



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

AUGUST 11, 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 Cindy Roth Wurster, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Tim Schubert, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Kevin Cavanaugh, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Stephen Fedota, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Eric Friedman, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Patrick Noonan, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Rodney Bettenhausen, Planning & Zoning Commissioner Robert Kolososki
ABSENT :	
ARRIVED :	

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

A. PZC Minutes - 07-28-2026

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 25 W. Michigan Avenue

1. Final Planned Development to allow for the development of 1 new single-family home on W. Michigan Avenue; and,
2. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision to permit a 1-lot single-family residential subdivision.

PFSUB-000016-2026 25 W Michigan Ave – District #2

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on July 23rd, 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. Engineer Plans
7. Elevations

Background:

Mr. Vyverberg provides background and states the property is zoned Planned Development and has been the subject of two previous Planned Development applications, the most recent in 2020, which included a Final Planned Development and a single-family residential subdivision.

Sworn in petitioner:

Jigar Patel, 48 N. Inglewood Drive, owner of 25 W. Michigan Avenue.

Sworn in Architect – Mr. Solanki, Algonquin, Illinois.

Mr. Patel states he would like to construct a single-family home for himself and his family. He currently lives in Palatine in a townhouse and would like to remain in Palatine and move into a single-family home.

Commissioner Bettenhausen questions why the site plan shows six new parkway trees while the engineering plans show only two.

Mr. Solanki states the parkway trees were included in the site plan as planned. Commissioner Bettenhausen notes that the engineering plan shows a 10-foot easement on the west side, while a 20-foot easement is required.

Mr. Solanki states the plan should be corrected to show the 20-foot easement.

Commissioner Kolososki asks whether the submitted elevations are final.

Mr. Solanki states they are close to final. He explains that the front elevation will include brick and siding.

Commissioner Kolososki notes differences between the elevations that were submitted.

Mr. Solanki states the plans have been revised several times and are still being finalized.

Commissioner Kolososki states the site plan needs to be corrected and the setbacks need to be clearly identified.

Mr. Solanki agrees and states the plans will be corrected. He discusses the garage and rooms above the garage.

Staff (Mr. Vyverberg) provides additional information and states the previous Planned Developments were approved but never brought to fruition. He explains that parkway trees are required approximately 40 feet on center, resulting in approximately 3.5 to 4 trees being required. If the Final Planned Development is approved, the plans will be reconciled accordingly.

He also explains that the plans contemplate a 20-foot utility easement and right-of-way line. He notes that the easement was not part of the previous Planned Development approval and was not ultimately incorporated into a building plan.

Mr. Vyverberg states the previously approved plans involved a two-lot subdivision. He notes that the proposed front yard setbacks are consistent with the surrounding properties and that the proposed reduced rear yard setback is consistent with previously approved developments in the area.

Commissioner Fedota asks about the proposed side yard setbacks for the subdivision.

Mr. Vyverberg states the R-2 district requires a minimum 10-foot side yard setback. The proposal provides a 21-foot setback on the west side and a 10-foot setback on the east side.

He explains that when the property was annexed into the Village in 1991, the existing development and setbacks were established based on the surrounding properties.

He notes that the driveway to the south and the adjacent property ownership also influenced the configuration. The subject parcel was never formally subdivided.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether the property will ultimately be considered nonconforming.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that the property is currently a vacant tax-divided parcel. The Zoning Ordinance prohibits construction on a tax-divided parcel under these circumstances, which is why the petitioner is required to obtain approval of a formal one-lot subdivision. He notes that some surrounding properties were legally nonconforming when annexed into the Village. The subject property complies with the R-2 standards, with the exception of the rear yard setback.

He further states that the proposed lot depth is consistent with the lot depths of properties to the east and west that were previously approved.

Staff Recommendation:

The requested zoning relief is unique because the subject property is a tax-divided lot that currently contains only an accessory structure and driveway that was associated with the property located at 724 S. Plum Grove Road. Under the Village Code, a tax divided lot that contained a principal structure prior to 2005 would be considered a buildable lot. Because no principal structure exists on the subject property, a formal subdivision is required before a new single-family residence can be constructed. The proposed Planned Development would permit a one-lot single-family residential subdivision similar to the two previously Planned Developments approved by the Village Council. Although the proposed lot does not comply with the required rear yard setback, the property is located within the Michigan Avenue/Plum Grove Road Sub-Area Plan, which recognizes that reduced rear yard setbacks may be appropriate in this area. In addition, the proposed lot depth is consistent with the adjacent properties located on both the north and south sides of Michigan Avenue between Plum Grove Road and Brockway Street. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Final Planned Development and Preliminary and Final Subdivision for a 1-lot single-family residential subdivision for the subject lot, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall substantially conform to the Plat of Subdivision prepared by Murray and Moody LTD. and the Engineering Plans prepared by Smith LaSalle, dated 5/14/2026, revised 6/26/2026 and the Elevation Plan prepared by SG Solanki Architects, 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 all required signatures.
3. Planned Development Letter of Credit in the amount of \$10,000 shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
4. Review fees shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
5. All required public improvements shall be completed in conjunction with the development of the Subject Property.
6. Recording fees in the amount of \$300 shall be submitted.
7. Any future modifications to the property shall be subject to the bulk requirements of the Village's R-2 Single Family Residential district.
8. Cash-in-lieu of sidewalk shall be required pursuant to the Village's recently installed sidewalk.
9. Parkway trees shall be installed across the frontage of the subject lot, in conjunction with the development of the new lot in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer

Commissioner Fedota notes that the new sidewalk appears to align with the proposed driveway curb cut and asks how the curb cut will be addressed.

Mr. Vyverberg states the curb cut will be addressed during the building permit application process.

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 Friedman states this is an appropriate next step for a property that was previously approved but was not developed by the prior developers. He states the proposal fits well with the R-2 standards and would be a good fit for the property and the future resident.

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 Tuesday, September 8th, 2026.

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

B. 315 S. Oak Street

1. Special use to operate a Group Home that has five (5) persons, plus staff, pursuant to 10.06(c)(9) of the Palatine Zoning Ordinance.

SU-000270-2026 – 315 S Oak St – District #2

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on July 23rd, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey
4. Business Plan
5. Floor Plan
6. Standards for Group Homes as a Special Use

7. Public Notice

Background:

Staff (Mr. Auer) provides background and states the Petitioner is requesting Special Use approval to operate a group home at 315 S Oak St. The business plan indicates that five individuals will reside at the property and receive care from staff, with staff present and providing supervision 24 hours per day.

Sworn in petitioner:

Sworn in: Mr. Toroiman – 1506 Good Ave., Park Ridge, IL – Owner of the property and business.

Mr. Toroiman states he is proposing a small group home for five residents with one staff member present 24 hours per day. He explains that the property would operate and appear as a residential home, with no office, signage, or high traffic. The residents would live in the home and it would not operate as a clinic or nursing home. He states the business policy would not permit residents to have vehicles on the property. The home has a two-car garage and a two-car driveway, and only one staff vehicle is anticipated. He states there should be no need for on-street parking. The property will comply with applicable Village zoning, building, and property maintenance requirements, including smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detectors, and fire alarm requirements. He states the intent is to preserve the residential character of the property and neighborhood.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asks how many vehicles will be located on the property. Mr. Toroiman states there will be one staff member and one vehicle. He confirms that no other vehicles are anticipated to be parked in the driveway.

Chairperson Wood asks about Mr. Toroiman's experience and the proposed residents. Mr. Toroiman states he is a registered nurse with 25 years of healthcare experience and manages several home health businesses. He states residents will generally be 65 years of age or older and will be screened to ensure they are appropriate for the home. Residents must be capable of evacuating the residence and would be moved to a higher level of care if their needs exceed what can be provided.

Commissioners ask about transportation, therapy services, visitors, staffing, meals, housekeeping, laundry, and the potential impact on traffic. Mr. Toroiman states residents may receive physician, therapy, and transportation services as needed, but these services are not expected to create significant traffic. One staff member will be present during each 12-hour shift. Meals will be prepared in the home, housekeeping and maintenance will be provided, and a visitor policy will be established.

Commissioner Kolososki asks about the number of bedrooms and bathrooms. Mr. Toroiman confirms the residence will have three bathrooms and does not conflict with

state licensing requirements. Staff will primarily handle laundry and other household responsibilities.

Mr. Auer provides additional information regarding the zoning requirements for group homes. He states the proposed use meets the Village's prerequisite standards, including the minimum separation requirement of 1,300 feet from another group home. The proposed residents will not be permitted to park vehicles on the property. He explains that the Village zoning ordinance does not establish a specific staff-to-resident ratio and that staffing requirements are governed by applicable State licensing standards.

Chairperson Wood asks whether four residents would be permitted without Special Use approval. Mr. Auer confirms that a group home serving four residents would be a permitted use, while five or more residents requires Special Use approval. Mr. Vyverberg adds that the property must also comply with all applicable State licensing, parking, and other regulations.

Commissioners ask whether similar group homes exist in Palatine and whether the proposed facility would serve a specific clientele. Staff states that most group homes are located in R-2 districts and that they are not aware of another group home in Palatine specifically serving residents age 55 and older.

Mr. Auer summarizes that the proposed group home meets the zoning standards for a group home and that the Planning and Zoning Commission will make the final determination regarding whether the application satisfies the Special Use standards.

Public Comment:

Resident Jim Kwasiborski, 342 S Oak St., expressed concerns regarding parking, compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, and the potential impact on the established character of the neighborhood. He requested denial of the application and emphasized the importance of applying zoning regulations consistently. He also expressed concerns regarding the manner in which the property was being converted and stated that renovations had already begun.

Commissioner Friedman and Mr. Auer clarified that a group home serving five residents is permitted as a Special Use in the R-2 district and that the application is being evaluated under the applicable Special Use standards. Chairperson Wood further explained that group homes serving four or fewer residents are permitted, while five or more residents require Special Use approval.

Resident Kenneth Joerg, 321 S Oak St., expressed concerns regarding the distance from other group homes, parking, street parking, and work being performed at the property. Mr. Vyverberg stated that parking associated with the group home must be provided on the subject property and that violations of Village parking regulations could be addressed through the Village's enforcement process. He also stated that the remaining work at the property is subject to the permit review process.

Resident Kendall Roberts, 333 S Oak St., expressed concerns regarding traffic, staffing, visitors, transportation services, deliveries, and the potential impact on the residential character of the neighborhood.

Resident John Schwieger, 309 S Oak St., questioned whether the proposed use could change in the future and whether the facility could eventually accommodate residents requiring a higher level of care. Staff explained that any change in the approved use would be subject to applicable State and Village requirements and could require additional review.

Resident Jonathan Pope, 155 E Glade Rd., expressed concerns regarding traffic and the level of detail in the business plan. He questioned staffing levels, resident care requirements, and the lack of detail regarding facility operations.

Resident Ms. Mohilldean, 404 S Oak St., expressed concerns regarding existing traffic, nearby commercial and industrial activity, railroad noise, safety for elderly residents, and emergency power. She questioned whether the property was adequately suited for the proposed use.

Former 315 S. Oak St. property owners, Peter and Kristen Von Busch, now of 824 W. Dorset Avenue, stated that they had owned the property for approximately 14 years and had understood that it was being sold as a private residence. They expressed concerns regarding the proposed number of residents, visitors, transportation, medical equipment, and the potential impact on the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Noonan noted that a group home serving four residents could be permitted without Special Use approval if it met Village and State requirements. Mr. Auer confirmed this and stated that applicable permitting requirements would still apply.

Chairperson Wood asks whether Staff has recourse if parking becomes an issue. Mr. Auer states that vehicles parked in violation of Village regulations may be subject to citations and the applicable adjudication process.

Mr. Mihai states the intent of the proposal is to provide housing for elderly residents who want to remain in a residential community rather than move to a nursing home or larger facility. He states he is a registered nurse with extensive healthcare experience and intends to operate the residence in a manner consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

Chairperson Wood asks about visitors and residents who may require hospice or a higher level of care. Mr. Mihai states that residents will be screened to ensure their needs are appropriate for the facility and that residents requiring a higher level of care would be transferred to an appropriate facility. He also states that additional language regarding visitor limitations could be added to the policy.

Commissioner Fedota asks about staffing and workspace. Mr. Mihai states that staff will work 12-hour shifts and that a designated workspace for documentation will be provided within the residence.

Commissioner Friedman asks about occupancy and age requirements. He states that the business plan identifies a maximum of five residents, generally age 65 and older, subject to applicable State regulations.

Mr. Joerg returned to the discussion and asked about occupancy. He questioned whether a married couple could share a bedroom and whether there could be more than five residents. He also asked about the age requirements for residents. Commissioner Friedman stated that the occupancy and age requirements are established by State regulations and the submitted business plan. He noted that the business plan identifies residents age 65 and older and a maximum of five residents.

Staff Recommendation:

The Petitioner is requesting to operate a Group Home at the subject property. The submitted business plan states that the operation will consist of 5 individuals receiving care from staff and be supervised 24 hours per day. The property will be remodeled to accommodate each client receiving care with a dedicated bedroom-dwelling unit. The proposed business operation is compliant with the Village's pre-requisite standards for Group Homes. Residents receiving care at the residence are not permitted to park vehicles at the subject property. The Petitioner has applied for the necessary State review, which is subject to the Village review and approval. The submitted business plan indicates the Petitioner has not operated a Group Home in the past. Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Planning and Zoning Commission. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval of the project, Staff recommends the following conditions be included:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the plans (floor plan, business/operations plan) prepared by Mihai Toroiman, Oak Crest Residential Living LLC, dated 06/26/2026, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.
2. The Illinois Department of Public Health licensure shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of the Planning & Zoning Department.

Discussion:

Commissioner Fedota states that the submitted packet contains inconsistent information regarding the plans and floor plans and requests clarification from Staff. Mr. Auer states that Staff modified the floor plan to clarify the core elements of the proposal. Commissioner Friedman notes that one submitted floor plan incorrectly showed five bedrooms and three bathrooms.

Resident Dina Wasmund Joerg, 321 S Oak St., asks how the facility will be advertised and whether the property address will be disclosed. She also questions the potential impact on surrounding property values.

Mr. Mihai states that the property address will be disclosed and that advertising will include facility pamphlets, Internet advertising, and word of mouth.

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 Schubert stated that he believes the proposed use could have a negative impact on the surrounding area. He expressed concerns regarding traffic and parking and stated that a caregiving home should have adequate parking and transportation accommodations. He stated that the proposed Special Use does not align with the surrounding area and that there is insufficient community support. He also expressed concern that the petitioner has not demonstrated that he is being a good neighbor.

Commissioner Fedota stated that the proposal is an attempt to address senior housing needs on a smaller scale. However, he expressed concerns regarding the potential impacts on the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding area. He cited concerns regarding traffic and parking and stated that he was uncomfortable with portions of the business plan. While the proposal appears to comply with State regulations, he stated that additional information is needed regarding parking and emergency power provisions, even if generators are not specifically required. He stated that the petitioner has not adequately addressed the safety of the residents.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster discussed the differences between assisted living and independent living and stated that Palatine needs additional senior housing options. She noted that she lives near Oak Street and understands the close-knit nature of the neighborhood and that the proposed use was not what residents expected when the property changed ownership. She stated that she generally supports group homes because they typically do not negatively impact surrounding neighborhoods and can provide an important community service. She expressed concern, however, that the business plan contains several unanswered questions and that the site plan and operational details need further clarification. She stated that she would support providing seniors with an opportunity to remain in Palatine rather than move to a larger facility, but she was not convinced that this was the appropriate location for the proposed use.

Chairperson Wood stated that there is a significant need for elderly residents to remain in a home-like environment and recognized the petitioner's dedication to providing that type of housing. However, she questioned whether the subject property is large enough to adequately accommodate the proposed use and expressed concerns regarding staffing and the business plan. She stated that parking and traffic were not her primary concerns because the street is relatively quiet despite being located within a busier area. She acknowledged the residents' concerns and stated that she believes the concept could work if the staffing and business plan were improved, but she was not convinced that the property is large enough or that the proposal is ready for approval.

Commissioner Kolososki stated that the Commission has a difficult responsibility in balancing the needs of elderly residents with the concerns of surrounding neighbors. He referenced relatives who have required senior care and stated that he supports

efforts to provide appropriate housing for elderly residents. However, he expressed concern regarding the proposed location and questioned why the group home was being proposed in this particular neighborhood. He stated that while the building itself may be suitable, he believes the location is not appropriate for the proposed use.

Commissioner Friedman stated that he supports the application and the proposed type of use. He noted that the intent is for the facility to function and appear like a residential home rather than a commercial facility, and stated that placing this type of use in a business park would defeat that purpose. He stated that the proposed residents are individuals who want to remain in a home and continue living within the community. He noted that the Zoning Ordinance establishes specific conditions for group homes serving five or more residents and that, if the property housed four residents, the additional Special Use review would not be required. Commissioner Friedman expressed support for the application.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has not met the standards and request to approve was denied by a vote of 3-6. A second vote to deny the request was approved by a vote of 6-3. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday September 21st, 2026.

RESULT:	MOTION TO APPROVE - FAILED
MOVER:	Cavanaugh
SECONDER:	Kolososki
AYES:	Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen
RESULT:	MOTION TO DENY - APPROVED
MOVER:	Cavanaugh
SECONDER:	Schubert
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Rodney Bettenhausen
NAYES:	Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Robert Kolososki

C. 1490 N. Quentin Road and 885 W. Dundee Road

Annexation from unincorporated Cook County into the Village of Palatine;
Final Planned Development to allow a 38-unit townhouse development;
Final Plat of Subdivision; and
Rezoning to Planned Development

FPD-000279-2026 – 1490 N Quentin Road and 885 W Dundee Road

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on July 23rd, 2026 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Final Architectural Plans
2. Final Engineering Plans
3. Proposed rendering
4. 1490 Quentin Rd Townhomes Landscape Plan 2026-06-12-L-1_v1 (1)
5. Attachment - Fence Spec Sheet_v1 (4)
6. Plat of Annexation 885 W. DUNDEE Road and 1490 N. Quentin Road
7. Townhomes at Deer Grove - PROJECT NARRATIVE Revised 7-27-26
8. Executed Petition to Annex
9. FPD application
10. Public Notice

Background:

The Subject Property is 4.85 acres and is presently located in unincorporated Cook County. The Petitioner received Preliminary Planned Development approval in April 2026 to allow for a 38-unit rental townhouse development on the Subject Property. The Petitioner has submitted the required plans and information and is requesting Annexation from Unincorporated Cook County into the Village of Palatine; Final Planned Development; Final Plat of Subdivision (Plat of Consolidation from 3 lots into 1); and Rezoning to Planned Development.

Sworn in petitioner:

Lawrence Freedman – Attorney for the Applicant – 95 Revere Drive, Northbrook
Mr. Schwartz – Cornerstone LLC, Developer and Applicant – 3190 Doolittle Drive, Northbrook

Mr. Freedman states that they are requesting Final Planned Development approval. He states that the proposal conforms to the previously approved Preliminary Planned Development and is appropriate for final approval. The petitioner has worked with Village Staff and the development team to further develop the plan details and is available to answer questions.

Commissioner Friedman asks what has changed from the Preliminary Planned Development to the Final Planned Development.

Mr. Schwartz states that the plans have been further developed, including the landscape plan and revisions discussed during the preliminary review. The engineering and civil engineering plans have been further developed and refined, along with the annexation and easement agreement addressing potential future development to the west.

Mr. Freedman provides additional information regarding the annexation agreement and states that it will be presented to the Village Council following a public hearing.

The agreement will be a binding contract between the Village and property owner addressing the exhibits and conditions determined appropriate by the Village Attorney. The agreement is currently being drafted by the Village Attorney and will subsequently be submitted to the petitioner for review before being presented to the Village Council.

Chairperson Wood references her previous concerns regarding the lack of landscaping and asks how many courtyards are proposed and how they will be landscaped.

Mr. Freedman states that the number of courtyards remains the same as shown in the Preliminary Planned Development.

Mr. Schwartz references the site plan and explains that the courtyard area will be landscaped.

Commissioner Bettenhausen questions the proposed white vinyl fencing and asks why white was selected.

Mr. Schwartz states that white is the selected color and that he considers it a neutral color.

Commissioner Bettenhausen asks whether the plans are complete and whether fencing or railing will be provided around the detention pond.

Mr. Schwartz states that fencing will be provided along the west side of the detention pond. No fencing will be provided where the pond abuts the roadway; instead, a row of shrubs will provide a buffer in that location.

Commissioner Cavanaugh notes that the existing electric billboard has a 10-year lease and asks for confirmation that the lease will not be renewed.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that the petitioner and attorney have discussed the billboard and that the Village Code does not allow off-site signage. The petitioner does not intend to retain the billboard. Lease information has been provided by the petitioner. The existing billboard at the south-east corner of the property will be removed, and the billboard on the north-west side of the property will be removed at the beginning of 2036.

Mr. Freedman states that the annexation agreement will require that the billboard lease not be renewed. The petitioner has agreed to the concept and has requested that security be posted to ensure funds are available for removal of the billboard if the billboard operator does not remove it when the lease expires. The details are being finalized by the Village Attorney and will be addressed in the annexation agreement.

Commissioner Friedman asks about the utility pole and references the grading plan, noting that the proposed grading lowers the grade at the pole approximately four feet and places it into the detention pond area.

Mr. Schwartz states that the area is already relatively low and clarifies that the four-foot difference is from the existing grade at the edge of the detention pond.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether anything in the existing lease obligates the petitioner to provide an easement area.

Mr. Freedman states that he does not recall seeing anything in the lease requiring an easement. He states that he wanted to confirm the actual expiration date and whether there was an option for renewal.

Commissioner Friedman asks whether the petitioner is aware of any existing access obligation associated with the property.

Mr. Freedman states that he does not believe there is an access obligation contained in the lease.

Commissioner Schubert asks whether construction of all units will occur at the same time.

Mr. Freedman states that construction is anticipated to occur concurrently.

Commissioner Schubert asks about the anticipated construction timeline.

Mr. Freedman states that construction is expected to take approximately 18 to 24 months.

Mr. Schwartz states that they may construct a building and model unit to facilitate presales.

Mr. Vyverberg provides additional information and states that the level of detail provided during the Preliminary Planned Development review was sufficient and that the building materials remain consistent with the previously approved plans. He states that the engineering plans have been conditionally approved by the Village Engineer, subject to conditions, including revisions to the landscaping plan. He also notes Staff's preference that the fencing be constructed in a straight alignment without scalloping.

Mr. Vyverberg references the site plan and notes a termination point that would allow for a future transition to the west. He states that the property to the west is located in unincorporated Cook County and that the adjacent property owner is seeking attached single-family residential development.

He further discusses the proposed access and notes that the petitioner would like a cross-access condition to be incorporated into the plans. This has been discussed with the petitioner and will be noted accordingly. He states that IDOT would likely permit only right-in/right-out access because the property has approximately 100 feet of frontage. Future development of the property to the west could provide full access to the southern property and additional access to Quentin Road for the northern property.

Mr. Vyverberg concludes that the plans are in compliance with the previously approved Preliminary Planned Development

Staff Recommendation:

The final plans are consistent with the preliminary approvals and maintain the required improvements, as identified. As noted through the initial public hearings, the Subject Property has previously been studied and reviewed for annexation into the Village. And, the proposed use of the property aligns with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Map recommendations. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the

Annexation, Final Planned Development, Final Plat of Subdivision, and Rezoning to Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Final Engineering Plans and Final Engineer's Estimate of Probable Cost shall be submitted and revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning. The Village will be installing the sidewalks along Dundee Road and recording a recapture accordingly.
2. A Public Improvement of credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and a Planned Development letter of credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. A separate letter of credit shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney and Director of Planning and Zoning to ensure the ultimate removal of the billboard in the north-west corner of the property.
3. 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.
4. The final photometric plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer as part of the building permit process.
5. The final plat of consolidation (subdivision) shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning.
6. Recording fees in the amount of \$600 shall be submitted.
7. A construction management plan indicating the proposed material delivery routes and contractor parking areas, shall be submitted to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning.
8. All required extra agency (e.g. IDOT, CCHD, MWRD) permits shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
9. The final architecture and elevation plans shall be revised and submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village.
10. The final landscaping/fencing plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. This would include the final proposed fencing plan and elevation for the proposed fencing plan on the southern and western sides of the property.
11. The final easement language for the roadway connection for the property located directly west of the Subject Property shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney and Director of Planning and Zoning.
12. Signs prohibiting the displacement of snow into the dead end areas where fire hydrants are proposed to be located shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Fire Prevention, as part of the building permit review.
13. The final rules and regulations summarizing the requirements for the townhouse operations shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney and the Director of Planning and Zoning.
14. The final Plat of Annexation shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether street lighting is included in the provisions. Mr. Vyverberg states that photometric plans are included in the final engineering plans.

Sworn In: Chris Lupo, 399 W. Montrose, Elmhurst, IL

Mr. Lupo asks about the proposed grade elevation around the sign, noting that the grade would be lowered approximately four feet, and questions whether a structural analysis has been completed to ensure the integrity of the sign.

David clarifies that the civil engineer established the proposed grading but did not perform a structural analysis of the sign. He states that the area around the sign pole would likely remain at its existing grade, with the surrounding area sloping down.

Mr. Lupo asks whether this would be sufficient.

Commissioner Friedman states that the matter would be addressed during the permit process and reviewed by the Village Engineer.

Mr. Vyverberg agrees and states that the matter would be addressed during permit review. If the Village has additional questions or requires documentation regarding the structural integrity of the sign, the petitioner would be required to provide the information. He notes that this is not a Planning and Zoning Commission matter. Chairperson Wood acknowledges Mr. Lupo's concerns and advises him that he may follow up with staff regarding the matter.

Mr. Lupo reiterates his concern that the project is moving forward without confirmation that the proposed grading can be completed safely and that approval is being based on statements without supporting documentation.

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

Discussion:

Commissioner Kolososki states that he continues to believe the proposed subdivision is crowded. Although two town homes were removed from the plan, he still feels the development appears crowded and states that he is not supportive of the proposal.

Chairperson Wood acknowledges the concern regarding the density of the development and questions whether the site may be better suited for development in another area.

Commissioner Kolososki notes that the cost of land is a driving factor in the proposed density and reiterates that he is not supportive of the proposal.

Commissioner Friedman states that the project received Preliminary Planned Development approval and that the Final Planned Development is required to conform to the Preliminary Planned Development. He clarifies that what items remain open for review at the final stage, noting that the final plans contain additional details, revisions, and nuances that were not presented at the preliminary stage.

Commissioner Friedman also raises a concern regarding the proposed white fencing and asks whether a condition could be added requiring a color other than white, noting that the white fencing may create glare and contrast sharply with the surrounding environment.

Commissioner Noonan questions whether such a condition would be comparable to telling a property owner they cannot build a brown house and notes the difficulty in defining an acceptable color.

Commissioner Friedman states that the fencing is part of the overall community and is subject to review as part of the Planned Development and annexation process.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster notes that approximately 150 feet of fencing is proposed along the forested area and states that she thought the fencing shown on the plans was beige.

Commissioner Friedman states that the white fencing could reflect sunlight and stand out against the grass, sky, and surrounding environment, appearing as a stark white surface.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster notes that the proposed homes are neutral in color and states that a fence in a similar neutral color would be more appropriate.

Commissioner Friedman reiterates that the amount of fencing is also a consideration.

Mr. Vyverberg states that a fencing plan has been submitted and that fencing is addressed as a condition. He notes that the color of the fencing has been raised as a concern and that portions of the fence are proposed to be scalloped. He states that the Village Council will review the remaining matters and that the contrasting white color has been discussed as part of the condition.

Commissioner Friedman states that he would like the vote to reflect a condition requiring the fence to be a color other than white.

Mr. Freedman states that the petitioner would be agreeable to modifying the condition.

Mr. Vyverberg addresses resident concerns regarding traffic on Quentin Road. He states that a traffic analysis was completed as part of the Preliminary Planned Development review and that the project engineer, who is also the traffic engineer, did not identify concerns. He acknowledges that there may be traffic congestion on Quentin Road and notes that widening Quentin Road near Dundee Road has been discussed, which could improve traffic conditions if completed.

Chairperson Wood asks for clarification regarding the voting process and whether a Commissioner who previously voted against the Preliminary Planned Development is required to vote in favor of the Final Planned Development.

Mr. Vyverberg states that if the Final Planned Development complies with the approved Preliminary Planned Development, the Final Planned Development should be approved. However, a Commissioner who previously voted against the Preliminary Planned Development is not obligated to vote in favor of the Final Planned Development.

Commissioner Noonan made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Friedman.

Chairperson Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 8-1. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday, September 21, 2026.

RESULT:	MOTION APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE
MOVER:	Noonan
SECONDER:	Friedman
AYES:	Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	Jan Wood

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

NO ONE CAME FORWARD

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

1530 N Elm St and 1254 W Northwest Highway will be heard at Village Council on Monday, August 17th, 2026.

366 N Quentin has not been reviewed by Village Council and is anticipated for a date in September

Next Meeting on August 25th, 2026

VII. ADJOURNMENT

RESULT:	APPROVED TO ADJOURN - 10:00 PM
MOVER:	Noonan
SECONDER:	Roth-Wurster
AYES:	Jan Wood, Cindy Roth Wurster, Tim Schubert, Kevin Cavanaugh, Stephen Fedota, Eric Friedman, Patrick Noonan, Rodney Bettenhausen, Robert Kolososki
NAYES:	None