



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

JULY 14, 2026 AT 7:00 PM

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

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Wood called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

II. ROLL CALL

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Bettenhausen moved to approve the minutes; Commissioner Kolososki seconded the motion. Motion Approved by Voice Vote

RESULT:	APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE
MOVER:	Bettenhausen
SECONDER:	Kolososki
AYES:	Jan Wood, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None

- A. Draft PZC minutes - 06/23/2026

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 1152 W. Wood Street

1. Variation to permit 800 square feet of ground floor area for accessory structures in the rear yard, instead of the 700 square-foot maximum.

VAR-000273-2026 – 1152 W Wood St

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on June 25th, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Petitioner Narrative**
4. **Site Plan**
5. **Cut Sheets**
6. **Public Notice**

Background:

The Petitioner is requesting to construct an accessory structure in the rear yard of the subject property. The Petitioner is requesting a Variation to permit 800 square feet of ground floor area for accessory structures in the rear yard, instead of the 700 square-foot maximum. Requesting a 240 square foot shed in the rear of the yard for a total coverage of 800 square feet. Shed will be 5 feet north of the garage, complies with setbacks and has a 10-foot peak. Per the Village Zoning Ordinance, accessory structures are limited to a maximum of 700 square feet coverage. The resident indicates he needs additional storage.

Sworn in petitioner: Kirk Pagenkopf, Owner – 1152 W Wood Street, Palatine, IL
Mr. Pagenkopf states his home has a detached 560-square-foot garage and a large yard that requires substantial maintenance equipment, including lawn and driveway equipment, which does not fit in the existing garage. He proposes replacing an older metal shed with a new 12-foot by 20-foot (240-square-foot) Tuff Shed to provide adequate storage and allow the garage to be used for vehicle parking. He notes the home was built in the 1920s and the detached garage limits available storage. He states the proposed shed will not impact visibility, cannot be seen from the street, and neighboring property owners have expressed no objections.

Chairperson Wood asks the petitioner to verify the size of the property.

Mr. Pagenkopf states the property is approximately 30,000 square feet and notes there is a utility easement, with property west of the utility pole located within Inverness. He points out the surrounding properties.

Mr. Auer provides additional information and states the proposed shed would be located in the rear yard. Combined with the existing garage, the total accessory structure area would equal 800 square feet, exceeding the maximum permitted 700 square feet. He states that, other than ground floor area maximums, the proposal complies with all applicable height and bulk requirements. Staff reviewed the surrounding area to determine consistency and identified two nearby properties that also exceed the maximum accessory structure area. He notes the larger lot sizes and dimensions of these properties reduce the impact of larger accessory structures on surrounding properties.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks whether the 700-square-foot maximum is established by code regardless of lot size.

Mr. Auer states the 700-square-foot maximum is the code requirement for this property. The size of the lot, residence, and rear yard are considered when evaluating accessory structures.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether the property is zoned R-2, which has a minimum lot size requirement of 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Auer states that 9000 square feet is the minimum lot size requirements.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner is requesting to construct a shed in the rear yard, exceeding the maximum ground floor area permitted for accessory structures. Upon review of the subject and surrounding properties, Staff notes the larger lot size and rear yard location of the proposed accessory structure, which may reduce the impact of improvements upon nearby properties. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Variation application, subject to the following condition:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the site plan, building plans, and Petitioner's narrative 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 Cavanaugh made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Noonan

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cavanaugh states the request meets the required standards. He notes the property has a larger-than-average yard, the proposal is consistent with the character of the surrounding area, and he does not believe it will negatively impact neighboring property values.

Commissioner Schubert states the shed will not affect sight lines because of its location near the end of the street. He notes the additional 100 square feet is reasonable given the size of the lot and believes the storage will allow the garage to be used for vehicles, making it a worthwhile investment.

Chairperson Wood states the additional square footage is reasonable considering the size of the property and the amount of equipment needed to maintain it. She notes the detached garage limits available storage, the proposal does not increase lot coverage beyond allowable limits, and the size and location of the structure will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood. She concludes the request meets the standards for a Variation.

Commissioner Friedman states he agrees with the comments made by the Commission.

Chairperson Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will be administratively approved by the Village Manager.

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

B. 257 N. Hale Street

1. Special Use to permit a front yard setback of 16 feet, instead of the minimum required front yard setback of 30 feet.

SU-000276-2026 – 257 N Hale Street

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on June 25th, 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. **Building Plans**

5. Petitioner Narrative**6. Public notice****Background:**

The Petitioner is proposing to expand the existing second story of the subject residence. The existing home is currently set back 16 feet from the front lot line along Hale Street and has a legally non-conforming front yard setback. The Petitioner is requesting a Special Use to permit a front yard setback of 16 feet instead of the minimum required front yard setback of 30 feet. The Petitioner is requesting to expand the existing second story of the residence. The proposed expansion does not exceed the maximum building or lot coverage for the zoning district. Presently, the principal structure is set back 16 feet from the front lot line along Hale Street. In the R-2 zoning district, the minimum front yard setback is 30 feet. The proposed expansion does not encroach further upon the existing 16-foot front yard setback. The zoning ordinance requires that, upon expansion or enlargement of any nonconforming structure, a property must obtain compliance with zoning standards. Setback reductions are contemplated as Special Uses in the residential districts. The submitted designs indicate the proposed second story addition will be 36 feet high at its highest peak. This proposed design complies with the maximum height in the R-2 district. The submitted documents include a new attached deck located in the side yard, displaying a setback of 7.5' from the side lot line, in compliance with the Code.

Sworn in petitioner: Keith Gronke, 257 N Hale Street — Homeowner

Mr. Gronke stated he is proposing to expand the second floor of his home by adding a bedroom and bathroom while maintaining the existing building footprint. He presented the existing and proposed elevations and explained that the addition would remain within the current 16-foot front setback and would not further encroach into the required setback. He noted the proposed height is shown at approximately 36 feet but believes the final height will be closer to 32 feet to better match the pitch of the existing front porch roof. He added that the revised roof design is also intended to accommodate current insulation requirements.

Commissioner Friedman asked about the existing second-floor configuration toward the rear of the home and the proposed shed dormer, commenting on the roof peak.

Mr. Gronke explained that meeting current insulation requirements influenced the proposed design and reiterated that the final roof pitch would likely be lower than shown on the plans.

Mr. Auer provided additional information and stated the petitioner is requesting to expand the second story of an existing residence with a legally nonconforming 16-foot front setback along Hale Street. He noted the property has not previously received zoning relief and that any expansion of the nonconforming structure requires Special Use approval. The proposed addition complies with current height and bulk requirements and does not increase the existing front setback encroachment. Staff evaluated surrounding properties and identified several homes with similar setbacks

and comparable building heights. Based on that review, Staff determined the proposal is consistent with the character of the neighborhood and would not create adverse impacts. Mr. Auer presented photographs of comparable homes in the area.

Mr. Auer noted several homes on Hale Street and Benton Street have building heights exceeding 30 feet, including one nearby home measuring approximately 34 feet.

Commissioner Schubert asked about the wooden deck on the north side of the home and its distance from the property line.

Mr. Auer confirmed the deck complies with current zoning standards.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner is requesting to expand the second story of the residence. Presently, the residence encroaches upon the required front setback and is legally nonconforming. Upon review of the surrounding properties, Staff observed properties encroaching upon the required front setback and of similar height to the proposed residential expansion. Staff does not foresee the proposal bringing forth adverse conditions upon the surrounding area. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use application, subject to the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Site Plan and Building Plans 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 Fedota Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Noonan

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Fedota stated the proposal raised an interesting discussion regarding building bulk but noted there are similar homes in the area with comparable setbacks and massing. He felt it was an excellent way to modernize a home built in 1926 to better meet the needs of a 2026 family.

Commissioner Kolososki agreed, stating the addition would provide much-needed, livable space in a home with limited square footage.

Commissioner Friedman stated the request met the Special Use standards, created no concerns related to public health, safety, or welfare, protected surrounding property values, and was consistent with similar conditions in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fedota added there were no sight-line concerns associated with the proposal.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will be administratively approved by the Village Manager.

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

C. 300 N. Clark Drive

1. Special use to permit a fence in a front yard.

SU-000268-2026 – 300 N Clark Dr

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on June 25th, 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. **Fence Elevation**

Background:

Mr. Auer outlined the request and stated the petitioner is seeking approval of a Special Use to construct a 6-foot-tall solid vinyl fence with a 5-foot setback from the front lot line abutting Baldwin Road.

Sworn in petitioner: Anna Papes -Owner

Ms. Papes stated she is requesting approval for a white vinyl privacy fence to replace the existing mix of chain-link, wood, and picket fencing surrounding the property. She referred to the photographs included in a packet (provided by the petitioner) and noted that the existing landscaping along Baldwin Road satisfies the Village's landscaping requirements. She explained that she would like one uniform fence to replace the aging chain-link and wood fencing, believing the white vinyl fence would improve the appearance of the property.

Ms. Papes stated that the staff report referenced only two comparable 6-foot fences, but conducted her own review and identified approximately 25 properties within a two-mile radius with fences located close to the property line. She believes the proposed fence would not impact visibility or change what neighboring properties already experience. She added that moving the fence farther back would require the removal of mature trees, which she would like to avoid. She also cited safety concerns associated with living on a corner lot, including debris and trash being thrown into the yard, as a primary reason for the request.

Chairperson Wood asked about the location of existing wood fence and requested clarification.

Mr. Auer explained that the existing wood and chain-link fences do not create zoning conflicts. However, replacing them with a taller, more solid fence does not qualify as a "replacement" under the current ordinance. To meet the criteria for a replacement, the fence must : 1) be no taller than the existing, and, 2) maintain the level of opacity as the existing fence. For corner lots abutting a front yard of a neighbor property, fences are required to be set back 20 feet from the front or side lot line. Any fence beyond this point must obtain special use approval by Village Council.

Chairperson Wood clarified that while the existing fence is permitted to remain, a new fence must comply with current regulations regarding height and style. She asked Ms. Papes why she selected a white fence, noting it may stand out more than the existing fencing.

Ms. Papes responded that white vinyl is a popular, cost-effective choice that is common throughout the neighborhood. She also presented photographs of 25 nearby properties with similar fencing.

Commissioner Kolososki commented that a large amount of white fencing could appear overwhelming and suggested a 5-foot fence might be more appropriate than a 6-foot fence.

Ms. Papes stated she prefers a 6-foot fence for additional security. She added that a brighter fence may also improve visibility and potentially discourage vehicle accidents compared to the existing weathered wood fence.

Chairperson Wood accepted the petitioner's photographs of fences in the surrounding area into the record as Exhibit #9.

Ms. Papes provided an additional packet including a mock-up of the proposed fence, superimposed onto a photo of the subject property. Chair Wood accepted the document and established the item on the record as exhibit #10.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asked whether there had been incidents of loitering, trespassing, or police calls related to the property. Commissioner Bettenhausen requested any photos of the incidents.

Ms. Papes stated she has experienced unwanted solicitors, trash being thrown into the yard, and hazardous materials being left on the property, creating concerns for her family's safety.

Mr. Auer explained that the request is for a 6-foot-tall solid fence located within the front yard of a corner lot. He clarified that, for corner lots, the shorter street frontage is considered the front yard. He reviewed the 2024 text amendment regarding corner-yard fencing and explained how it applies to this property.

Chairperson Wood asked whether there is a maximum permitted fence height.

Mr. Auer stated that the maximum permitted height is 6 feet. He explained that staff evaluated corner-yard fences throughout the surrounding area and found that the majority of fences observed were open-style fences, and, 4 feet or less in height. Staff also identified several 6-foot fences; however, these fences comply with the required setback. He presented photographs of comparable corner-lot fences and stated that, while the proposed fence would not create sight-line or visibility concerns, staff concluded that a 6-foot solid fence located only 5 feet from the property line is generally inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Auer stated that the zoning ordinance does not require a certain area-size to satisfy the review of the surrounding area. He continues, stating that staff seeks to form a comprehensive understanding of the nearby area when reviewing any zoning petition.

Chairperson Wood asked what would be permitted if no fence currently existed on the property.

Mr. Auer stated that any new fence would be required to meet the current 20-foot setback requirement because the proposal does not qualify as a replacement of the existing fence.

Commissioner Schubert asked whether the petitioner could simply replace the existing fence in its current configuration.

Mr. Auer stated that the existing fence could be replaced only if it remained substantially the same in height and openness.

Chairperson Wood asked how far the existing chain-link fence is currently set back.

Mr. Auer stated it is approximately 5 feet from the property line.

Robert Yedinak, 864 E. Baldwin Ave., spoke in support of the request. He stated he has lived in the neighborhood for three to four years and previously served on the Wheeling Plan Commission. He noted the property's pie-shaped lot and stated moving the fence farther back would significantly reduce the usable yard area. He agreed that litter is an issue in the neighborhood and believes replacing the existing chain-link fence with a 6-foot fence behind the existing landscaping would improve the property. He also noted that relocating the fence would require removal of mature trees and expressed his support for the petition.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner is requesting approval to construct a 6' tall solid vinyl fence, set back 5' from the lot line abutting Baldwin Road. Following review of the surrounding area, the proposed fence is generally inconsistent with fences observed. Staff believes that the proposed fence may detract from the overall appearance of the community. The Village established ordinances to evaluate corner-yard fences thoroughly, as tall, solid fences may present adverse impacts upon surrounding properties. Typically, the Village has not supported 6' tall solid fences proximate to a lot line abutting a street. Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the Special Use application. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Site Plan and Fence elevations submitted by Anna Papes, petitioner, except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village's Codes and Ordinances.
2. The existing landscaping shall be maintained pursuant to landscaping standards set forth in 6.03(b)(4)d.ii of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Papes responded that the concern regarding the white fence is overstated because the existing hedges would largely screen it from view. She stated that if the fence were moved farther back, it would actually become more visible. She also reiterated that she identified approximately 25 homes with similar fence locations and referenced a previously approved 6-foot fence at 1036 Hunting Drive that included vegetation and was installed by the same contractor she intends to use.

Commissioner Fedota complimented the petitioner on the information she submitted. He noted that the visual simulations made the fence appear closer to 5 feet in height than 6 feet.

Ms. Papes acknowledged the photo simulations may not accurately depict the proposed height.

Commissioner Fedota asked whether she would consider reducing the fence height to 5 feet.

Ms. Papes stated she is reluctant to do so. She explained she began the approval process the previous summer and continues to believe a 6-foot fence is appropriate for privacy, safety, and consistency with other fences in the area.

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 Schubert stated the petitioner and neighboring resident presented good information and demonstrated community support for the request. However, he believes the front yard should continue to be treated as a front yard under the ordinance and feels the proposal may require a different fence style or greater setback. He stated he could not support the request as presented.

Commissioner Fedota stated corner-lot fencing has consistently been a challenging issue. While he understands the petitioner's concerns, he noted the ordinance allows replacement of the existing fence in kind, and he believes a 6-foot solid fence creates excessive visual bulk. He stated he could not support the requested variation.

Commissioner Friedman stated the Commission must evaluate whether the proposal enhances or detracts from the appearance of the neighborhood. While he appreciates the petitioner's cost considerations, he believes a solid white vinyl fence at the proposed location would not enhance the community's appearance and therefore could not support the request.

Chairperson Wood stated the request is difficult because the petitioner has legitimate reasons for wanting additional privacy and security, and neighboring residents support the proposal. However, she believes the Commission must consider whether a 6-foot solid fence would enhance or detract from the neighborhood and expressed concern that it may detract from the area's appearance. She questioned whether replacing the existing fence with the same style and height would be a more appropriate solution.

Commissioner Kolososki stated the primary concern is the proposed height. He believes a 5-foot fence would be more compatible with the neighborhood and encouraged the petitioner to consider an alternative design, stating that a 6-foot fence is excessive.

Commissioner Bettenhausen agreed, stating a 6-foot white vinyl fence would create too much visual contrast and that a different color or design would be more appropriate.

Chairperson Wood summarized that the request did not meet the required standards. The motion to approve the Special Use failed by a vote of **2-6**. A subsequent motion to deny the request was approved by a vote of **6-2**. She noted the petition is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the Village Council on **Monday, August 3, 2026**.

RESULT:	MOTION TO APPROVE - FAILED
MOVER:	Schubert
SECONDER:	Friedman

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

RESULT: MOTION TO DENY - APPROVED

MOVER: Friedman

SECONDER: Schubert

AYES: Jan Wood, Tim Schubert, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki

NAYES: Kevin Cavanaugh, Patrick Noonan

D. 317 W. Northwest Highway

1. Special Use to permit a massage therapy business.

SU-000260-2026 – 317 W Northwest Highway

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on June 25th, 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. **Floor Plan**
5. **Business Plan**
6. **Public Notice**

Background:

Mr. Auer provided background and stated the petitioner is requesting approval of a Special Use to operate a massage therapy business at the subject property.

He explained that the subject property is located within the Steven's Pointe Shopping Center and is zoned B-2, Shopping Center District, where massage therapy businesses are permitted as a Special Use under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Auer stated the petitioner has submitted documentation confirming licensure through the State of Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. He reviewed the submitted business plan, noting the proposed hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and Sunday by

appointment only. He further noted that the business will operate by appointment only, with no walk-in clients permitted.

Mr. Auer stated the tenant space is approximately 835 square feet and the proposed operation will not contain equipment of significant scale. He added that the proposed use is not expected to generate additional parking demand, as the property has historically been occupied by retail and business uses, and staff does not anticipate adverse impacts on the surrounding shopping center.

Sworn in petitioner: Melissa Ohnsted – 317 W Northwest Highway, Business Owner

Ms. Ohnsted stated she has been a licensed massage therapist for many years.

Commissioner Schubert noted that massage therapy businesses are common in the area and asked why she selected this location.

Ms. Ohnsted stated she has been searching for a suitable location for approximately six years but found most spaces were either too large or too expensive. She lives in Palatine, likes the location, and wants to establish her business close to home.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asked how many clients she anticipates seeing each day.

Ms. Ohnsted stated she expects to see approximately 6 to 9 clients per day and currently has an established client base of approximately 125 clients.

Commissioner Friedman asked where she currently operates her business.

Ms. Ohnsted stated she currently travels to clients at various locations. She added that opening a permanent location in Palatine would encourage her clients to patronize nearby restaurants and businesses before or after their appointments, benefiting the local business community.

Mr. Auer provided additional information and stated the petitioner is requesting approval to operate a massage therapy business. He noted the petitioner has provided documentation confirming her Illinois licensure, along with a business plan. The proposed business will have one employee, and the hours of operation are not expected to create conflicts with surrounding businesses. He reviewed the floor plan and noted the tenant space was previously occupied by a retail use. Staff does not anticipate any additional parking demand beyond what is currently provided within the Steven's Pointe Shopping Center.

Chairperson Wood asked what businesses are located adjacent to the proposed tenant space.

Ms. Ohnsted stated nearby businesses include Pep Boys and Guaranteed Rate.

Commissioner Fedota noted the floor plan did not appear to show a door leading into the primary treatment room.

Ms. Ohnsted explained that the treatment room will have a sliding barn door.

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. The proposed business does not increase the required parking facilities beyond the parking that is currently provided by the Steven's Pointe retail center. 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 Melissa Ohnstead, dated 04/22/2026, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Noonan stated the proposal is a good use of the vacant space.

Commissioner Friedman agreed and stated the business is a good fit for the shopping center.

Chairperson Wood stated the request meets the Special Use standards, presents no concerns related to public health, safety, or welfare, will not adversely affect surrounding properties, and is not expected to create parking issues.

Commissioner Kolososki stated the proposal is a good use of the space.

Commissioner Fedota congratulated the petitioner on establishing a permanent brick-and-mortar location and stated the business would be a welcome addition to the community.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will be administratively approved by the Village Manager.

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

E. 366 N. Quentin Road

1. Preliminary and Final Planned Development to permit a 3-lot single-family residential development.
2. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision to permit a 3-lot single-family residential development.

-
3. Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential to Planned Development (Single Family Residential).

PFSUB-000015-2026 – 366 N Quentin Road

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on June 4th, 2026 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. **Site Plan**
6. **Engineering Plans**
7. **Elevations**
8. **Landscape Plans**
9. **Public Notice**

Background:

Ms. Bremanis provides background and states the subject property was annexed into the Village in 1991 and is zoned R-1. She notes a previous proposal for a four-lot subdivision with a bulb-style cul-de-sac was denied. The petitioner is now requesting approval for a three-lot single-family residential subdivision served by a private road. The requests include Preliminary and Final Planned Development approval, Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision approval, and rezoning from the R-1 Single-Family District to a Planned Development for three single-family residential lots.

Sworn in petitioner: Attorney for the Petitioner: Ms. Shaw, 540 W. Briar Place, Chicago, Illinois.

Ms. Shaw states the petitioner, Jin Kim of PNK Construction, intends to construct one single-family home for his family and two additional single-family homes for sale. The Planned Development includes three private lots served by a private road. Engineering plans have been completed addressing stormwater management, utilities, and water service. The private road will connect to Quentin Road, and the existing residence on the property will be demolished. Ms. Shaw states PNK Construction has over 30 years of experience in design, architecture, code compliance, and residential construction. The property consists of approximately 1.433 acres. She reviews the proposed lot sizes and building sizes.

Ms. Bremanis clarifies that the square footage shown may represents two-story homes.
Ms. Shaw provides the dimensions of each proposed lot.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether the listed square footage represents the building footprint or total living area.

Mr. Dababneh, engineer, 4202 Central Road, Unit 1A, Glenview, Illinois, is sworn in.

Mr. Dababneh explains that the square footage shown on the site plan represents the foundation footprint. The proposed homes would be approximately 2,930 square feet of finished living space.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether all three homes are proposed as two-story residences.

Mr. Dababneh confirms they are, with basements.

Ms. Bremanis clarifies that final architectural plans are not required at this stage. The petitioner has submitted conceptual home designs, and the Commission is reviewing the building footprints and lot coverage. Any future homes would be required to comply with the Planned Development standards.

Chairperson Wood asks whether this is typical for Preliminary and Final Planned Development requests.

Ms. Bremanis states that it is. Staff reviews the proposed footprints and lot coverage to ensure they meet the applicable standards.

Ms. Bremanis reviews the site plan.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether sidewalks are proposed.

Ms. Bremanis identifies the sidewalk locations on the plans.

Ms. Shaw states the private road will be constructed to all applicable Village ordinances. The hammerhead turnaround complies with Fire Department requirements, and the development will include lighting and sidewalks. She presents conceptual elevations of the proposed homes, describing them as modern single-family residences constructed with quality materials that will enhance surrounding property values.

Ms. Shaw states drainage concerns have been addressed through bioretention swales designed to manage stormwater. She believes the project satisfies the standards for a Planned Development by protecting the public health, safety, and welfare, avoiding injury to surrounding properties, and providing adequate ingress and egress.

Regarding the rezoning request, Ms. Shaw explains that the existing R-1 zoning does not permit the proposed three-lot subdivision. Rezoning to a Planned Development incorporating R-2 standards would allow the property to be developed more productively while remaining compatible with surrounding residential development.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether the four architectural renderings depict one home from different angles or several different homes.

Ms. Shaw states they are conceptual renderings only and do not represent the final home designs.

Chairperson Wood expresses concern that final architectural designs have not been provided and states she would prefer to review actual proposed elevations.

Jin Kim, 366 N. Quentin Road, owner and architect, is sworn in.

Mr. Kim states the submitted renderings are conceptual and not final designs. He believes the eventual homes will be appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Dababneh notes the proposed landscaping.

Chairperson Wood states she is particularly interested in seeing the design of the home that will front Quentin Road.

Further discussion follows regarding the orientation of the homes and how they will face the surrounding streets and neighboring properties.

Ms. Shaw reiterates that the submitted elevations are concepts only but states the home facing Quentin Road will be aesthetically pleasing and compatible with surrounding homes.

Commissioner Friedman clarifies that while the proposed development must comply with setbacks, bulk regulations, and other Planned Development standards, the petitioner retains flexibility in the final architectural design following approval.

Ms. Bremanis explains that the submitted building footprints are conceptual. If approved, the property would be rezoned to a Planned Development following the R-2 Single Family Residential District.

Commissioner Friedman discusses the hammerhead turnaround, noting it appears tight as shown on the plans, and asks the petitioner to explain the street design.

Ms. Bremanis provides additional information regarding the lot lines and setbacks.

Ms. Shaw further explains the private road layout, hammerhead turnaround, and setbacks for the proposed homes.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether the Quentin Road entrance will provide full access or be restricted to right-in/right-out movements.

Ms. Bremanis states it will be full access.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether the permeable pavers are intended to absorb stormwater runoff.

Mr. Dababneh explains that the permeable pavement is designed to capture the first inch of rainfall from the private roadway. Additional bioretention facilities along the west and south property lines will collect runoff from the residential lots before discharging to the Village storm sewer along Quentin Road.

Commissioner Fedota asks about the elevation difference between the proposed development and the existing homes to the west.

Mr. Dababneh states the roadway grading is designed to accommodate fire apparatus. Surface runoff will flow west toward catch basins and the bioretention areas, while the site itself remains relatively flat.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether vehicle headlights from the hammerhead turnaround will impact neighboring rear yards.

Ms. Bremanis states that landscaping and a solid fence are proposed to help mitigate lighting impacts.

Further discussion follows regarding grading.

Commissioner Bettenhausen notes the proposed driveway apron does not appear to meet Cook County standards.

Mr. Dababneh states the apron will be revised during final engineering review.

Ms. Bremanis summarizes the application, noting the proposal includes demolition of the existing residence, subdivision into three lots, home footprints meeting R-2 bulk standards, engineering plans addressing utilities and stormwater, sanitary sewer and storm sewer connections to Quentin Road, required parkway trees, landscaping, and compliance with the Planned Development standards.

Commissioner Friedman asks staff to verify an earlier reference to a 10-foot dimension to ensure no additional zoning variation would be required.

Ms. Bremanis states that staff will review the item.

Public Comment

Christopher Thomsen, 373 N. Chalary Court, states the property is not vacant as described because an existing house remains on the site. He believes the proposed homes are not compatible with surrounding residences and opposes the development. He recalls attending the 2018 meeting when a similar proposal was denied due to concerns over the private road, including snow removal responsibilities. He believes the current proposal presents similar concerns and states the private road extends directly toward an existing home's backyard.

Michael Weill, 834 W. Willow Street, expresses concern about groundwater and drainage. He states his sump pump operates frequently and worries that excavation for three new foundations could worsen groundwater conditions. He is also concerned about the larger proposed home and the private roadway.

Ms. Shaw responds that snow removal and maintenance of the private road will be the responsibility of the homeowners' association. She states a geotechnical investigation was completed by ECS Midwest, which found normal soil conditions with no groundwater concerns expected to impact neighboring properties.

Commissioner Kolososki asks how deep the soil borings extended.

Mr. Dababneh states the borings extended approximately 15 feet and that the geotechnical report can be provided.

Commissioner Kolososki asks whether groundwater was encountered.

Mr. Dababneh states groundwater was not encountered within the 15-foot borings. He explains that the previously mentioned 8-10 feet relates to the design depth of the bioretention facilities required by MWRD, not groundwater. He also notes safety boulders will be installed near the end of the private drive. He adds that neighboring properties currently have limited drainage infrastructure and the proposed catch basins and storm sewer connections will improve drainage in the area.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether drainage through the bioretention swales will remain open or be conveyed through PVC piping.

Mr. Dababneh states the system will utilize open grading.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether a snow storage area has been identified.

Ms. Shaw states a no-parking area near Lot 1 could potentially serve as snow storage.

Mr. Dababneh states no formal snow storage plan has been developed. The Fire Department requested the landscaped buffer between the sidewalk and curb.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks about the landscaped area shown on the plans.

Mr. Dababneh states it is intended as landscaping.

Commissioner Friedman comments that a designated snow storage area should be established to support long-term street maintenance.

Ms. Bremanis states staff would coordinate that issue with the Engineering Department.

Michael Weill returns to the podium and asks whether the final architectural designs will require additional approval.

Ms. Bremanis explains that the Village does not have an architectural review board.

Chairperson Wood asks what the final homes will ultimately look like and how the review process works.

Ms. Bremanis explains that the project will proceed through Planned Development and site development review addressing infrastructure. Individual building permits will then be reviewed for compliance with the approved Planned Development. If future home designs differ substantially from the approved concept, an amendment to the Planned Development would be required.

Mr. Weill asks who reviews the final home designs and what the construction timeline will be.

Ms. Bremanis states that the Building Division staff reviews the permit plans for consistency with the approved Planned Development.

Chairperson Wood notes the homes must comply with the approved Planned Development standards.

Mr. Weill asks whether the third home will be larger than the others.

Commissioner Friedman states it is likely to be because it is located on the largest lot.

Mr. Weill states he hopes the homes will be attractive and compatible with the neighborhood.

Rebecca Thomsen, 373 N. Chalary Court, expresses concern that the conceptual home designs are not representative of homes typically found in Palatine. She also raises concerns regarding traffic safety at the private road entrance onto Quentin Road and notes the private road terminates directly toward an existing residence.

Chairperson Wood asks what the distance is between the private roadway and the neighboring home to the west.

Ms. Bremanis believes the setback is approximately 10 feet from the rear lot line.

Ms. Shaw concludes by stating the petitioner wants to be a good neighbor and will continue addressing residents' concerns. She notes the private road will serve only three homes,

resulting in minimal traffic, and states the petitioner understands the importance of maintaining a safe roadway.

Commissioner Friedman notes the roadway is designed to accommodate emergency vehicles but acknowledges it will also serve delivery vehicles and other service traffic.

Staff Recommendation:

The proposed Planned Development is consistent with the standards of the R-2 Single Family Residential District and the land use recommendations of the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The development has been designed to comply with all applicable Village requirements, and the proposed lots are compatible in size, lot characteristics, and development pattern with the surrounding properties. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Planned Development, Subdivision, and Rezoning subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall substantially conform to the Plat of Subdivision prepared by United Survey Service, LLC and the Engineering Plans prepared by RBD Associated, INC, dated 3/16/2026, except as such plans may be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. All future residences shall follow the Village's R-2 Zoning District Standards.
3. A Public Improvement letter of credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
4. Review fees in the amount of 1.5% of the total project improvement costs (as defined in the Village Code) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
5. A Planned Development letter of credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
6. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted on Mylar with the required signatures and significantly conform to the Plat of Subdivision prepared by United Survey Service, LLC.
7. A Subdivision Improvement Agreement shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.
8. Recording fees in the amount of \$300 shall be submitted.
9. The Final Engineering Plans and Final Engineer's Cost Estimate shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
10. The appropriate Homeowner Association documents shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney. Homeowner Responsibility: These documents shall explicitly state that the homeowners' association (HOA) is responsible for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of: all sanitary and stormwater infrastructure (sewers, manholes, catch basins, and volume control systems). The private roadway, internal sidewalks, and roadway lighting are also included in the Homeowner's responsibilities.
11. A construction management plan, indicating the proposed material delivery routes and contractor parking areas, shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer/Director of Planning and Zoning, as part of the site development/building permit review process.

12. All required extra agency permits shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer

Chairperson Wood asks to see the slide outlining the standards.

Ms. Bremanis comments on Item No. 3 and explains that if the adjacent property were ever developed, it could gain access to the proposed private roadway, allowing for potential future development.

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

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

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kolososki states the proposed hammerhead turnaround functions well and appears workable. He does not see it as an issue. While the proposed homes are different from those typically seen in the area, he believes the unique site has the potential to become a valuable addition to the neighborhood and is in favor of the proposal.

Commissioner Fedota agrees the development has the potential to become a positive addition to the neighborhood, although it is not a traditional subdivision. He expresses some concern regarding the aesthetics of the eastern portion of the site and traffic movements, particularly left turns in and out of Quentin Road. He notes that previous proposals were considered out of character, but believes this proposal is appropriately scaled and can work. He is in favor of the request.

Chairperson Wood states the decision is difficult because the Commission does not have final architectural plans to review. She discusses other nearby developments that are different in appearance but still blend into their neighborhoods. She understands the concerns expressed by neighboring residents, noting that the property currently contains one home and will instead contain three homes, creating a significant visual change. She hopes the final home designs will fit well within the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Kolososki references newer homes along Plum Grove Road as examples of homes with modern designs that successfully blend into established neighborhoods.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 6-2. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday August 3rd, 2026.

RESULT:	APPROVED BY ROLL CALL
MOVER:	Cavanaugh
SECONDER:	Kolososki
AYES:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	Jan Wood, Tim Schubert

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

No one came forward

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Bremanis states that the driveway on Doe Road was eligible for and received administrative approval.

Ms. Bremanis announces that there will be two agenda items scheduled for the July 28, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Fedota moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Noonan seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 9:41PM