

APPROVED

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: 1821 NORTH VERDE SUBDIVISION - PC #21-007
PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, REZONING FROM R-1 TO
R-3, LOT WIDTH VARIATION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 14th day of February, 2024 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY JO WARSKOW, Acting Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
HAILEY NICHOLAS, Assistant Planner

APPROVED

2

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, let's call this Plan Commission hearing to order. We'll all stand and say the pledge, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, if we could have our roll call, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: And Vice Chair Warskow.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Here.

All right, and we have approval from the last meeting's minutes to vote on. Does anybody want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion to accept the minutes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have to abstain; I was not there.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, anybody opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: So, the minutes are recorded into the record. All right, so let's have our first petition here today.

Who is representing 1821 North Verde Subdivision?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: That would be me, John Van Kooten.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, Sam, have all the public notices been given?

MR. HUBBARD: They have, yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, feel free to adjust microphones as needed. You could use that podium, too, with those microphones.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Hi, I'm John Van Kooten and this is my wife Annie, and we own the property at 18 --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: One second. Can I ask to swear you in?

APPROVED

3

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Sure.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Can you hold your hand up?

(Witness sworn.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Thank you. Now, if you can spell your last name for the court reporter?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Okay, that's V-a-n K-o-o-t-e-n.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, and have you seen the conditions of approval?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: And you agree to all those conditions?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: I do.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, please go ahead and give your presentation.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Okay, so we own the property here at Verde, and we have asked for a subdivision and a rezone. When I originally looked at the property, I had checked the Village's maps to see what it was zoned, and then looked at the Comprehensive Map and found out that the Comprehensive Map actually called for this property to, allowed for this property to be rezoned to R-3. So, once I saw that, I came down to the Village and spoke with a few people here at the Village and just asked if this was a feasible project. I think there was some sort of application to look at it preliminarily and then that came back positive, and then we moved forward there through five rounds of negotiations about curb sidewalks, streetlights and what have you to get to this point.

So, if we can go to the next slide, we'll talk about that.

MR. HUBBARD: There's a pointer up there, if you press to the right, it should go to the next slide.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Okay, cool. All right, so the original subdivision was already two existing lots of record, they just weren't separated in a way that would work for this. So, the original lots were a small one on the corner that was only 6,000 square-foot and 38-foot wide, and then the interior lot was 120-foot wide and 20,000 square-foot.

This is the original plat. That's what that looked like. You can see the existing home and then there is an existing garage that would be closer to Palatine frontage road there, and then the home is facing Verde there. Then we've got a couple of small sheds in there, too.

The existing conditions like you just saw, it's a two-story single-family home, Cape Cod style, frame construction. It's a slab foundation, no basement. Two-car detached garage, and there's two driveways already with two culverts off of Verde. I don't think those driveways and culverts are going to line up for this, but there's already some right-of-way there.

These are the variations that are required on the interior lot. So, the corner lot, because it's on the corner of Palatine frontage, and Verde requires a very large side yard setback, that side yard setback would be consistent with the neighbor's yard who would be to the east of us. He is on Patton Street, facing Patton Street, and his side yard is approximately, I want to say it's around 39 feet, and that's what, I think the last few inches will get determined in the permit process but we're right around 39-foot. So, that puts the corner lot at about 90 feet,

APPROVED

4

and it only leaves 68.5-foot for the interior lot where 75 feet is required. It's within 10 percent of, you know, of the ordinance, so typically that's something that, you know, would be allowable and so that's how we proceeded and that's what we've come up with at this point.

So, there's the variations: Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.2, Minimum Lot Width at Building Line, allows for 68.5-wide where 75 is required, and then another one, 68.5 lot where 75 is required. So, those are the two specific ordinances that we need a variation on.

Then, again, the zoning was in the Comprehensive Plan so that was already decided in 2019. You can see here, I've pulled up those maps for you. So, when I originally looked at the property, this is what I saw, right, and this is what made me feel like this was something that could be done here. I went to the original Zoning Map and I saw R-1, and then I went to the Comprehensive Map and I saw that the Village had decided in 2019 that it would be appropriate for R-3 on this corner.

Okay, and the new lots that we're proposing, I spoke of the corner one. It's a 90-foot wide, 50,000 square-foot, so it's a sizeable lot because it's got that 30-foot side yard setback. They're also pretty deep lots, 171-foot, so it's a pretty sizeable corner lot but it's got a 30-foot setback on the side, and then the traditional setbacks in front. That lot actually allows for a 50-foot wide building where the interior lot actually allows for 54 because I have so much setback on Palatine frontage road, for the future, you know, in case it gets widened and that kind of thing.

So, this is a photo of the proposed lots. You can see that the lot that's fronting Palatine and Verde there, that corner lot, that's the big one. You see where the, or you see the dotted line, that is the footprint. That's not how big the houses are going to be there, that's the allowable footprint. So, that footprint that you see there is not something that we would be trying to build, you know, we would be building something more in the area of like a 3,500 square-foot home or something. But what the survey here is showing is the allowable.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The buildable envelope.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: There you, buildable envelope. Okay, you see on the, you see the big side yard setback, and then on the other one we have the traditional setbacks of I believe five feet on each side.

All right, and then the proposed use is for the construction of two new single-family homes. We would demolish the Cape Cod which is in very poor condition. It's not in such bad condition that it needs to be ripped down immediately, but it's not in good enough condition to move forward with. That was the way I determined it originally. The two proposed new single-family homes will have finished basements and garages and it will be brick and frame.

The site improvements that we, some of the stuff that we worked on in these five different rounds, the elimination of the existing well system, so this house was on well and septic prior to this. So, we're going to have to cap off, I don't know the terminology for that but per code, right, so we're going to get rid of that existing well. We're going to get rid of the existing septic system per code.

The grading plan has been approved by the Engineering Department. We've gone over that several times because I know there is a little bit of drainage issue in the area. So, that took some time with the Engineering Department to come up with something that was going to satisfy everybody.

We're going to be adding two water connections and two sewer connections. We already have two driveways and culverts, but those are probably going to be

APPROVED

5

repositioned. I'm sure there's going to be maybe some right-of-way stuff, too, to work on in the future; hopefully not but maybe there will be.

Then the big one is, I would say in lieu of street widening curbs and sidewalks which is not appropriate there because the rest of the street is all R-1 kind of estate lots, it would kind of lead to a sidewalk to nowhere kind of thing. So, I suppose in lieu of that, we've come up with the streetlights. So, we have a streetlight on the corner already, an existing streetlight on the frontage road and Verde, but we're going to put another one then at my expense at the end of the property which would be 168-foot away from the frontage road. So, you have one on the corner, the existing one, and then another 168-foot another streetlight, so it's going to be well lit. Then an estoppel agreement for if there's any future street widening curbs or sidewalks in the area.

Then trees, there's, you know, quite a few trees on the property and we'll work with the permit department to make sure that we leave tree that we can.

That's about it. That about sums it up. Does anybody have any questions for me?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Not yet.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Generally, we'll have you give your presentation, and then Staff give their presentation. We'll have questions here among the Commission, open it up to public. We don't really have many in public today, and then we'll come back for our additional questions and any motion that we make.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: So, if you want to have a seat, we'll get our Staff report.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Thank you so much.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, thank you, Chair Warskow.

So, the subject property is at 1821 North Verde Avenue. As you've heard, it's in an R-1 One-Family Dwelling District, and on the Comprehensive Plan it is classified as appropriate for single-family detached uses, and I'll touch a little bit more on that later in the presentation.

Specifically, the Petitioner is requesting a rezoning from the R-1 District into the R-3 District, both are single-family, One-Family Dwelling Zoning Districts, and then they are requesting preliminary and final plat of subdivision approval to subdivide the property into two lots. It is existing as two lots today. One is a standard lot size, the other is a substandard lot size.

Then there are two variations being requested, as you've heard, to reduce the required lot width for Lot 2, the southern lot, the interior lot, from 75 feet to 68.5 feet. It is two variations but it's the exact same code requirement; that's because this particular requirement appears in two different chapters in the code, one in the Zoning Code and one in the Subdivision Code.

The Petitioner appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee in August of 2020. I would characterize that review as generally favorable of the concept. Staff did encourage the Petitioner to reach out to some of their neighbors and make them aware of the proposed subdivision, and on May 17th of 2021, they held a neighborhood meeting to introduce this project to the neighbors and understand any concerns they may have. According to the Petitioner, only three members of the public attended the neighborhood meeting.

APPROVED

6

Their primary concerns were whether or not the property would be redeveloped as single-family or as some sort of other commercial use.

This is a neighborhood aerial showing the property. The subject lot is outlined in red. This just kind of gives a very general visual of how this property compares to some of the lot sizes in the vicinity. This particular lot was subdivided in 1956 before it was incorporated into the Village. Originally, it was two lots, both I believe of the same size. However, when Palatine Road was expanded, the northern lot had to give part of the lot, the majority of that lot away to accommodate for that Palatine Road expansion, leaving that northern portion substandard in size.

Relative to zoning, the existing property, as I mentioned, is zoned R-1. To the north, there are R-3 neighborhoods and a section of P-L Public Lands. To the east, it is all R-3, and then to the south, it is R-E, that's a Residential Estate Zoning District. Then to the west, there is an R-3 area and a pocket of R-1 as well. So, in regards to the rezoning, the rezoning of this property would put it into the R-3 Zoning District and that would be compatible with the property immediately to the east, and so we do see this rezoning aligning with what the zoning is in the vicinity, and it is going to be compatible with that zoning to the east. Additionally, there is a small pocket, as I mentioned, 12 lots to the west which it would also be compatible with. R-3 zoning is also, you know, compatible to R-1 and R-E to the south, although the R-3 zone does allow for a little more intense use of land, you can get a little bit more density on smaller lots.

One of the primary things that we look at when it comes to rezoning is the Comprehensive Plan. So, the Comprehensive Plan designates this lot as suitable for single-family detached zoning, and that's consistent with the entire frontage along Palatine Road. So, the rezoning into the R-3 District is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. The plan is based on good, sound planning principles. It places the higher intensity land uses closer to the major arterial like Palatine Road, and that acts as kind of a buffer to some of the lower intensity land uses that occur in this vicinity to the south. Not to say that R-3 is an intense usage of land, but in comparison to the R-E District to the south, it allows a slightly higher intensity of use and this does kind of make sense, you know, given the configuration of Palatine Road to the north. So, we are supportive of the rezoning in this instance.

Here's the plat of subdivision, and there is the variation being requested for Lot 2 which is shaded in red. If the lot was constructed at a code-compliant lot size, it would look roughly like this as bounded in the dashed blue line. You can see there's really not too much of a difference between the two lot sizes. It represents only an 8.6 percent reduction in lot width. So, the Staff Development Committee found that this was the minimum necessary to allow for redevelopment of this lot. Lot 2 does exceed the minimum allowable lot size by 35 percent. So, while it is a little bit substandard relative to the width, it is well in excess of the minimum allowable lot size required by code.

We did find that the variation was really a byproduct of the unique shape and configuration of the lot as a corner lot. It would be impossible to configure these lots in a code compliant way unless they were located or reconfigured to a north-south orientation as opposed to the east-west orientation. The north-south orientation wouldn't really be compatible with the existing fabric in the vicinity, so we think the configuration proposed makes a little bit more sense. Also, it's a byproduct of the right-of-way taking for the Palatine Road expansion. Had that not occurred, then this lot would definitely have been able to fit to code-compliant lots.

We also compared the proposed lot sizes to the lots in the vicinity.

APPROVED

7

We didn't focus on anything to the north side of Palatine Road. Palatine Road is a pretty large major arterial and it functions as a pretty substantial barrier between this property and the fabric and character of the neighborhood to the north. So, we really focused our analysis on the lots to the south, east and west. These lots highlighted here and bolded in black outline are the lots that we compared this proposed subdivision to. Overall, there were 28 lots analyzed, and you can see the table to the left outlines the proposed lot sizes in comparison to the average and median lot size in the vicinity. Generally, it was compatible. It was a little bit larger than the median lot size, and the two lots were just around the minimum size of the average lot size of the lots surveyed. So, it was compatible with the neighboring lot sizes.

Here is the site plan for the proposed redevelopment. Three things I want to mention, and Mr. Van Kooten mentioned these as well, but the streetscape along Verde is not built up to standard. It's not quite the full roadway pavement width. It doesn't have curb and gutter, and there is no sidewalk. So, rather, it is a requirement of any subdivision to update to current code standards, but because these would be the only two lots along the entire Verde frontage that would comply, in the past we have allowed subdividers to enter into an estoppel agreement, as you heard, which would prevent them from objecting to a special assessment in the future to allow for the installation of those improvements if the Village determines at such time that those improvements are warranted in the future. So, that's one of the conditions of approval.

One of the other conditions of approval was that the Petitioner should work with us to adjust the layout of the proposed homes to potentially save some of the trees on the site. Really, there's only one tree worth mentioning; it's right here kind of on the southwest corner. The footprint shown here doesn't accurately reflect where this home will be constructed. The required setback actually falls more along this line here, so there is a little bit of room between the tree and where the maximum size footprint could be located, and we think it's possible to potentially save this tree. It is the largest tree on the site, and we'll work with the Petitioner as part of the building permit process to see if it is feasible to save that tree.

Finally, I would mention that a fee in lieu of on-site detention is required. It's going to amount to I think a payment of around \$8,000, and the Petitioner will be required to put that money up when the site development permit is issued for the infrastructure work required for this site.

That being said, the Staff Development Committee is supportive of this application and recommending approval subject to the eight conditions as outlined in the Staff report and summarized here on the screen. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, do I have a motion to --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, all those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, it's in the record.

Now, do any of my fellow Plan Commissioners have any questions before we open it up to the public? Yes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Open to the public?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, I know.

APPROVED

8

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do. If the Petitioner, Mr. Van Kooten, would come up? Mr. Van Kooten, do you live in the area?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: I live in Glenview.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, okay, and so from the notes and the proposal, it sounds like you're going to be the general contractor on this?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And have you done this before?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, can I ask you, about how long have you been working with the Village to get this to this stage?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: A couple of years. Two years, something to that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And have you done this, how many times have you done this before, done a residential development?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: A residential development?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Quite a bit. In particular, zoning and variations, only once or twice on the zoning or variation. But in terms of construction, yes, a lot more in the city. I did a lot of walk-up condos near the United Center.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: In Chicago, the city?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, that's all I have. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, just maybe Sam could give me some clarification. If and when the Village decides to go ahead and develop sidewalks, curbs and all of that, so does everybody, does the Village bear any of that cost or is all of that cost borne by all the people around the area where that development is going to be done? So, how is the cost distributed I guess is the question?

MR. HUBBARD: I mean, it can go one of two ways. It can be a capital project that the Village plans for, or it could be, you know, the funds could be levied through a special assessment. I think it depends on, you know, really the overall need, who's requesting it and how many of these lots are being subdivided maybe at a time and, you know, whether or not the neighborhood is really pushing for that improvement.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But if the special assessment were to be just in this area, it wouldn't be beyond those people who live in the area, and if they go that route, they'd want to recover all the, the Village is going to recover all the cost of doing this or is that something that would be negotiated?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe it would be for the full cost, but I can't say I'm entirely certain, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, the Petitioner or whoever owns this when you get through developing it really doesn't have any idea what this is going to ultimately run should the Village then decide to do that. Is there any kind of a limit put on it?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, it would be subject to an estoppel agreement that I believe would get recorded against the property, so anyone purchasing and doing their due diligence should be able to uncover, you know, what these obligations are.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, thanks. I just wanted a little clarification

APPROVED

9

on that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Any other Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, this would be recorded on the deed, the estoppel certificate?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe so, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: With the deed.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: With the deed, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'm sorry --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: That's okay, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, the only thing I was kind of a little confused with, Sam, could you go back to the site plan thing you had up? Maybe that's the engineering. That just looks like, it looks like different than the plat of resubdivision that was on there, because if you look at like the widths in there, just the way it lays out, it seems like on this plan the property to the north has a much narrower space for the buildable envelope to the northerly --

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, there's errors on both the western and northern building envelopes shown here. They don't comply with the setbacks that are required. We did make the Petitioner aware of that, so he should be aware that these building envelopes don't represent, you know, the location where the foundations could be constructed to code.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Can you go to the final plat of resubdivision real quick? Is the final plat, is this closer, the one that you've brought up, is that closer to what it should look like?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, exactly.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I got you, all right.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: I would make a point though, that's as big as the footprint could be. It will definitely be smaller.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Understood, yes.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'm just, I'm talking about like the northerly side yard thing. Then I guess the other thing here is on the other, I guess I'm just trying to think here what the calculation is between the building envelopes. To me, I understand that the building envelopes are what they are. Is there like an FAR that, I don't know off the top of my head, I don't remember, but what's like the FAR that would restrict the size of a house in these envelopes? Is that --

MR. HUBBARD: It would have to comply with the floor area requirements of the R-3 District. Off the top of my head, I want to say that's maybe around 50 percent, I don't know.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Around 50, Sam.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Around 50, okay. So, I know the Petitioner has said that the building is not going to be this big, however, I'm just curious as to how big it could get within this, because these are pretty close together. I don't have a problem generally with this project, with the subdivision and all that stuff. The only issue I do have is I just want to make sure that we're not like, I mean, because, you know, obviously this building envelope is a pretty big envelope and they're somewhat closer together than I think ideally we would like.

APPROVED

10

Those would be my two concerns, but if the Staff feels comfortable that our other bulk restrictions would be sufficient to limit these, you know, I can live with it.

I see the 30-foot, I guess the last question here, I'm sorry, on this, it says nine-foot building setback line, and then seven-foot building setback line. So, that would be, on the northerly lot it couldn't get any closer than nine feet from that bifurcating line between the lots, and then on the southerly lot it could get as close as seven-foot to the property line.

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's 10 percent.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, 10 percent. Yes, these are the standards of the R-3 District.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, so the catch is that if we have a narrower lot, we've got that narrower setback line as well. I'm not as concerned about the width of the lots; I am a little bit concerned about the setback.

MR. HUBBARD: I mean, you're talking about a half a foot setback difference if it was at 75 feet in width. So, it wouldn't be much of a difference.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, okay. All right, that's all. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I've got one question for Mr. Van Kooten.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DROST: On the, you mentioned in your presentation that you were thinking about a 35,000 square-foot pair of homes --

MR. VAN KOOTEN: 3,500.

COMMISSIONER DROST: 3,500, excuse me, 3,500. Have you thought about what the sales price would be for these homes?

MR. VAN KOOTEN: I think, you know, it's changed in a couple of years.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, yes.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Originally, I talked about --

COMMISSIONER DROST: You were here in 2020 when you initially started the process.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: I think originally in the rounds that are documented there, we talked about like \$850,000, but I think things have gone up a bit since in the last couple of years. I think everybody is aware of that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so you're looking at million-dollar homes.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Probably right around that number, yes. Hopefully, we get the Bears in town and that works out for everybody.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It would be a stone's throw away.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: It's pretty consistent with what's down Verde. I mean, yes, I'm sure you guys have been down Verde, maybe not recently, but --

COMMISSIONER DROST: You've been down there, Mr. Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, good.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes, a lot of new homes down Verde to the south between Palatine frontage and Thomas. Then along Verde and Patton there, there's a lot of new construction, a lot of vacant lots.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And that would be consistent with the neighbors to the south as well, the home prices?

APPROVED

11

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Yes. Yes, yes, oh, yes, that's exactly what they're doing. I'm just, you know, copying what they've been doing. That's been working for them and everyone has been happy with it, so, with craftsman style home that everybody likes in the Chicago area right now.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, I'm going to open it up to public commentary.

Do we have anybody in the public who would like to speak to this petition?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: No, okay. I'm going to close this portion of the public commentary and ask my fellow Commissioners if we have any more questions before we make a motion.

Comments? Questions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #21-007, a Rezoning from the R-1 One-Family Dwelling District to the R-3 One-Family Dwelling District, and a Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision to re-subdivide the property into two lots, and the following Variations:

- 1. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.2, *Minimum Lot Width at Building Line*, to allow a 68.5-foot wide lot where 75-foot wide lots are required.**
- 2. Chapter 29, Section 29-307B.2, to allow a 68.5-foot wide lot where 75-foot wide lots are required.**

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

- 1. The existing home on the subject property shall be demolished no more than six months after subdivision approval by the Village Board.**
- 2. Prior to issuance of a building permit for a new home on Lot 1, impact fees shall be required in accordance with Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code.**
- 3. A Design Commission application shall be required for each new home on the subject property.**
- 4. Linkage fees, in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Municipal Code, shall be required prior to permit issuance for each new home on the subject property.**
- 5. The Petitioner shall continue to work with the Village on the final design and footprint of the homes on each proposed lot and shall preserve as many of the existing mature trees on the subject property that are in good health, as feasible.**
- 6. Prior to issuance of a site development permit for the required improvements, the Petitioner shall provide a \$8,264 fee in lieu of on-site detention.**
- 7. The Petitioner shall enter into an estoppel agreement with the Village, which agreement shall state that the property owner will not object to the establishment of a special assessment for construction of paving, curb and gutter, storm sewer, and sidewalk improvements within the Verde Avenue right-of-way.**
- 8. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

APPROVED

12

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, can I get a roll call, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: I'm sorry, who's the second?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Commissioner Jensen.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, Commission Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Warskow.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes.

All right, congratulations. You have a unanimous approval or recommendation from the Plan Commission. Next stop is the Village Board, and Sam, do you have a tentative date for that?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, it looks like we're going to be targeting the March 4th Village Board date, but we'll be in contact. I'll let you know once that date is confirmed.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, well, congratulations. Best of luck with your project.

MR. VAN KOOTEN: Thank you. I'd like to thank everybody for showing up and hearing me out. I appreciate it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: You're very welcome.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Good luck.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Good luck.

(Whereupon, at 8:03 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)