



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**JUNE 9, 2026 AT 7:00 PM**

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

**MINUTES**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**7:00 PM**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Wood called the Meeting to Order at 7:00 PM

**II. ROLL CALL**

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

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>MOTION APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	NOONAN
<b>SECONDER:</b>	BETTENHAUSEN
<b>AYES:</b>	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen
<b>NAYES:</b>	None

A. Draft PZC Minutes: May 26, 2026

**IV. PUBLIC HEARING**

A. 317 W. Northwest Highway

1. Special use to permit the operation of a massage therapy business.

No action was taken on this item, as the petitioner did not meet the required public notice requirements.

---

**B. 1244 N. Jack Pine Court**

1. Special use permitting a rear setback of 17 feet, encroaching upon the minimum required rear yard setback of 40 feet in the R-2 zoning district.

**SU-000266-2026 – 1244 N Jack Pine Court – District #1**

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

**Petitioner's Exhibits:**

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

**Background:**

Mr. Auer provides background and states the Petitioner is requesting to construct a rear addition to the principal structure on the subject property. Requesting a Special use to permit a rear setback of 17 feet, instead of the minimum required rear yard setback of 40 feet in the R-2 zoning district, pursuant to the zoning ordinance.

**Sworn in petitioner:**

Petitioner: Jenna Froelich Collins and Michael Collins – 1244 Jack Pine Court (Owners)

Ms. Collins states they are requesting approval for two small single-story additions at the rear of the home. She explains that the lot has a unique configuration and that the proposed additions would encroach onto the required 40-foot rear yard setback. She notes that the home, which was constructed in 1995, is already located within the current 40-foot setback area. The additions are intended to provide additional living space for their growing family and help make the home their long-term residence.

Ms. Collins references the plat of survey and explains that the south-west portion of the rear yard contains the larger open area, while the north-west side consists primarily of a narrow walk-around area with irregular grading and large boulders. She reviews the proposed locations of the additions and their relationship to the rear setback line. She states that she has spoken with all surrounding neighbors,

including those most directly affected by the project, and all have expressed support for the proposal.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks how the existing deck would be affected by the addition.

Ms. Collins states that the existing deck would be removed.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether the deck will be replaced.

Ms. Collins states that there are no plans to replace it at this time.

Chairperson Wood asks how the addition may affect the nearest neighboring property and whether it would obstruct views, noting the presence and potential removal of mature trees between the properties.

Ms. Collins explains that the larger addition would be located behind the garage and adjacent to the rear corner of the neighboring home. She states that the project was discussed with the affected neighbors and that they expressed no concerns. She also notes that one tree would be removed as part of the project. The neighbor abutting the rear of the property was informed of the tree removal and required process and had no concerns.

Commissioner Fedota asks which neighboring properties were notified.

Ms. Collins states that the adjacent properties to the rear of the home were informed of the proposal.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether there are any existing drainage, retention, or ponding issues on the property.

Ms. Collins states that there are no significant drainage concerns. She notes that the walk-around area on one side of the home can become wet and that a sewer structure located beyond the property line directs water toward that area. However, she states that the area has never experienced flooding, standing water, or elevated water conditions.

Commissioner Friedman notes that the existing floor plan already contains a breakfast nook, kitchen, and laundry room in the area of the proposed addition. He asks about the necessity of the request, observing that the proposal appears to enlarge and open up existing spaces rather than create new functions.

Ms. Collins states that the primary purpose of the addition is to enlarge the kitchen area and provide a larger laundry room that would also function as a mudroom.

Mr. Auer provides additional information and states that the petitioner is requesting two additions at the rear of the residence. He notes that the proposal does not create any concerns related to lot coverage, building height, or area and bulk requirements. To determine the petition's alignment with Special use standards, Staff evaluated the requested encroachment into the rear yard setback and reviewed surrounding properties for consistency. He states that several nearby properties have rear setbacks that are less than the currently required 40 feet within the R-2 District. The

former zoning ordinance — active at the time of development — contemplated portions of the principal building as a permitted obstruction in the rear yard. This provision allowed for the principal structure to encroach upon the minimum 40' setback if a minimum setback of 25 feet was maintained.

He further explains that the configuration of the lot limits expansion opportunities and creates a disproportionate amount of open space on one side of the property, making alternative addition locations less practical. Staff believes the proposal is compatible with the surrounding area and meets the standards for a Special Use.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether staff reviewed the location of the existing zoning rear yard setback line relative to the current home and the proposed additions. He asks how much of the existing residence is already located within the required rear yard setback area.

Mr. Auer states that when the home was originally constructed, the Zoning Ordinance permitted up to 10 percent of the principal structure to encroach into the required rear yard setback, provided that a minimum setback of 25 feet was maintained. Staff reviewed the original standards and determined that the existing home complied with those requirements at the time of construction.

Commissioner Friedman comments that Staff is assuming compliance based on the fact that the home was legally constructed.

Mr. Auer agrees.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Petitioner is requesting to construct a rear addition to the principal structure and an encroachment upon the minimum required 40-foot setback for the R-2 zoning district. At the nearest point, the proposed addition would be located 17 feet from the rear lot line. Upon review of the surrounding properties, Staff confirmed many principal structures, which are set back from the rear lot line at a distance below the required 40 feet. The proposed addition does not conflict with any additional R-2 zoning district standards. Staff recognizes the encroachment upon the rear setback is a sizable difference from the 40-foot setback, but also notes that the existing residence has a legal nonconforming rear yard setback of 27 feet. Staff also considers the lot's shape and its direct relationship to the petition. Staff believes the lot design simultaneously creates a disproportionate area of open space on one side, and is less compatible for an addition to the principal building on the south side of the lot. Accounting for the aforementioned items, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use application, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Floor Plan and Elevations submitted by the petitioner, except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village's Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

**DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Noonan states that the subject property is a unique lot and notes that the proposal is consistent with similar properties in the surrounding area.

Commissioner Friedman states that he appreciates the geometry and topography of the lot and the limitations they create for expanding the home. He notes that the proposal does not create any concerns related to lot coverage or other bulk regulations and is focused specifically on the rear yard setback. He states that the addition is a reasonable solution that allows the family to expand the home while working within the property's constraints.

Chairperson Wood states that the proposal represents a significant addition but notes that it is limited to a one-story structure and does not extend across the entire rear of the property. She finds the request to be reasonable, notes that no neighboring property owners have objected to the proposal, and agrees with Staff's conclusion that the request meets the standards for a Special Use.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster states that the lot configuration is unique and that the proposed additions are appropriately tucked into the site. She believes the design is logical given the property's limitations and notes that the project will not negatively impact surrounding property values or cause harm to neighboring properties.

Commissioner Fedota states that although the proposal reduces the rear yard setback below the current minimum requirement, the addition remains a one-story structure and will sit below the sight lines of neighboring homes due to the site's topography. He notes that the exterior materials will match the existing residence and that the overall bulk and scale of the addition are not objectionable.

**Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0. This item will be reviewed by the Village Manager and approved if applicable or to Village Council on July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED BY ROLL CALL</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Noonan
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Friedman
<b>AYES:</b>	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen
<b>NAYES:</b>	None

C. 630 N. North Court, Unit:140

1. Special use to permit the operation of a massage therapy business.

**SU-000265-2026 – 630 N North Court, Unit 140 – District #6**

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

**Petitioner's Exhibits:**

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

**Background:**

The Petitioner is requesting approval of a Special Use to operate a business that includes massage uses. Therefore, the petitioner is requesting a Special Use to permit a massage therapy business at the subject property.

**Sworn in petitioner:** Yvette Sitkowski – 630 N North Court, Unit 140 - Owner

Ms. Sitkowski states that she is proposing a specialty massage business offering private, one-on-one services by appointment only. She explains that there will be no walk-in customers and no front desk operations. She anticipates seeing only a few clients per day and operating approximately five days per week, generally between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., depending on demand. She states that her practice focuses on the health and well-being of clients through light, superficial massage techniques targeting the lymphatic system and reducing fibrosis.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether the business will utilize ultrasound equipment. Ms. Sitkowski states that no ultrasound equipment will be used.

Commissioner Fedota asks about her professional background and qualifications. Ms. Sitkowski states that she became certified several years ago and has pursued additional specialty certifications through continuing education courses and seminars. She describes her career as a lifelong learning journey and notes that she previously worked providing massage services in hotels and resorts. She has also completed additional training and educational programs related to her specialty.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether she currently has an established client list.

Ms. Sitkowski states that she does not currently have a client list and hopes to build one over time.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether she is certified through the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH).

Ms. Sitkowski states that she is certified.

Mr. Auer provides additional information and states that the petitioner is seeking Special Use approval for the proposed massage business. He notes that the proposed use is compatible with the zoning district and that all required State certifications have been provided. He states that the business is compliant with parking requirements and operates by appointment-only. Staff does not anticipate any adverse impacts or conflicts with surrounding properties.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether the proposed operation would be located within a single office suite connected to a common corridor with shared restroom facilities available.

Mr. Auer states that he is not aware of those specific operational details.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Petitioner is requesting to operate a business massage therapy use at the subject property. Following the evaluation of the submitted business plan, Staff does not foresee the proposed business conflicting with the Special Use standards. Also, the proposed business does not increase the required parking facilities beyond the excess parking that is currently provided by the Renaissance subdivision. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use application, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the floor plan and business plan submitted by Yvette Sitkowski, dated 05/01/2026, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

**DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Fedota states that he has no concerns regarding the proposed use. He notes that the business is expected to generate minimal parking demand and appears capable of meeting all applicable operational requirements, including hand-washing and health-related standards. He believes the use is appropriate for the building.

Chairperson Wood states that the proposed business is compatible with the other uses located within the office park. She notes that the operation will occupy a small office space, is not expected to create parking issues, and represents a reasonable start-up business. She finds that the request meets the required standards for Special Use approval.

**Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0. This item will be reviewed by the Village Manager for approval or tentatively to Village Council on July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED BY ROLL CALL</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Fedota
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Noonan
<b>AYES:</b>	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen
<b>NAYES:</b>	None

## V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment:

Joseph Douglas McArthur – 6006 Highland Drive, Rolling Meadows

Mr. McArthur states he is in possession of a subdivision plat of survey prepared by Murray & Moody, a certified land surveyor. He references prior direction from Mr. Ottesen to submit the document to the Public Works Department.

Chairperson Wood notes the document is on file with Public Works.

Chairperson Wood states that the Planning and Zoning Commission hears matters related to special uses and zoning relief only, and is not the appropriate body for the issues being raised. She explains that the Commission's authority is limited to land use and zoning matters.

Mr. McArthur questions whether procedural rules were provided prior to his comments and reiterates that he previously submitted the plat in PDF format per instructions from Mr. Ottesen. He also states he submitted a FOIA request for the plat of survey and was informed that no records exist.

He references Ordinance O-136-95, which he states annexed the Euclid right-of-way north of Lots 20 and 21, and asserts that his property (Lot 20) was impacted without due process or compensation due to an expansion of the right-of-way. He further states there is only a 10-foot utility easement and claims a 35-foot expansion has occurred. He contends jurisdiction is unclear between Palatine and Rolling Meadows and raises concerns regarding authority over drainage and the bike path area, stating it is unsafe and improperly authorized. He also suggests that the MWRD (Metropolitan Water Reclamation District) should be involved.

Chairperson Wood references prior discussion from a previous meeting and asks staff for any updates.

Mr. Auer states he has been briefed on the matter and has no new updates, but staff will continue to work with Mr. McArthur on the issue.

Chairperson Wood asks what the next step would be and suggests scheduling a meeting with staff to help resolve the matter.

Mr. Auer states that a meeting with administrative staff, engineering staff, and public works would be the most appropriate next step, as they are best positioned to address the technical issues raised.

Chairperson Wood reiterates that Mr. McArthur should meet with staff rather than continue bringing the matter to public comment, noting the issue is outside the Commission’s jurisdiction.

Mr. McArthur declines a staff meeting and states he wishes to keep the matter on public record.

He further states he received a ruling from the Public Access Counselor dated May 11, referencing a decision by Joshua Jones. He indicates he intends to escalate the matter to the Attorney General’s Office. He reiterates concerns regarding FOIA responses, ownership of easements, drainage authority, and jurisdictional responsibility. He again asserts that the bike path and easement use were not properly authorized and that there is no clear documentation of ownership or regulatory authority.

Chairperson Wood states the matter is outside the scope of the Commission and reiterates that no further discussion is appropriate within this forum.

Mr. McArthur thanks the commission for their time.

**VI. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Auer states there was no Village Council Meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2026. The two most recent items have not been deliberated - 100 E Wood Street and 649 W Revere will be deliberated on 6/15/26.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>MOTION APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Noonan
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Schubert
<b>AYES:</b>	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen
<b>NAYES:</b>	None

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:00 PM

