



# VILLAGE OF PALATINE

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

## PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES • MARCH 21, 2023

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

### I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dennis Dwyer	Chairman	Present	
Patrick Noonan	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Eric Friedman	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Plan Commissioner	Present	

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Plan Commission - Regular Meeting - Mar 7, 2023 7:00 PM

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Eric Friedman, Plan Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Dwyer, Noonan, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

### III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

#### A. Case Staff Statements

1. 52 W. Colfax Street

File # PPD-000001-2023 - 52 W Colfax Street

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. 5350 Preliminary Elevation
2. 5350 Preliminary Plat
3. Proposed Floorplans & Elevations
4. 52 W Colfax - Development Narrative & Description
5. PPD Application - Submittal Docs 01/26/23
6. Current Zoning Map
7. Stone Garden Plat of Survey - south of subdivision
8. Stone Garden Site Plan - directly south of the subject
9. Plat of Survey - 52 W Colfax
10. Current Utility Map
11. Daily Herald Public Notice
12. Color Elevations
13. Objection Email - Bell
14. Objection Email - Logan
15. Objection Email - Herm
16. Objection Email - Fisher

**Sworn in Staff: Ben Vyverberg**

**Sworn in Petitioner: Greg Rose - GWR Enterprises, Inc. - 47 N Bothwell St., Palatine, IL & Tim Spies of Spies & Associates - 534 W Campus Dr., Arlington Heights, IL**

Mr. Rose explains that the property at 52 W Colfax Street is dilapidated. The existing property is 132 X 132 in dimension. He is proposing (4) modest single family homes; three that would face Brockway Street and one that would face Colfax Street. The sizes would range from 2000 to 2800 square feet. He states the homes design would be smaller and acknowledge the aesthetic look and feel of the surrounding neighborhood. Exterior materials would be natural looking, not vinyl and would blend with the existing area.

The new modest homes are modest, but will not be boxy. Renovating the existing residence may appear to be desirable but it's not salvageable from a financial aspect. He states that it's an interesting home but it's beyond repair. He explains that the property is larger than the property to the south and requests support of this project. Mr. Rose presents elevations of the proposed properties. He states he grew up in Palatine and has built 80 homes in the Village. He is vested in the area and is working on something appropriate for the downtown area.

Mr. Kolososki asks if the Petitioner would considered (2) houses on the property.

Mr. Rose states they would not. He believes the homes proposed fit well with the downtown area and the Village's vision. He states that another consideration would be townhomes but that would make it less desirable than his proposed plan.

Mr. Friedman questions the elevations and asks if there will be any other presentation than entry door/garage, entry door/garage at the street level.

Mr. Rose states garages are set back and it becomes a challenge when the homes are 30' Wide.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks about the storm water retention.

Mr. Spies anticipates 48" storm sewers that would be installed behind lots 1 thru 3 and discharge would be at Brockway. It would be reviewed in Final Engineering.

Mr. Bettenhausen expressed concern about the close proximity of the storm sewer to the house along the north side of Lot 1 and asked if there is enough room to access the sewer for maintenance and repairs. Could the storm sewer be relocated between the houses of Lots 1&2 or 2&3? Mr. Spies responded that he believes there is enough room along Lot 1 but will review other alternatives.

Mr. Kolososki asked if there will be windows on the side elevations of the homes.

Mr. Rose states there would be.

Mr. Fedota asks about the 2nd floor egress plan with the slider door in the back. He state that the 5' setback on either side of houses is proposed and limits the space. This doesn't allow exposure at the rear of house or use of the backdoor.

Mr. Kolososki states there is no reason to use the back door. There is nowhere to go.

Mr. Bettenhausen also states there is nowhere to go.

Mr. Rose states a paver patio would be an option off the slider door and could be comfortable in a small area.

Staff Statement:

Mr. Vyverberg states the subject property was previously operated as a chiropractic office and personal residence. He presents photos of surrounding properties, with a view of the surrounding area. He explains the Zoning in the area and states the subject lot is currently zoned as R-3. Under the current proposed development, 3 lots would have driveway access to Colfax Street and one lot to Brockway street with a 2-car garage and driveway parking available. He states the lots provide comparable setbacks in the area.

He states the surrounding neighborhood is completely developed, with all of the required infrastructure and utilities available. The Village Code would require both volume control and storm water detention for this property and parkway trees would need to be installed.

Mr. Dwyer reads into record and summarizes opposing emails that have been received. They state that they have lived in the area for many years and it has many historic homes. The proposed plan is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and request the petition be denied.

Resident: Mr. Doug Wickley  
242 N Brockway St

States his concern regarding drainage, aesthetics & driveway access.

Mr. Tom Hargrove  
260 N Brockway St

States he's been in Palatine since 1985. He acknowledged that the existing house is not salvageable. He has concerns regarding the driveways and states the side setbacks are so small that the fire department could probably not pitch a ladder there. He also is concerned with the removal of the mature trees. He believes the proposed plan is too dense of a development. He also states his concern regarding the storm water.

Mr. Dwyer states that the water would not run off any faster than it does right now.

Mr. Hargrove states it currently collects now and it doesn't run into the storm water.

Mr. Vyverberg states there needs to be additional details reviewed and would be addressed by engineering prior to final plan review.

Mr. Hargrove states it is just too much house on too small of a lot.

Mr. Nathan Eder  
234 N Plum Grove Rd

States he is there to acknowledge that another historic home will be torn down in Palatine. He shares some history of the home and states the home was built in 1890 and is a piece of Palatine history. He'd like the village to

consider the vision for the downtown area. Demolishing the historic buildings on larger lots to make way for new builds with minimal setbacks, and removing the large established trees that contribute to the neighborhood's character and eco system could change the downtown landscape and would cease to exist forever. History is important to Palatine's downtown future. He requests to keep the vision of the unique, charming downtown Palatine in consideration while deciding the future of this property.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This area of the Village maintains varying land uses (attached multi-family, single-family homes, non-conforming duplexes, detached single-family with a shared central drive, condominiums, and apartment uses). While the Future Land Use envisioned a continued medical office use, Staff believes the proposed is a compatible land use and site plan to incorporate into the area. By utilizing the existing street system and providing direct driveway access for each lot, the existing single-family land use patterns will continue for this property. And, the proposed front yard and corner side yard setbacks align with the surrounding properties. Although the rear yard setbacks are narrower than the Code may require, Lot 4 provides a 50-foot setback and works to comparably with the surrounding setbacks to the east. The proposed elevations and materials should also align with the existing elevations in the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All extra agency permits shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
- 2. The Engineers Estimate of Probable Cost (EEOPC) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
- 3. Review fees, based upon the finally accepted EEOPC shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
- 4. The Final Architectural Plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Community Development/Planning and Zoning, including the final material quantities and distribution. The final separation of the dwellings shall comply with the IRC R-302, in a manner acceptable to the Director of Fire Prevention.**
- 5. The Final Engineering Plans shall be submitted and revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and shall include both volume control and stormwater detention.**
- 6. The Final Landscaping Plan shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning. The plan should review the ability to maintain any of the existing healthy trees within the property.**
- 7. A Public Improvement letter of credit in an amount of 115% of the approved EEOPC, for said public improvements, shall be submitted in a**

- manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
8. A Planned Development Letter of Credit in the amount of \$40,000 - (\$10,000/unit, per Article 14 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.
  9. If required, a Final Plat of Subdivision shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning. As determined by the Village Attorney, the HOA declarations shall be submitted and revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.
  10. A construction management plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and the Village Engineer and shall outline the proposed development schedule and identify the material delivery routes and proposed parking areas for the contractors, in conjunction with the building permit application submission.

Mr. Dwyer asks for clarification on condition #9 - final plat of subdivision will be required.

Mr. Vyverberg clarifies.

Mr. Dwyer asks Mr. Rose if he accepts the conditions.

Mr. Rose states they do accept the conditions.

Mr. Richard Riva

210 N Bothwell Street

States he prefers to see 3 houses on the property and have driveway access to the rear.

**Mr. Noonan made a motion to close the public hearing. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Mr. Friedman.**

**Discussion:**

Mr. Kolososki states that access for fire trucks is difficult to maneuver, even with sprinkler systems and 1 hour walls.

Mr. Dwyer states there are similar small homes on Colfax and sprinkler systems and smoke detectors are only good if maintained. He states the proposal is compatible to properties to south and west but not to the north and east. He feels this is not the place for this proposed development. It is too dense for this property.

Mr. Friedman states the zoning for this property could have a multi-family usage as it is zoned now.

Mr. Fedota states underlying zoning at Plum Grove and Colfax is also zoned R2 as well.

Mr. Vyverberg states it may have been used as an office use at one time.

Mr. Dwyer states comprehensive plan shows what is there now or what is desired.

Mr. Noonan states he is sad to see a historic house leave but acknowledges it

is beyond repair. He feels that the proposed plan is too much for the property.

Mr. Fedota states that parking is lost on the east side of Brockway. Maximum 1 car length on driveway and no parking on the street.

Mr. Kolososki also feels the plan is too much for this lot.

Mr. Friedman believes that even changing the plan from 4 homes to 3 would still present 3 skinny deep lots.

Mr. Noonan states that with 2 or 3 homes there might be a chance that the trees could be saved.

Mr. Fedota states 2 homes would fit more with the character of the downtown area. He also states that the finish might be different but the doors and garages do not fit the monotony code.

**Mr. Noonan made a motion to accept Case #PPD-000001-2023; seconded by Mr. Kolososki - Vote to accept was unanimously denied by a vote of 6-0.**

**Mr. Dwyer summarized the vote to recommend denial was unanimously accepted by a vote of 6-0. This will tentatively go to Village council on Monday 4/10/23.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMEND TO DENY [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Patrick Noonan, Plan Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Robert Kolososki, Plan Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Dwyer, Noonan, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

**IV. COMMUNICATIONS****Communication:**

Mr. Vyverberg states there will be a Plan commission meeting on April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

He confirms that Village Council approved the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to combine the two boards was approved. The 1<sup>st</sup> combined meeting of ZBA and Plan Commission will be 5/2/23. Meetings will be scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesdays of the month.

He provides an update on the 780 W Dundee project and states the Village Council approved the development. He also provided clarification provided by the Fire Marshall regarding street parking for this project.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**