water shed.

Mr. Dwyer asked if detention basins would be required for this kind of

development.

Ms. Romack stated she believes so.

Mr. Dwyer explained it would have to be compensated by a detention basin to hold water from a 100 year storm.

Ms. Romack pointed out there is a difference between the lots indicating where the wetlands are located.

Mr. Dwyer clarified the rule is the water issues would be addressed by engineering.

Mr. Sutton expressed their concern with the access to power lines and the capacity of these new homes being out on their lines.

Ms. Romack would have to be addressed at the time of development.

Mr. Dwyer stated the Village would not allow the removal of power lines.

Mr. Sutton referred to the slide of Nick's Subdivision and asked about possibility of properties off Benton Street having a mirror image proposal done.

Ms. Romack stated there is no reason you cannot but explained the Sub-Area was focusing on lots along Plum Grove Road and Michigan Avenue but we are open to hear others recommendations and ideas for extending the Sub-Area.

Mr. Sutton pointed out they are on well and septic and they put in sewers and water on Benton Street. He asked if that would inhibit their inclusion on some of this planning. He asked what the difference between R-1 and R-1A zoning.

Ms. Romack spoke to the zoning lot requirements stating they are all single family.

Mr. Sutton clarified they are progressively smaller lot area from R-1, R-1A, R-1B, & R-1C

Mr. Vyverberg stated R-1 is the most restrictive.

Mr. Sutton spoke to the lot sizes of the properties along Michigan Avenue and Benton Street and stated the consensus is they would like to be considered in these options.

Mr. Dwyer explained they can speak to a developer to see if they would be interested in developing the property or can speak to Village staff to include the properties along Benton Street in the Sub-Area plan.

Sworn in Ms. Chris Burbidge 632 S. Plum Grove Road and owns 622 S. Plum Grove Road and 644 S. Plum Grove Road.

Ms. Burbidge stated one of her lots is zoned R-1 and the other two are R-2. She asked if the Village is going to rezone the properties to R-2 or if she would have to.

Mr. Vyverberg explained they noted the disparity of the zoning classification in the Sub-Area plan. He stated Staff would welcome an application for rezoning from one residential classification to another given the lot perimeters are staying the same. Mr. Vyverberg explained it is up to the property owner to make a formal request unless the Plan Commission recommends that Village staff

undertakes that discussion with Village Council.

Mr. Dwyer explained it is more common from the property owner to make that request and pointed out once the Sub-Area is approved that request should be much easier.

Ms. Burbidge stated she was wondering if staff would blanket it and everyone would be R-2.

Mr. Dwyer explained the Village does not rezone without the property owner's consent.

Sworn in Mr. Murali Nichinbabl-Sriram 53 W. Gilbert Road

Mr. Nichinbabl-Sriram asked about the utility road next to 41 W. Gilbert Road and 35 W. Gilbert Road.

Ms. Romack stated she does not believe there is a road.

Mr. Nichinbabl-Sriram stated there is a space between 2 properties there.

Mr. Vyverberg stated he is unaware of any right-of-ways, but it is possible there is an easement.

Mr. Nichinbabl-Sriram stated he believes it is a utility area because the power lines run through that area.

Mr. Vyverberg explained it most likely an associated utility easement to allow access.

Mr. Nichinbabl-Sriram asked if the new homes be dumping water in the detention pond that is in his backyard.

Mr. Vyverberg stated no other subdivision would be able to tap into that basin and use their purposes explaining it has to be self-contained within their development.

Mr. Nichinbabl-Sriram asked if he can have access to the PowerPoint.

Mr. Friedman stated it is posted on the Village's website.

Sworn in Mr. Gary Wronkiewicz - 1000 S. Brockway Street

Mr. Gary Wronkiewicz stated he is a developer in the area. He stated he thinks Staff should explore something less than R-2 being so close to downtown and walkable to stores. He stated if the right lots are put in it would support the downtown area. Mr. Wronkiewicz spoke to the lots years ago were 50-60 feet wide. Mr. Wronkiewicz submitted an article from the Daily Herald dated March 24, 2008 into record. (Exhibit # 4) He stated they are expecting 2 million more people by 2030 and asked how they will accommodate them. He stated he gets calls from people looking for affordable housing in the suburbs to accommodate younger people moving into the area. He spoke to the way he designed Summerset Court, which are smaller lots with all young families most with kids. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated all have been there for 12 years and all came from outside of Palatine. He stated 80% of his developments have brought residents from outside of Palatine. He submitted Exhibit #5 which commented on a Chicago plan that focuses on infrastructure. Mr. Wronkiewicz pointed out this

area already has all the infrastructure including the streets, water and storm sewer. He spoke to developing in this area would provide convenience for people being closer to jobs. Mr. Wronkiewicz spoke to water problems and how he handled in Summerset Court with underground pipes. He stated he has never had any flooding issues because it collects the water and slowly releases it into the sewer systems. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated he feels they should look at a plan other than R-2 pointing out the downtown area has lots that are 50 feet in depth that work. Mr. Wronkiewicz pointed out the R-2 has you building big homes because economically that's all you can do but on a smaller lot a 2,600 square foot home can be built that accommodates more people, which is what a lot of this area to the north is.

Mr. Noonan stated a lot of people move to the suburbs to have more land.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out most people in the area seem to be more favorable of the R-2

Mr. Wronkiewicz explained he is presenting another idea. He stated things are changing, people are driving smaller cars. He stated economics have changed things and everyone has lost value in their homes. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated the bigger lots can't be developed because you can't get the value out of them.

Mr. Noonan stated he understands what Mr. Wronkiewicz is saying but pointed out the article is 10 years old and most people are moving out of the state not into the state.

Discussion on people moving out of the state.

Mr. Wronkiewicz explained the reason for handing out the article is because not much has been done about it. He stated we have to think about where our kids will go and what can they afford.

Mr. Dwyer stated we also have to think about the surrounding neighbors, as well as our children.

Sworn in Mr. Fjori Lubonja - 644 S. Benton Street

Mr. Lubonja expressed his concern with current water issues that cause his sump pump to run 24 hours to the point he has to replace it twice a year. He spoke to the lake that is around his property and how adding more houses will cause his house to be under water.

Mr. Dwyer explained historically properties that are built with detention basins the surrounding properties have benefited. He explained in most cases they have drawn water from adjoining properties as well so proper development of the area would help the situation.

Mr. Lubonja asked why he can't have the same benefits as this side.

Mr. Vyverberg restated they focused on areas where there is development inquires specifically the Plum Grove Road area. He stated if Plan Commission would like to add a condition to further contemplate reviewing east over to Benton Street staff would take that into advisement.

Mr. Lubonja expressed his concern if they develop across the way his house

would get more water and will need to sell his land
Mr. Dwyer explained additional water cannot go onto surrounding properties and generally it is less.

Mr. Friedman asked what the recommendation becomes if not a rezoning process.

Ms. Romack explained it becomes standards for the future. She stated this is recommendations for future development and an amendment to our current comprehensive plan.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out when people look to buy land they ask what the surrounding zoning is but a better question is what the zoning direction for the area. He pointed out the Comprehensive Plan is a better guide.

Discussion on R-2 being a holding zone.

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

Mr. Kolososki stated he thinks it is a good move and is more desirable.

Ms. Robins agree with Mr. Kolososki.

Mr. Dwyer asked if anything denser would be appropriate.

Mr. Kolososki stated he doesn't think so. He pointed out more density would be creating more water problems because they would be creating more impervious surface. Mr. Kolososki pointed out people don't move to Palatine to have the neighbor that close together.

Mr. Friedman stated he would like to consider extending the plan to Benton Street.

Mr. Noonan agreed with Mr. Friedman.

Mr. Dwyer agreed with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Noonan.

Mr. Fedota stated he thinks it would be beneficial to incorporate that area because they would be impacted by the developments.

Ms. Williams made a motion to approve the Sub-Area Plan subject staff's conditions; seconded by Mr. Fedota.

Mr. Fedota made a motion to approve extending the sub area plan east of Benton Street; seconded by Mr. Noonan.

Mr. Dwyer summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 9-0 subject staff's conditions with the added recommendation to extend the area east of Benton. This item will tentatively go to the Community and Economic Development Committee of

the Village Council on June 4 , 2018 or June 11, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Teri Williams, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Stephen Fedota, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

3. Motion to approve and expand the sub area to include neighboring properties

RESULT:	MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Stephen Fedota, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

4. Lot North of 724 S. Plum Grove Road - Old World Subdivision

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on April 30, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Public Notice
2. Application for Preliminary Planned Development
3. Proof of Ownership
4. Preliminary Plat of Resubdivision
5. Preliminary Utility Connections
6. Floor Plans
7. Elevations
8. Narrative email from Mr. Gary Wronkiewicz dated 2-13-18
9. 2016 Final Planned Development Ordinance-Old World Subdivision #0-48-16
10. Objectors Exhibit #1- Email from 28 W Summerset Ct dated 5-15-18
11. Objectors Exhibit #2- Email from 21 W Summerset Ct dated 5-13-18

Sworn in Mr. George Swiderski 50 year's resident at 724 S Plum Grove Rd.

Mr. Swiderski stated he never intended to be a burden to his neighbors or the city. He spoke to his certificates of recognition from local schools and institutions. He stated he has operated a taxidermy and art studio. Mr. Swiderski spoke to his art collection and how he likes to share with schools and handicap institutions. He stated because he is getting older it is time for him to retire. He stated he does not think it will be a burden on his neighbors which he has always been in good standing with.

Mr. Wronkiewicz spoke to what was approved in 2016 and why they are proposing the change. He referred to the slide of the original proposed approved plan for Old World Subdivision. Mr. Wronkiewicz pointed out in 12 years neither lot has sold. He stated it is a flag lot explaining it was designed to get the 9,000 sq.ft. He stated lot 1 should be okay but lot 1 will probably never sell. Mr. Wronkiewicz pointed out lot 1 is 115 ft. from the street to get to drive with a 2.5 ft. drop and will have issues removing snow. He spoke to the layout allowing a 2.5 car garage and where the location of the front door would be right next to lot 2 possible fence. Mr. Wronkiewicz spoke to the power pole that will have to be relocated and the cost that almost prohibits it. He spoke to the sewer location that would have to be relocated which is also expensive. He stated after he seen it sitting so long he spoke to Mr. Swiderski and after he developed Summerset with smaller lots so redesigned to do similar setbacks. He referred to the slide of the proposed floor plans which are the same as Summerset. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated Summerset homes would fit in the proposed lot and can even go bigger. He stated the plan is to be between 2800-3100 sq. ft. He pointed out some people don't want bigger homes but want bigger spaces which is what these layouts allow. He explained this may not be the plan but wanted to show what would fit there. He referred to the slide of the proposed elevations to show what it would look like from the street. Mr. Wronkiewicz explained the slide shows 20

ft. setbacks but the proposed plan is to have 25 ft. He further explained he sets the house back an additional 5 ft. which gives it the look of a 30 ft. setback line. He spoke to the areas existing homes being 99ft. deep which allows colonial homes and how redesigning the lots allow more architectural details. He passed out pictures of homes they built in Palatine and all homes required variations for setbacks. He referred to the slide showing the difference from 2016 lot sizes and what is proposed. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated the proposed rear yard is 25 ft. which is more than Summerset and if they built smaller homes it would be more like 28-30ft. He further explained the side yard would be 10 ft. which is the same as R2 zoning. Mr. Wronkiewicz spoke to the architectural design and how it gives an in and out look that pushes some of the house back instead of all on the 25 ft. lot line. He pointed out Plum Grove is a busier street so what he is proposing is like a transitional lot. He referred to the Utility Connections slide and spoke to the setbacks of the proposal along with the neighboring property. He stated this proposal does not make the lots across the way change. He spoke to the other subdivisions in the area and their setbacks. He referred to the slide with the preliminary plat of subdivision to show Mr. Swiderski property and explained it will stay the same but the portion to the north will be divided which currently has a garage and workshop. He stated they have been passed over for years and have to decide what to do with them. Mr. Wronkiewicz pointed out it is walking distance to downtown Palatine and close to Schaumburg that offers plenty of employment. He stated there is existing infrastructure including water and sewer facilities. He referred to the surrounding zoning slide indicating the location of the proposed lot to Summerset Subdivision and nearby transitional subdivisions. He referred to the aerial slide to show the lots are 99 ft. deep but pointed out you can't tell driving down the street whether you are 25 or 30 ft. back. Mr. Wronkiewicz spoke to his creativity in past developments and how they turned out nice with 80% of buyers being from outside of Palatine. He spoke to his other developments including the Brockway Place Townhomes that are 4 ft. off the sidewalk, and Stone Garden which is 9ft. off the sidewalk. He stated it is a little denser but is working well and has received a lot of nice comments on them. He spoke to Green Leaf Court that required variances for 25 ft. setbacks and how it is one of the nicest divisions in the Palatine area. He again spoke to Summerset Court and their setbacks being 25 ft. front and rear yards. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated though his creativity is out of the box he only gets good comments on them being well designed and 3 dimensional. He spoke to the location being close to parks, trails and downtown.

Ms. Robins asked how big the homes will be

Mr. Wronkiewicz stated it will be 3000 sq.ft. or less since the trend is to go with smaller homes.

Ms. Robins asked if this is considered one of the smaller home trends.

Mr. Wronkiewicz answered yes comparing it to the large homes at Arcadia which are approx..4200 sq.ft.

Ms. Robins asked if these are smaller than the surrounding area

Mr. Wronkiewicz answered no. He spoke to other homes in the area and how it

would fit in.

Mr. Vyverberg spoke to the location of Summerset Court and how it backs up to a shopping center that is zoned B2. He spoke to New Haven and how the lot sizes have an average of 10,000 sq.ft. compared to the proposed lots being just over 6800 sq.ft. Mr. Vyverberg stated though Old World was unconventional in its approach it complied to the R2 standards.

Mr. Wronkiewicz agreed Old World meets the standards but pointed out it is not selling so he explained his new proposal is more conventional.

Mr. Dwyer asked when the Planned Development expires.
Mr. Vyverberg explained it is good through April 2019.

Mr. Dwyer asked if it expires if the zoning will revert to R2
Mr. Vyverberg explained it would have a P classification but would have no zoning rights to do anything.

Mr. Dwyer asked what the zoning was before it became P.
Mr. Vyverberg stated he believes so but is uncertain.

Sworn in Mr. Steve Madden 62 W. Michigan

Mr. Madden stated he has lived there for 22 years and has not met Mr. Swiderski. He suggested putting in a ranch similar to the one built Michigan and Cedar since there are ranches right across the street and he thinks it is a disservice to the homeowners not to have something similar. He spoke to tree preservation and how the proposed lots have trees you can't put your arms around. Mr. Madden stated this is suburbia and doesn't need high density. He compared Fair Oaks to Summerset and how Summerset is not part of their community. He spoke to the 30 homes that have been built in the area and pointed out these are good size lots and doesn't need high density.

Mr. Vyverberg pointed out the 2 emails that were submitted should be read into record.

Mr. Dwyer read into record exhibits number 10 & 11 which are emails of support.

Sworn in Mr. David Albrecht 28 W Michigan

He stated him and his wife have lived there for 30 years. He stated they are both retired teachers from Palatine. He stated George has been a good neighbor. Mr. Albrecht stated he was okay with the first subdivision plan but is not okay with this plan. He stated he has a ranch style home across the street and sees these as Summerset style houses. He spoke to the setback and driveway width and how they will have very little grass. Mr. Albrecht stated this is not what he wants to look at and is concerned that future potential buyers will not want to look at it either. He stated if this is approved it will diminish his property values and pointed out it is out of character.

Sworn in Mr. Pramod Sadalage 55 W Michigan

Mr. Sadalage stated he bought his house in August 2017 for lot size and privacy. He stated his lot is over 40,000 sq.ft. and would like to see privacy on all sides so doesn't want to look at monster homes. He pointed out from the backside Summerset looks big like apartments. Mr. Sadalage pointed out the subarea plan stated Michigan Ave. is substandard and doesn't think they should add more homes to an already substandard road. He pointed out most lots are much bigger lots so these won't match up. Mr. Sadalage agreed with Mr. Albrecht that this will reduce the property values. He stated he moved from Schaumburg to Palatine for a bigger lot and if the future direction is the lot sizes will be reduced maybe he is not fine with coming to Palatine.

Mr. Wronkiewicz stated he did build a nice ranch on Michigan and Cedar but stated that is the first time anyone has ever asked to build a ranch because they are more expensive to build. He spoke to the concerns on trees and landscaping pointing out he always tries to save the trees when he can. He spoke to Summerset and how they transplanted 16 trees. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated he would save a tree if it is worth saving. He spoke to Arcadia down the street and how it is a little quieter area so they were able to develop bigger homes. He pointed out this lot has been passed over and something needs to be done with it or it will just have an old garage on it that will not add any value to the area. Mr. Wronkiewicz stated 2 nice homes will add value. He spoke to the landscaping and privacy concerns. He stated most of the homes in the area have 2 car garages which is what they're proposing. He referred to the utility connections slide to show the location of the drive and where there would be green space. Mr. Wronkiewicz pointed out everyone lost home value in 2010 and explained the only way to get the value back up is to build new homes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Although unconventional in its configuration, Old World Subdivision complied with the R-2 standards for Lot area and setbacks. Lot 1 was narrow at 47 feet, but the 3-lot subdivision functioned as an R-2 development, due to the lot areas and setbacks. Under the proposed configuration, Staff cannot support the smaller lot sizes and setback reductions for homes yet to be constructed. In addition to being inconsistent with the redevelopment patterns within the Plum Grove Road and W. Michigan Avenue area, the proposed subdivision is also substandard for the residential developments along W. Michigan Avenue, where the 8 lots in between Plum Grove and Brockway all maintain 150 feet of frontage and are improved with one home.

Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision. If the Plan Commission recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Final Engineering plans shall be revised to coincide with the Plat of Subdivision and in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
2. Any building not constructed by the Petitioner shall receive approval from Village Council prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3. A \$20,000 letter of credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village

Engineer.

4. A letter of credit in the amount of \$110% of the cost estimate shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
5. Review fees in the amount of 1.5% of the cost estimate shall be submitted.
6. Cash-in-lieu of detention and concrete ribbon shall be paid in an amount and a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
7. The sidewalk location shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
8. Parkway trees shall be installed pursuant to the Subdivision Ordinance requirements.
9. MWRD and NPDES permits shall be submitted.
10. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and Village Engineer, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
11. Standard Village of Palatine Easement Provisions shall be included.
12. PINs shall be added.
13. Recording fees shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Clerk.
14. A fully executed Subdivision Improvement Agreement shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.
15. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted on Mylar with all required signatures.
16. The architectural plans shall comply with the Village's monotony code.

Mr. Hanson asked what staff would support pointing out the flag lot was very narrow. He asked if staff had an alternative option they would support.

Mr. Vyverberg explained the Old World Subdivision though unconventional has been approved by Village Council twice and meets all setbacks. He spoke to the layout of the proposals and how the desire to maintain the house on lot 3 is leading not only the proposal tonight but Old World Subdivision as well. Mr. Vyverberg spoke to the possibility of incorporating the lot on the corner and stated short of someone acquiring all four lots and reconfiguring he is not sure what the most appropriate development would be.

Mr. Dwyer asked Mr. Wronkiewicz is he has seen the conditions

Mr. Wronkiewicz stated most items are standard and can work through any issues.

Mr. Hanson asked Mr. Wronkiewicz if he can and will meet the conditions

Mr. Wronkiewicz stated probably

Mr. Vyverberg explained these are standards conditions subject to subdivisions.

Mr. Wronkiewicz answered yes he can and will meet the conditions and understands staff wants denial because it doesn't meet codes but that is the purpose of the Plan Commission to decide what to do.

Mr. Albrecht stated he can build one house on the lot and there would be plenty of room.

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

second

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Kolososki stated they are trying to put too many houses on too small of a lot. He stated it doesn't fit in neighborhood and for all the reasons discussed he feels it is a bad idea.

Mr. Noonan stated though they passed the proposal in 2016 the bottom line it isn't moving. He agreed they need to make adjustments but doesn't agree with this plan. He stated 55 W just bought a year ago so there are obviously ranches selling in the area. He pointed out developers don't like to develop one but the bottom line is what it is.

Mr. Dwyer stated there are too many variations. He pointed out it is inconsistent with the neighborhood and since it is not next to Plum Grove it can't be a transition.

Mr. Friedman stated they tried making a case that it's like Summerset Ct but the difference is Summerset only opposes it density on itself because it can only been seen by the development itself. He pointed out imposing that amount of density on a neighbor is not the same application.

Mr. Noonan agreed with Mr. Friedman

Mr. Noonan made a motion to deny seconded Mr. Fedota.

Mr. Dwyer summarized that this request had not met the standards and was unanimously denied by a vote of 9-0. This item will tentatively go to the Community and Economic Development Committee of the Village Council on June 4 , 2018 or June 11, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Stephen Fedota, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

5. 1500, 1532, and 1548 N. Hicks Road

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on April 30, 2018 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Public Notice
2. Application for Preliminary Planned Development
3. Proof of Ownership
4. Preliminary Engineering Plans
5. Elevations
6. Engineering Narrative from Spies & Associates Inc dated 5-3-18
7. Response email from Spies & Associates Inc dated 5-3-18

Sworn in Mr. Greg Rose, KF Walter Homes and Mr. Tim Spies, Spies and Associates

Mr. Rose gave a brief overview of the property and request. He stated the property is near Walgreens at Hicks Road and Dundee Road. He stated he has been building in Palatine for 8 years. Mr. Rose stated he is looking at this property for a townhouse community. He stated it is currently zoned R-1 with 3 parcels being 1500, 1532, and 1548 N. Hicks Road. He spoke to the numerous past proposals for this property. Mr. Rose explained the current proposal is for 12 ranch townhomes, which would be four 3-unit ranch townhouses and the rezoning to accommodate this project. He explained the benefits being low profile with 3 units instead of a tall sometimes objectable courtyard style. He pointed out this will create an excellent transitional civic planning being that it is along Hicks Road and abutting Walgreens. Mr. Rose stated this will allow a good transition from retail, to very low profile townhomes, to the larger single family homes on the interior. He spoke to the difficulties of these home sites with driveways off of Hicks Road. Mr. Rose stated this will meet a need in Palatine for single-level maintenance free living. Mr. Rose gave a quick overview of the plans referring to the slides of elevations. He spoke to the entrances, elevations, and possible drop/lookout conditions on the western portion of the property. He spoke to the floor plans and square footage referring to the floor plan slides. Mr. Rose stated Mr. Spies can speak to site plan.

Mr. Spies gave his professional background. Mr. Spies gave a brief overview of the preliminary engineering plans. He explained these plans are just preliminary and do not have the final nuts and bolts put together yet but have taken a close enough look at the site to know they can meet the necessary infrastructure improvements to make it function as a final subdivision. He referred to the slide of the existing topography explaining it drains to the northwest. Mr. Spies spoke to the utilities and how the existing water main runs along the north line of Garden Avenue. He explained they will tap into it and run an 8-inch water main up the center of the property. He spoke to the location of the sanitary sewer and

how it is terminating at the east side of Elm Street approximately 300 feet north of Garden Avenue. He further explained they will run it from there south to garden and then east approximately 400 feet to the site.

Mr. Spies spoke to the storm water management and how everything drains from the southeast to the northwest. He explained they will put storm water detention basin in the northwest corner of the property that will house the additional rate of runoff from the impervious area. Mr. Spies stated everything that drains into that basin will be released out a storm sewer at the southern end of the basin which will run out west on Garden Avenue to Elm Street and south to Home Street. He explained all release up to the 100 year storm even will run through the outfall pipe and anything in excess of the 100 year storm will overflow at the northwest corner of the basin. He referred to the existing topography slide stating the proposed overflow will follow same existing drainage direction.

Mr. Rose gave a brief overview of the layout. He explained the plan is to have 2-car garages with four 3-unit buildings. He spoke to the setbacks referring to the building setback slide explaining the western most buildings have 53 feet from building to property line, east side has 35 feet from back to rear property lines along Hicks Road, 25 feet to the first building off of Garden Avenue. Mr. Rose pointed out the Hammerhead for turnarounds and emergency vehicles. He stated they have also supplied 4 additional parking spaces on the site.

Ms. Robins asked about the stairs on the plans if they are single story units.

Mr. Rose explained the stairs are going down to the basements and very likely could have lookout conditions on the western buildings.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if there are any pictures of what the lookout will look like.

Mr. Rose answered no.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if sidewalks will be included in the plan.

Mr. Rose answered no.

Mr. Fedota clarified that the 4 parking spaces are in addition to the 2 car garages.

Mr. Rose answered that is correct.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out there are 2 spaces per driveway so it's 4 spaces per unit plus the 4 additional.

Mr. Noonan asked if it be required to put sidewalks on Hicks Road.

Mr. Vyverberg explained it would need IDOT approval which would be looked at in final engineering. He spoke to the current sidewalk conditions and how the current lots have none.

Mr. Fedota asked about lighting requirements for private roads.

Mr. Vyverberg explained if approved it would have to come back in for final engineering, which will require some form of lighting that follow the standards set by the Village Engineer.

Mr. Kolososki asked if the Fire Department reviewed the hammer head for truck turnarounds.

Mr. Vyverberg answered yes and explained there are some conditions in place upon approval.

Mr. Hanson asked if there are sidewalks south of the property.

Mr. Vyverberg spoke to the location of existing sidewalks.

Mr. Hanson asked if we would want sidewalks.

Mr. Vyverberg explained right now they are in a preliminary engineering faze. He further explained as a typical requirement of a subdivision ordinance if the proposal was approved by council sidewalks would have to a component of that plan.

Mr. Friedman clarified there are sidewalk shown on Hicks Road but not on the private roadway.

Mr. Vyverberg explained sidewalks along the private road are not required but sidewalks along the periphery are required.

Discussion on location of sidewalks.

Mr. Dwyer asked if there is any screening for the backyards that back up to Hicks Road.

Mr. Rose yes the plan is for a fence and additional landscaping.

Mr. Dwyer expressed concern with the detention basin that loops back to the homes on the west end. He asked if it can that be eliminated such as underground pipes or on the other side of the hammerhead.

Mr. Spies explained the original thought was to split it up on either side of the hammer head but it didn't work very well on the east side, which is why it was extended further to the south on the west side. He stated they can look into adding additional 60" pipes explaining right now they have 2 rows of them. Mr. Spies stated in final engineering they can relook and try to shorten up the southern leg of the detention but at this point they are just showing they can attain the volume that is needed to store the runoff. He stated the final Engineering will show more options

Mr. Bettenhausen spoke to the architecture and how all he sees is roof pointing out it looks very high for a low profile home. He asked if it can be lowered to the peaks of the garages.

Mr. Rose stated it is hard to see in a 2 dimensional image. He explained if they lessened the pitch on the home they would have to lessen the pitch on the garage and then it doesn't have the look you would like to have. He spoke to design elements that can be added.

Mr. Bettenhausen asked if there will be usable attic space.

Mr. Rose explained part of the plan if feasible is to have a drop down attic with a 10x10 system with trusts and some kinds of storage. He stated there will be no hidden second stories.

Mr. Vyverberg gave a brief overview of the request. He stated the general plan has been articulated by the petitioner. He explained it abuts Walgreens with a drive-thru which is zoned B-2. He stated the subject property is zoned R-1 and is approximately 1.9 acres. Mr. Vyverberg explained the proposal is for a 12 unit townhome development, which has a density of 6.09 units per acre. He spoke to the existing storm water system and how there is a little hole in the neighborhood. He referred to the slide showing the existing storm sewer location on the slide and how there is a donut hole where there are no storm sewers presently. Mr. Vyverberg explained the petitioner's solution is to extend the line running the sanitary sewer up through Elm Street and make the connection accordingly. He further explained the storm sewer would then be terminated into the existing storm sewer along Home Avenue. Mr. Vyverberg spoke to the parking being 2 cars in garage, 2 cars in apron and 4 additional spaces to be utilized for the entire 12 units, which equates to 4.33 spaces per unit.

Sworn in Mr. Dale Bell 1511 N. Elm Street

Mr. Bell expressed his concern with what he will see out his window if this proposal is approved. He stated his current view is the detention basin where deer frequent.

Mr. Spies explained they will be berming up along the west line to meet the slope coming down. He further explained they anticipate the berm to be 4-5 feet high showing the location on the slide.

Mr. Bell clarified there will be no fence just a berm.

Mr. Rose explained the plan does not include a fence but instead landscaping.

Mr. Bell expressed his concern with the increased traffic onto Garden Avenue because Home Avenue and Garden Avenue are narrower streets and are not made for that amount of traffic. He stated they have people cutting through on Elm Street from Dundee Road.

Mr. Dwyer spoke to the possibility of adding a condition for a traffic study to show the estimate of traffic flows during peak times.

Sworn in Ms. Anna Czechowski 1535 N. Elm Street

Ms. Czechowski expressed concern with the amount of cars on 3 lots. She pointed out the location of her home and expressed her concern that Elm Street is no longer going to be a quiet street. She stated it is a quiet single family area with no sidewalks. Ms. Czechowski explained they want it to retain the country feel and is concerned adding 12 families to 3 lots is too much.

Mr. Dwyer clarified with staff that the comprehensive plan contemplated office use for these lots.

Mr. Vyverberg spoke to 2010 Comprehensive Plan, which identified Hicks Road and Garden as a sub area. He stated 4 proposals have previously come to the Plan Commission but none were approved. He spoke to the surrounding properties zoning and explained because of the challenges an office use was

contemplated.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out that would bring more traffic than the townhomes.

Mr. Vyverberg agreed with Mr. Dwyer and clarified the comprehensive plan was speaking directly about these 3 lots and the remaining homes on Elm Street should be contemplated as single family residential.

Sworn in Ms. Elisa Campos 336 E. Garden Avenue

Ms. Campos stated she is not opposed to change but thinks this is too drastic and will change the character of the neighborhood. She expressed her concern with the density because they are doubling the amount of families that are already there. She stated they are right next to the proposed development and don't like the idea of all the roof tops. Ms. Campos explained everyone is there for the character of the neighborhood with their big lots. She spoke to the closeness to the shopping and how they like the open spaces and the wildlife.

Mr. Dwyer asked Ms. Campos what she would think of an office building on this property.

Ms. Campos stated they were not crazy about the 2 stories that would be blocking their views. She explained a lot of people are in the neighborhood for the 100x300 lots.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out it is very unlikely for this area to be developed as single family homes.

Ms. Czechowski clarified staff's statements and how the area in question is not single family anymore.

Mr. Vyverberg explained the underlying zoning is R-1, which is exactly the same as all the properties along Elm Street and Hicks Road. He spoke to the Comprehensive Plan, which is the Villages view of what the future holds from a realistic development standpoint. He explained because of the pressure of the location of these lots single family residential was seen as an unrealistic use so it forecasted another use such as office.

Ms. Czechowski spoke to the other proposals and how their value will go down.

Mr. Vyverberg spoke to the other proposals that were not approved and the zoning notification requirements.

Ms. Czechowski stated they can buy all of the properties and build a big shopping center.

Sworn in Mr. George Limberg 1484 N. Hicks Road

Mr. Limberg stated his property is directly south of the development and did not receive any mailings about the changes to the proposal.

Mr. Vyverberg explained the mailing requirement is within 250 feet of the zoning property.

Mr. Dwyer asked if his property is in a trust

Mr. Limberg stated no. He spoke to the neighborhood being a quiet residential area and everyone would like it to stay that way. He spoke to the staff report and

how other developments have not been approved because they too were too dense. Mr. Limberg spoke to the practicality of having an access on Hicks Road pointing out the existing properties already have the access on Hicks Road. He spoke to drainage and his concern for his neighbors and friends in the area with the grading changes that will be required. He spoke to the previous comments on difficulty to develop single-family homes but pointed out that is what the neighborhood is and believes that is still practical and will help the property values in the area. Mr. Limberg expressed his concern with the proposal not being a good fit for the area.

Sworn Mr. Walt Bilyk 1460 N. Elm Street

Mr. Bilyk pointed out if this is approved the rest of the neighborhood will change because there will be no way to prevent other types of developments to be built throughout the neighborhood. He agreed with his neighbors and is against it because it is against the character of the neighborhood. He stated they are large lots with no sidewalks. He spoke to the drainage and the 12" drainage pipes they are proposing. He spoke to the previous proposals and how he doesn't understand how the 12" pipe will work but thinks rather a 36" pipe would be needed. Mr. Bilyk stated if the whole area is going to be redeveloped there should be a master plan so it is not all hodge podged and residents can decide what they want to do if it is going to be developed into high density.

Mr. Dwyer clarified the sub area contemplated only this property but the rest of the area doesn't change

Mr. Vyverberg stated that is correct.

Mr. Bilyk asked what is to prevent someone else from proposing something else in the future since you have changed the neighborhood allowing a high density development.

Mr. Dwyer stated there are no guarantees in life.

Mr. Bilyk stated you set the stage for it.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out the difference is this property faces commercial on 2 sides and is kind of separated from the rest of the area.

Mr. Bilyk stated if the concern is the existing lots emptying onto Hicks Road they can be turned around to empty on to Garden Avenue. He stated they could put 3 nice size homes and is confident the neighbors would support and they would sell.

Sworn in Mr. Brian Hennessy 1468 N. Hicks Road

Mr. Hennessy clarified the Village does not rezone without the owners approval.

Mr. Dwyer stated that is correct.

Mr. Hennessy pointed out many have said the reason they have come to Palatine is for the larger lots. He pointed out he has a driveway that goes out to Hicks Road and lives directly across from the Fire station. He stated he has kids and because his property is set back doesn't have an issue getting them to bed at night. Mr. Hennessy stated if these lots are rezoned it will completely change

the character of all the homes. He expressed his concern with the amount of families and cars and how it will be overwhelming.

Sworn in Ms. Vera Wisniewski 145 E. Home Avenue

Ms. Wisniewski stated she has 2 concerns. She spoke to the amount of 100 year rains that have occurred and expressed her concern with them. She explained her concern is being so close to Eagle Park there are a lot of kids that have always had Elm Street and Garden Avenue as safe places for them to walk because there hasn't been that much traffic. Ms. Wisniewski stated her second concern is if this is approved the church property will then become another monstrosity in the neighborhood adding more density and traffic.

Sworn in Mr. Dennis Schwantz 1536 N. Elm Street

Mr. Shwantz expressed his concern having these lots exit to Garden Ave. He stated he doesn't understand the issue of exiting onto Hicks since these properties already had entrances on Hicks. He expressed his concern with the 100 year flood zone and how his property is located downstream referring to the slide.

Sworn in Ms. Lori Limberg 1520 N. Elm Street

Ms. Limberg stated in 2007 council unanimously rejected the proposal for townhomes stating it will change the character of the neighborhoods. She compared the plans and though this plan stated it will be less dense the numbers are quite comparable. She referred to previous statements on how it is not feasible and the need for a transition. She spoke to the properties on Dundee Road that are similar with the Speedway and shopping center and the 2 houses right next door and how they get the same traffic as Jewel. She spoke to the listing for 1548 N. Hicks Road and how it stated easy access to Hicks Road, which contradicts the statements on difficulty getting in and out. Ms. Limberg asked why the side exit of Jewel doesn't have the same turning restrictions as Walgreens has and spoke to the accidents related to it. She spoke to Speedway's turn restrictions and how if Jewel changed it would solve a lot of the problems and would elevate the congestion. She stated she doesn't understand why it is not feasible to have single family homes when there are 2 on Dundee Road that face the same problems. Ms. Limberg expressed her concern is with the grade of the properties with their property sitting 25 feet below the proposed site. She stated the original plan didn't have any ditches or drain pipes off of Garden Avenue or Elm Street and the revised plans added some ditches that are smaller than the ones by the church. She asked how the water flow will be controlled and expressed her concern with there only being 1 inlet for 600 feet compared to Home Avenue who had an inlet every 300 feet. She stated Mr. Ruppert and Mr. Vyverberg came out to the site to see the creek they want to run the water into is already having problems. Ms. Limberg spoke to the issues with the creek backing up and how adding the 12 townhomes will cause it to back up more. Mr. Ruppert doesn't feel it will be a problem but she explained her concern is who she contacts when there is an issue.

Mr. Dwyer explained the Village's Engineering Department requires that the water that runs off can be no greater than what it was before the development. Ms. Limberg clarified her concern is it is being rerouted. She spoke to Mr. Rose's other developments and how she was told they would not sell in this area of town. She pointed out it seems like it is a money situation because he can make more money on townhomes than a single family. Ms. Limberg stated her major concern is with the water drainage. She pointed out they have not contacted MWRD in the preliminary plan and stated she thinks it should be addressed now rather than after the fact.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The subject property is located directly south of a commercial inline center and a freestanding retail store, with drive through. Additionally, it is directly across Hicks Road from a major commercial shopping center on Dundee Road. As such, although this subdivision was platted in 1928, these lots are impacted by the commercial development on both sides of the Subject Property. The current Village adopted Comprehensive Plan recognized that the future best use of these 3 lots may not be single-family residential for these reasons. The previous townhouse proposals for these lots were not approved. The subject proposal provides a land use transition for the commercial properties, incorporates a moderate density lower than the typical Village benchmark, and includes a lower height to balance with the surrounding single-family residential properties to the west and south. Through inclusion of the northern lot, this development proposal is more comprehensive than previous.

Finally, the extended storm sewer system and culverts along Elm Street will manage the storm water from the site and connect to an existing system, where none presently exists in this area. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Development subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The final architecture, engineering, and site development plans shall substantially conform to the Spies and Associates Preliminary Engineering Plans, dated 01/25/2018 and the Mathias Jans Architect plans, dated 05/07/2018, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
- 2) The Final Engineering Plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer, and include the following:
 - a. A MWRD WMO permit would be required. Site runoff, volume control and detention requirements apply.
 - b. The site grading plan will need to be "cleaned up" as part of the final engineering submittal;
 - i. Clearly indicate proposed grades and existing grades.
 - ii. Clearly show flow direction with arrows and contour lines.
 - iii. The property perimeter shall be clearly labeled with proposed and existing grades.
 - c. An inlet shall be added on the NE corner of N. Elm Street and E. Garden Avenue in the parkway in a manner to allow runoff to flow to the structure from both

- Garden Avenue and Elm Street.
- d. The inlet at the SE corner of Elm Street and Garden Avenue shall be placed in the parkway in a manner to allow runoff to flow to the structure from both Garden Avenue and Elm Street.
 - e. Profile and cross sections of the Elm Street storm sewer will be required for final engineering clearly showing the cut/fill & final grading of the Elm Street sewer.
 - f. Please show 10-foot separation of sanitary/storm from water main or show construction use of water main quality pipe.
 - g. A ditch line shall be graded and established in the parkway areas along Elm Street and Garden Avenue, in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
 - h. Driveway culverts shall be replaced or required where the sewer trenches cross a driveway.
 - i. The sump pump discharge for 1443 N. Elm Street shall be connected to the proposed storm sewer on N. Elm Street.
 - j. The ditch line along the east side of Elm Street and both the north and south side of Garden Avenue disturbed with construction of the sanitary/storm sewer shall be regraded to include a 5-foot area at 4% from the edge of pavement, side slopes no greater than 3:1, at least 1% longitudinal slope, and a flow line of at least 1 foot in width. Driveway culverts impacted in the above referenced area shall be replaced with at least 10-inch diameter pipe, extend at least 3 feet from the edge of driveway and include a flared end section.
- 3) After the construction of the second building, the Petitioner's engineer shall submit updated impervious coverage calculations in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer. This shall include any Village recommend changes to the impervious calculations and engineering plans for the development.
 - 4) Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any building, the developer shall complete the detention basin installation and storm sewer extensions along Garden Avenue, south along Elm Street, including the required ditch line in the Elm Street and Garden Avenue ROW, with approval from the Village Engineer.
 - 5) A construction management and traffic plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Directors of Public Works and Planning and Zoning. This traffic management plan shall outline the proposed development schedule and identify the material delivery routes and proposed parking areas for the contractors, prior to the completion of internal drive. The construction traffic and material deliveries should be directed to and from Hicks Road for access to the site. A component of this plan shall also include an initial notification, by standard mail, to the residential properties within 600 feet of the subject property, once the initial site development schedule is known.
 - 6) As part of the implementation of the Final Planned Development, the Traffic Committee may review and recommend additional parking and traffic controls to the Village Council, including the parking adjustments/restrictions along Garden Avenue, proximate to the Subject Development.
 - 7) Homeowners Declarations shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney and Director of Planning and Zoning, and shall address the following items:
 - a. The internal road shall remain private and the Village will not be responsible for maintenance or snow removal. A snow removal and maintenance plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and the

Director of Fire Prevention.

- b. The private maintenance responsibilities of the HOA for the detention basin and any appropriate plantings within the detention basin.
 - 8) A Planned Development letter of credit in the amount of \$120,000 shall be submitted in manner acceptable to the Village of Palatine.
 - 9) An engineer's estimate of probable cost shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
 - 10) A letter of credit in the amount of 110% of the engineer's cost estimate for the public improvements shall be submitted.
- 11) Review fees in the amount of 1.5% of the engineer's cost estimate of the total project improvements shall be submitted.
- 12) Any building not constructed by the Petitioner shall receive approval from Village Council prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 13) One side of the private road shall be posted "No Parking Fire Lane", including the hammerhead with an ordinance created to enforce this requirement. This request should be submitted to the Fire Prevention Director.
- 14) A landscaping and screening plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and include substantial materials and screening on the west side of the site.

Mr. Hanson asked Mr. Rose if he can and will meet all the conditions.

Mr. Rose answered yes.

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

Mr. Kolososki stated he is not opposed to the project other than they are trying to put too many townhomes on this site. He stated the retention location and how it will be handled is not planned well.

Mr. Dwyer stated he would like a traffic study but stated he suspects the 12 small townhomes will not generate a lot of traffic.

Ms. Robins stated it does appear to be inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out the difference being the east side of the development faces Jewel.

Ms. Robins pointed out it seems to be a cohesive neighborhood and this is not consistent with it.

Discussion on the length of time they have been for sale.

Mr. Hanson pointed out it is possible for a single developer to put 3 single family homes turned 90 degrees whether it is economically feasible is one thing but it is possible.

Mr. Noonan stated maybe they can put 7 homes with a little court.
Mr. Hanson asked where they would exit.
Mr. Noonan stated on Garden Avenue.

Mr. Kolososki stated he thinks it is possible to put single family on that site and thinks it would be more cohesive. He stated he doesn't think the townhomes fit the neighborhood but maybe a small cul-de-sac community would work better.

Discussion on the cul-de-sac community and how many homes would work best.

Mr. Fedota stated townhomes create a sub community and this piece of land may be conducive for that but 12 units is pushing the density too far.

Mr. Bettenhausen stated maybe 6-8 townhomes would be a better fit.

Mr. Dwyer asked what the depths of the lots are.
Mr. Vyverberg stated currently as they stand they are 288 feet deep

Mr. Dwyer stated there is room to put a cul-de-sac in the middle and have single family detached homes.
Mr. Dwyer pointed out the storm water is outside of our purview and will leave that to Engineering Department.

Discussion on what they suggest and how it would be acceptable to developers.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to deny; seconded by Mr. Kolososki.

Mr. Dwyer summarized that this request had not met the standards and was unanimously denied by a vote of 9-0. This item will tentatively go to the Community and Economic Development Committee of the Village Council on June 4, 2018 or June 11, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Robert Kolososki, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

IV. COMMUNICATIONS**V. ADJOURNMENT**

1. Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Noonan made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Robins.

RESULT:	MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jane Robins, Plan Commissioner
AYES:	Hansen, Dwyer, Robins, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

