



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES • MAY 13, 2025

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Patrick Noonan	Commissioner	Present	
Cindy Roth-Wurster	Commissioner	Present	
Eric Friedman	Vice Chairperson	Present	
Jan Wood	Chairperson	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Commissioner	Present	
Tim Schubert	Commissioner	Present	

II. MINUTES

1. Planning and Zoning Commission - Regular Meeting - Apr 22, 2025 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Stephen Fedota, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Tim Schubert, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Roth-Wurster, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Cavanaugh, Fedota, Schubert

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 1239 W. Autumn Road

SU-000161-2025 - 1239 W Autumn Road - Recommended to Deny

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on April 24, 2025 and mailed to the required surrounding property owners.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application & Real Estate Disclosure**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Site Plan**
5. **Elevation**
6. **Public Notice**

Mr. Auer provides the background for the request:

The Subject Property is zoned R-2, single-family residential and is approximately 14,483 square feet. The property is located in the Autumn Road subdivision and is improved with a single-family home. Currently, there is no fencing at the subject property.

The fence is proposed to be located in the subject property's side yard abutting a street yard (north Grove Avenue). Concurrently, this side yard abuts the front yard of a residential lot to the south. This property is categorized as a "corner lot" by the Village of Palatine Zoning ordinance.

Pursuant to 6.03(b)(6)(b) "*Special Uses*" of the Village of Palatine Zoning Ordinance, fences located in a side yard abutting a street, which also abut the side lot line of a front yard, of an adjacent lot, are only permitted when approved through special use procedure. The petitioner is requesting Special Use approval to permit a fence in a side yard abutting a street and a fence in the side yard abutting a street, which abuts the side lot line of an adjacent front yard.

Mr. Auer reviewed the existing conditions and discussed the special use standards. He also referenced existing property references within the Village and similar circumstances, where fences were approved with 15 or 20' setbacks.

Sworn in petitioners: Yante Miranda and Jose Hernandez - 1239 W Autumn Road

Ms. Miranda states she has been a resident of Palatine for 21 years. They purchased the property in 2023. She explains her request is based on privacy and safety concerns. She notes that the existing properties presented do not reflect her property's conditions. The side where she is requesting the fence is flat and provides access to the water spigot. She uses a walker and wheelchair and needs access to the level side of the house. The rest of the property is graded unevenly, making this the only accessible area. She adds that her

daughter has special needs, and the fence would help keep her safe. She emphasizes that their situation is unique and asks for her special conditions to be considered.

Mr. Hernandez states he is a CDL driver and travels out of town every month. He wants to ensure his wife and daughter are safe, while he is away. He agrees the requested side is more level than the other side.

Chairman Wood asks when the house was purchased.

Ms. Miranda confirms it was in 2023.

Chairman Wood asks if there is a rear entrance and whether the home was newly constructed to accommodate her condition.

Ms. Miranda says they would like to add a patio in the back, but the grading was altered due to water runoff. It wasn't originally like that.

Chairman Wood asks if the fence is to prevent people from entering the property.

Ms. Miranda confirms and states it is a high-traffic area and a safety concern.

Chairman Wood asks if the neighbor, who objected, is present.

Ms. Miranda says no, and Mr. Hernandez clarifies it's the neighbor across the street.

Chairman Wood notes there are decorative fences in the area and asks if they are seeking privacy.

Ms. Miranda confirms it is for privacy, reiterating that it's the only side she can walk on due to the grading.

Commissioner Kolososki asks why they are requesting 6' fences on the rest of the property.

Ms. Miranda responds that a neighboring property has a 6' fence, and they want the height to match, though not the material.

Commissioner Friedman asks her to reference the site plan and explain the 5' setback request.

Ms. Miranda explains there is no walkable area due to the slope.

Commissioner Friedman asks if she accesses that area from the front door.

Ms. Miranda confirms the question.

Commissioner Friedman questions if a 15' setback would still allow space to walk.

Ms. Miranda explains that she uses a walker, they have a tractor, and that side is the only usable outdoor space due to water runoff and slope.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster notes the house was built by a developer who was aware of Miranda's needs.

Ms. Miranda says the grading was changed to stop water from draining into the neighbor's yard.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks if the builder presented alternative options.

Ms. Miranda says it was the Village that required the grading adjustment.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the slope is at the front, back, or across the yard.

Ms. Miranda states it's a cross-slope across the yard.

Commissioner Bettenhausen notes that a 6' fence would block neighbors from seeing her in an emergency.

Ms. Miranda says she is getting a special device to notify emergency services if she falls.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks if the yard could be regraded if a patio were added.

Ms. Miranda says regrading the backyard is not allowed. Chairman Wood asks if they have considered bushes. Ms. Miranda says she would consider it but notes the bushes would exceed 6'. Mr. Hernandez adds that neighboring bushes grow over sidewalks.

Mr. Auer states that staff's review and consideration was based on the fence being 5' from the lot line. Chairman Wood asks whether the required setback in that area is 15'. Mr. Auer responds that the zoning district's standard set back in the area is 20' without a special use.

Sworn in resident: Jeff Javior & Tiffany Javior - 1235 W Autumn Road

Mr. Javior refers to the slide showing the existing conditions and discusses the slope of the house, which makes it difficult for the owner to walk safely. He explains that the sidewalk on her side of Autumn Road is safe for walking, and the sidewalk across the street is the only other safe walking area available to her. He emphasizes that the only part of the property that is safe and accessible for her is the area where she is requesting to install the fence. He describes the original development and notes that the planned grading was changed to prevent flooding of the house located at the bottom of the slope. He also mentions the construction of a berm as part of those changes. Mr. Javior expresses his support for the homeowner and advocates for her situation, stating that she should be able to enjoy and safely use her property.

Commissioner Kolososki asks who installed the berm.

Mr. Javior states it was required by the Village of Palatine.

Commissioner Noonan asks staff if there is any documentation on this property.

Ms. Bremanis states she does not have that information on hand for this development.

Mr. Auer states that there is a drainage easement on the site plan and explains that stormwater impacts should be reduced for neighboring residents. Ms. Bremanis reiterates that the request at hand pertains solely to the fence, and drainage should not be part of this discussion, as the subdivision and home were inspected and approved through the process. Ms. Javior comments that if the fence is set back more than 5 feet, the petitioner would only have 9 feet of space to maneuver on her property. Commissioner Friedman states that the standard setback is 20 feet. Ms. Javior responds that the issue seems to be more about aesthetics than the petitioner's quality of life, and she continues to advocate for the neighbor's safety.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

In conclusion, the fence proposal is overall inconsistent with approved fences of

similar circumstance and character. Therefore, Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed special use application. Staff notes the other similar corner side yard fence approvals, provided a minimum 15-foot setback from the property line. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval, Staff recommended the following condition:

1. The fence is setback from the corner side lot line that parallels Grove Avenue, with a minimum 15-foot setback, in addition to the parkway along Grove Avenue, and includes the required landscaping between the fence and lot line.

Mr. Auer states there will be a revision to this condition:

The condition will read: **If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the requested Special Use, the Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plans as submitted by the applicant, except as such plans may be changed to conform with the village codes and standards.**

Ms. Javior asks about a property that was allowed a 15' setback if the standard is 20'.

Mr. Auer states that in this district, a 20' setback is the minimum setback without a permit. A side yard request can be for 10' or 15', however it must be approved via special use. A fence in the side yard can be requested at a lesser distance, but it must go through the special use process. The property referenced was approved at 15' as a special use. Chairman Wood states that variations and special uses are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Each request goes through the process and is evaluated individually. Some may be approved, and some may not. This is the same situation here, which is why residents may request a special use or variation. Ms. Javior asks why this special use for a disabled person would not automatically apply.

Ms. Bremanis explains that a special use is not a guaranteed approval-it is simply the process through which a request can be made. Mr. Auer provided a sample of a property that was approved at 15' through this same process. It was meant to demonstrate that relief was applied for and granted. Typically, fence requests at this reduced distance are denied. Ms. Javior refers to a house in the rear neighborhood that has a chain link fence with decorative landscaping. Mr. Auer states that the chain link fence was part of the final planned development for that subdivision. Applicants can request such allowances at the time of final planned development approval.

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

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

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Schubert states that the neighborly support is commendable and appreciates the advocacy shown for the petitioner. He acknowledges that other

fence requests have been approved with varying visibility impacts, but this particular request raises concerns due to the placement of the fence on the side lot, which does not align with other homes on the street. He recognizes that the petitioner has unique needs that limit her ability to enjoy the property, but believes there may be alternative solutions to address those needs.

Chairman Wood comments that this is a tough situation. She appreciates the passion and support from the neighbors and thinks it's commendable. From a safety standpoint, she has considered the neighboring property across the street and is concerned that the proposed fence may obstruct the view for other residents. She notes that, overall, fences in the neighborhood are typically in the backyards, not front yards. While the request meets safety concerns, it does not meet the aesthetic standards typically upheld. The 5' setback is not commonly approved, making this a difficult decision. She emphasizes the importance of considering each case individually, and acknowledges the reasoning behind staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Kolososki states that even moving the fence back 10' would be an improvement, as 5' from the sidewalk feels too close. He acknowledges the sensitivity of the issue and believes a compromise may be possible. Chairman Wood replies that even an additional 5' may not sufficiently address the concerns.

Commissioner Kolososki adds that from a safety standpoint, someone might be inclined to come 5' into the lot to look over the fence, whereas at a 20' setback, that becomes less likely.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster notes that corner lots naturally have less usable yard area. She emphasizes that when you install a fence, you're essentially putting up a wall, which may offer a false sense of security. If safety is a concern, she advises calling the police. While she's empathetic to the petitioner's situation and mobility limitations, she finds it difficult to support the request because of the broader impact on neighboring properties and the potential precedent it could set. She is not aware of similar special uses granted at this distance and feels the request does not meet the established standards.

Commissioner Friedman states that the petitioner acknowledged that much of their yard isn't usable due to the grading and their mobility concerns. He notes that of the area enclosed by the proposed fence, only about 20% would actually be of functional use to the homeowner. He encourages the petitioner to find a way to make use of that 20% in a way that meets their needs while staying within code requirements. From a planning and zoning perspective, he cannot support the request and urges the petitioner to explore other solutions.

A vote to approve this request subject to staffs conditions as per the revised submitted plan. The motion was moved by Commissioner Cavanaugh and 2nd by Commissioner Fedota. The vote to approve was denied by a vote of 6-3. A second motion to Deny the petitioners request was taken and moved by Commissioner Friedman and 2nd by Commissioner Fedota. The vote to deny was 6-3 and denied. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday June 2nd, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [6 TO 3]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Tim Schubert, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Roth-Wurster, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Fedota, Schubert
NAYS:	Wood, Kolososki, Cavanaugh

2. 2195 N. Hicks Road

VAR-000163-2025 - 2195 N Hicks Rd

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on April 24th, 2025 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. Elevation
6. Public Notice

Background:

Ms. Bremanis explains that In July of 2009, the Palatine Park District received approval for an offsite Electronic Message Board (EMB) sign, provides an elevation of the existing and proposed signage and states it will be located on the corner of N. Hicks Road and E. Recreation Drive with the following relief:

1. Special Use for a reader board
2. Variation to allow a reader board for a non-business use outside of the permitted corridors
3. Variation to allow a reader board on less than 300 feet of lot frontage along an approved corridor
4. Variation to allow the message board to be 50% of the sign area which would exceed the maximum permitted 40% of the total sign area
5. Variation to allow the size of the proposed sign to be 53 square feet in size which would exceed the maximum permitted 50 square feet for an institutional use

The Petitioner is now proposing to replace the existing EMB sign, with the same EMB sign type that is located on Northwest Highway at Community Park. The Petitioner is requesting a

- a. **Special Use Amendment for electronic message board.**
- b. **Variation to allow an electronic message board to be 100% of the sign area instead of the permitted maximum 40%.**
- c. **Variation to allow the size of the proposed sign to be 69 square feet instead of the maximum permitted 50 square feet for institutional use.**

*Staff notes that the existing approved variation for the Falcon Park EMB sign allows a 53 square foot sign, for an institutional use.

Sworn in petitioner: Michelle Eckelberry - 250 E Wood St - Palatine Park District - Director of District Services.

Rodney Whitehead - Olympik Signs - 1130 N Garfield St., Lombard, IL - sign contractor.

Mr. Whitehead explains that his company has been working in Palatine for over 40 years and is familiar with the village's codes. They installed the sign at the Aquatic Center, and the new sign is consistent with that one, with the added benefit of being able to control both signs simultaneously.

Ms. Eckelberry explains that the sign at the Aquatic Center was installed last fall, and the sign for the Falcon site will be the same. It will feature the Palatine Park District logo at the top and read "Falcon Park - Palatine Park District," with the message board below. The new signage will allow for broader communication within the community and coordination with other civic groups, enhancing the ability to share information. She states it is beneficial to provide real-time information. The sign can be turned off between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and its brightness can be dimmed. None of the signs flash or have continuous movement; the display functions more like a slideshow.

Commissioner Friedman questions whether the fixed sign panel identifying Falcon Park is intended to be included.

Ms. Eckelberry explains that it is part of the EMB however will be static and located at the top.

Commissioner Noonan states that the sign is one complete unit, and the top portion will say "Falcon Park."

Commissioner Friedman states that it appears to be part of the digital display.

Mr. Whitehead states that the software has the ability to control the header.

Commissioner Friedman confirms that the total square footage of the sign does not increase, as the header is integrated within the existing sign.

Chairman Wood asks staff if there have been any issues with the Aquatic Center sign that may have caused distractions.

Ms. Eckelberry states that the sign has a 20-second timer for displaying information.

Ms. Bremanis states that no issues were brought up during the review.

Chairman Wood - How long has it been up?

Ms. Eckelberry - The new one has been up since last September.

Chairman Wood - The sign information will be the same for both locations?

Ms. Eckelberry states that it will be the same, but it also has the ability to include information specific to each location's upcoming events.

Commissioner Kolososki asks what the lifetime of the sign will be.

Mr. Whitehead states that the board maintains its clarity and will still be relevant five, even ten years from now.

Commissioner Schubert asks if it will brighter than the existing sign.

Mr. Whitehead states it will not.

Commissioner Kolososki asks if the sign will be relevant and worth the cost and effort.

Ms. Eckelberry states that it is a way to connect that side of the community with the rest of town. It will provide information about concerts and events at other Palatine locations and parks, helping to unify the community. She believes it will be beneficial for all.

Chairman Wood - The current sign is 46 sq. ft., and the new one will be 63 sq. ft.?

Mr. Whitehead confirms that is correct.

Ms. Bremanis further explains that the sign is located on an easement and is considered off-site signage. The easement was specifically created for the sign. She provides additional pictures of the area and the existing conditions, along with a visual representation of what the sign may look like. She notes that she may request they submit a new elevation showing the banner, so it can be associated with the ordinance and included as part of the approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Park District received approval for an EMB in 2009. While the existing sign could be replaced with one of the same size and scope, the Park District is requesting an increase of 17 square feet and a change in the EMB area from approximately 50% to 100%, to align with the existing sign on Northwest Highway, adjacent to the Family Aquatic Center.

While staff understands the desire for a fully digital sign and the EMB management implications of being able to universally manage both signs on one system, the proposed changes represent a significant departure from the previously approved design and are located directly adjacent to residential properties.

Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Planning and Zoning Commission. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Special Use and Variation shall substantially conform to the sign plan prepared by Olympik Signs dated 02/05/2025, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The Electronic Message Board may not be illuminated between the hours

of 11 PM - 7 AM.

Chairman Wood asks what is the closest residential home.

Ms. Bremanis gives an approximate distance but states that, without measuring, she does not have an exact figure.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks if there have been any complaints about the existing signage.

Ms. Bremanis states that, to her knowledge, there have not been any complaints.

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

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

DISCUSSION:

Chairman Wood states that past requests for EMB signage have been approached very conservatively regarding sign allotments. She notes that this request is for the community and would be a benefit. She states that the existing sign at Falcon is difficult to read, and the new sign would be an improvement. The request meets the special use and variation criteria and has a similar situation to compare it to. She adds that there is no negative impact on safety or welfare, it will not reduce property values, and the residential area is a significant distance from the signage.

Commissioner Fedota states he is in favor of the sign.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster notes that the technology has changed. She references the special use and sample sign, stating that it would be an improvement. She is in favor.

Commissioner Friedman states that there are not many electronic signs in the area and no nearby driveways, so it will not be a distraction. He believes it is a good application for this technology.

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 May 19th, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Eric Friedman, Vice Chairperson
AYES:	Noonan, Roth-Wurster, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Cavanaugh, Fedota, Schubert

3. 839 W Brookside Street, 262 S Quentin Road, including the 3 vacant lots south of 262 S Quentin Road, and 836 W. Dorchester Road.

PFSUB-000010-2025 - 839 W Brookside St.

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on April 24th, 2025 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Plat of Subdivision**
5. **Plat of Vacation**
6. **Engineering Plans**
7. **Elevations**
8. **Public Notice**

Background:

The properties were annexed in 2002 and consist of 6 lots ranging from 8,712 to 20,025 square feet, totaling approximately 76,182 square feet (1.75 acres). They are currently zoned R-1 single-family residential. The surrounding properties are all zoned R-2 single-family residential.

The Petitioner is requesting a Preliminary and Final Subdivision to re-subdivide the 6 subject lots into 6 reconfigured lots; rezone the properties from R-1 to R-2; and vacate of southern 3 feet of the W. Brookside Street right of way and northern 3 feet of the Dorchester Street right-of-way, abutting the subject properties. The Petitioner is requesting a Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision to permit a 6-lot single-family residential development; and Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential to R-2 Single Family Residential; and Vacation of the southern 3 feet of the W. Brookside Street right-of-way and the northern 3 feet of W. Dorchester Road right-of-way, directly abutting the Subject Properties.

Sworn in petitioner: Greg Rose - 47 N Bothwell St., Palatine, IL - GWR Enterprises, Inc.

Mr. Rose explains that the existing six lots include four that face Quentin Road and are substandard. He proposes subdividing the two furthest west properties into 75 x 135 ft lots-two homes would front Dorchester, and two would front Brookside. The remaining four lots, which face Quentin, would still have driveways off Dorchester and Brookside. These lots would be wider and more appealing, as they would be further from Quentin Road. He states they are requesting R-2 zoning to match other subdivisions in the area. The proposed homes would be in the 3,000-4,000 sq. ft. range, with 75 ft. wide lots and 10 ft.

setbacks. He provides conceptual elevations of the proposed homes and notes that they are seeking R-2 zoning with no variances or relief.

Stormwater will be managed with a volume control area along Quentin Road. A depressional area will collect rainfall from the property before routing it into the MWRD system. He provides existing utility plans and notes that he was also the builder on two other nearby lots.

Commissioner Friedman asks him to speak to the need for the change in the right-of-way-does it make these lots consistent or unique in terms of drainage compared to the existing lots?

Mr. Rose states that it is not necessary, but it makes sense to include it.

Ms. Bremanis shows the subdivision layout and highlights the areas that have been vacated. She states that the new lot lines will be consistent with neighboring properties on Brookside and Dorchester.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks if the footprint of Lots 3 and 4 could be moved 5 or 10 feet to the east.

Mr. Rose states that it would be left to the homeowner's discretion but feels they would be agreeable to maintaining a 10 ft. side yard setback to stay as far from Quentin Road as possible.

Commissioner Friedman - What is the setback for interior lots?

Mr. Rose - There will be 10 ft. side yard setbacks on all interior properties. The house width on those lots would be a maximum 55 ft., while the larger lots could accommodate wider homes.

Commissioner Fedota asks if an HOA would be required for volume control maintenance.

Mr. Rose states that the responsibility would be deeded to the property. If maintenance or adjustments were needed, the property owners would be required to share in the costs.

Ms. Bremanis states that a sub-area plan was developed years ago, which envisioned R-2 zoning for this area. The new comprehensive plan includes the sub-area plan, and the proposed zoning is consistent with both the plan and the surrounding properties. She provides pictures of the existing conditions.

Chairman Wood asks if sidewalks will be continued.

Ms. Bremanis states that they would connect to the existing sidewalks.

Sworn in Resident: Christine Kujanski - 855 W. Dorchester Road

Concerns regarding drainage. States they are at the lowest point and would like to know what the process is, the length of time and how drainage would be addressed. She explains the current issues and would like assurance that these concerns would be considered.

Mr. Rose states that the engineering plan addresses MWRD standards. Water collected on the property-regardless of new impervious surfaces-must be captured according to both Village and MWRD requirements and routed through volume control measures. The impact on the community must be less than what currently exists. The Village Engineer and MWRD will require them to manage

stormwater more effectively than the current conditions. The anticipated timeframe for construction is to begin in late September, with completion expected within 18 months.

Commissioner Friedman asks about his side of street with scope of work planned - any changes to curb or pavement.

Sworn in: Tim Spies - Spies & Assoc - 534 W Campus Dr. - Arlington Hts.

He states that there is no work being done outside the property lines it is contained within. The grading of Brookside or Dorchester roads would not be changed. If there are depressed curbs they would be replaced with standard section.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The subdivision and rezoning to R-2 are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations, and comparable to the surrounding development patterns. The proposed lots meet or exceed all minimum required R-2 bulk and comply with all of the setback requirements and minimum required lot standards, per the Subdivision Ordinance. The proposed subdivision is also consistent with the surrounding subdivisions. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed request, subject to the following conditions:

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed request, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall substantially conform to the engineering plans prepared by Spies & Associates, Inc. attached here to except as such plans may be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted on Mylar with the required signatures and significantly conform to the Plat of Subdivision in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning.
3. The Final Plat of Vacation shall be submitted on Mylar with the required signatures in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
4. The Final Engineering Plans, Final Engineer's Estimate of Probable Cost, and Tree Preservation Plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning.
5. Review fees, in the amount of 1.5% of the total project improvement costs (as defined in the Village Code) based upon the finally accepted EEOPC shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
6. A Public Improvement letter of credit in an amount of 115% of the approved EEOPC), for said public improvements, shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
7. Cash in lieu of live detention in the amount of \$19,807.32.
8. Recapture fees in the amount of \$69,990.51 shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
9. All required extra-agency permits (MWRD letter of determination) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
10. A construction management plan, indicated the proposed material delivery routes and contractor parking areas, shall be submitted to the Village Engineer.

11. A Subdivision Approval Agreement shall be required.
12. Recording fees in the amount of \$300 shall be submitted.
13. The Architectural Plans for the homes shall comply with the Village's Architectural Design Guidelines - Section 6.41.1 of the Village Code.

Chairman Wood notes that the builder stated they are required to ensure the development does not worsen existing conditions. A neighbor expressed concern that it might. She asks how it would be quantified whether the condition has worsened or not.

Ms. Bremanis provides information, explaining that any runoff created by the new homes must be captured by the volume control system, including water from downspouts. There are three catch basins that drain into the volume control area, which is how the drainage will be managed.

Commissioner Friedman states that there is nothing in the conditions requiring an HOA to maintain the system. He asks if the Village would set up an SSA (Special Service Area) through the conditions to ensure proper performance over time.

Ms. Bremanis states that this would be addressed as part of the site development permit process and would be coordinated with the Village Engineer. Commissioner Friedman suggests that this requirement might be added to the conditions.

Resident - Ms. Kujanski states that there was a previous issue with flooding and the village did address and fix the problem. Would like to make sure that flooding doesn't occur with the new plan.

Wood states it is being addressed by engineering.

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

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

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Noonan states that the plan is consistent with the existing neighborhood.

Commissioner Fedota comments that the plan provides a desirable frontage with relatively same size lots.

Chairman Wood states that it is an improvement to the neighborhood, and the builder has a history in the Village with a good reputation. She is comfortable with the plan.

Commissioner Schubert states that it will be a good addition and is a solid plan.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster states that the location is desirable and moving the entrances off of Quentin Road creates a safer configuration.

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 2nd, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Patrick Noonan, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Stephen Fedota, Commissioner
AYES:	Noonan, Roth-Wurster, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Cavanaugh, Fedota, Schubert

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. ADJOURNMENT