



DES PLAINES PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, November 4, 2025
MINUTES

The Des Plaines Planning and Zoning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, November 4, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 102 of the Des Plaines Civic Center.

Chairman Szabo called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and a roll call was established.

PRESENT: Catalano, Szabo, Weaver, Fowler, Fallico, & Zadrozny
ABSENT: Veremis
ALSO PRESENT: Samantha Redman, AICP, Senior Planner
Jonathan Mendel, AICP, Assistant Director of CED

A quorum was present.

NO MINUTES FOR REVIEW

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM

There was no public comment.

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS:

Chairman Szabo noted there was one item:

- 25-062-LA – 651 Kenmare Court – License Agreement to allow irrigation in the public parkway portion of the right-of-way – Approved

Pending Applications:

Chairman Szabo introduced the cases on the agenda.

- 1. Addresses:** 9535, 9575, 9585, and 9601 E. Golf Road **Case Number:** 25-046-TPLAT-PPUD – **Continuance Requested to the January 13, 2026 PZB meeting**

The petitioner requests the following: i) a Tentative Plat of Subdivision to consolidate nine lots into one lot; ii) a Preliminary Planned Unit Development with a height, lot area, and required off-street parking exception for a proposed multifamily residential and single family attached residential development; and iii) any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

Member Fallico asked when they were replacing the garage siding, if they thought about moving the garage back. Ms. Doytchinova said no, because that would be a big investment and the back of the house has a porch. The distance between the porch and the existing garage is very small.

Member Fallico states this looks like the third parking spot in front of the house. Ms. Doytchinova states they are asking for a third parking space. The driveway is shared, but the neighbors complain they park on the neighbor's driveway. Member Fallico states he understands since he owns a shared driveway and also understands why Ms. Doytchinova would want this design for a driveway.

Ms. Doytchinova states concerns with safety and the neighbors understand the safety concerns living there too.

Member Fowler asked if there could be a circular driveway. Ms. Doytchinova stated they didn't think about that. Member Fowler asks staff. Assistant Director Mendel states no, only one curb cut is allowed per single family residential property within the City.

Member Catalano asked if Ms. Doytchinova could do paver blocks that allow grass to grow through it in the same area. Assistant Director Mendel states they are permitted a driveway up to 20 feet of width because of the one car garage. Ms. Doytchinova states that width is not sufficient for a turn around to face forward onto Touhy. A permeable paver could be allowed, but it exceeds the maximum width and you would need something wider to do a three-point turn in that location.

Member Fowler states she grew up in a similar location but was lucky to live along an alley. She understands the street is very busy.

Assistant Director Jonathan Mendel presented the staff analysis.

Issue: Ms. Doytchinova requests major variations to permit a 30-foot-wide driveway/turnaround within the front yard and for the minimum separation for front yard residential walkways from other hard surfaces.

Ward Number: #6, Alderman Mark Walsten

Existing Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential

Existing Land Use: Single Family Residence (residential)

Surrounding Zoning: North: R-1, Single Family Residential District
South: R-1, Single Family Residential District
East: R-1, Single Family Residential District
West: R-1, Single Family Residential District

Surrounding Land Uses: North: Single Family Residences (residential)
South: Single Family Residences (residential)
East: Single Family Residences (residential)

West: Single Family Residences (residential)

Street Classification: E. Touhy Ave. is classified as an Other Principal Arterial under IDOT jurisdiction.

Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan illustrates this site as residential.

Property/Zoning History: *Overview*
The subject property was developed by at least 1951 using available historical aerial imagery depicting it and the surrounding residential neighborhood. Since then, the subject property has been a single-family detached residence and has had a one car wide driveway to a one car detached garage on the eastside of the subject property.

MAJOR VARIATION

Request Description: *Overview*
The petitioner has been discussing their driveway and access needs with staff throughout 2025 during which time staff has provided them with the minimum and maximum regulations for driveways allowed for their particular property.

The petitioner requests, effectively, a 3-point vehicle turning area within the westside of their front yard adjacent/expanding the driveway in this area to about 30 feet wide (see the attached petitioner's preferred plan).

To seek this design petitioner requests major variations from:

- Section 12-9-6.B.3.b.(1) of the City Code limiting the subject property's driveway width to 20 feet; and
- Section 12-7-1.C of the City Code requiring residential walkways in the front yard to be separated from the proposed driveway hard surface.

This proposed turnaround area is intended to permit forward vehicle movements onto Touhy Ave. because the petitioner believes forward movement is safer than backing onto Touhy Ave normally and especially during morning and afternoon peaks.

Consideration of Alternatives

Section 12-9-6.B.3.b permits maximum driveway widths depending on the size of the property's garage or carport parking capacity.

- 1 car garages are allowed a maximum 20-foot-wide driveway

- 2 car garages are allowed a maximum 23-foot-wide driveway
- 3 car or greater garages are allowed a maximum 26-foot-wide driveway

The subject property only has a 1 car garage which limits the maximum permitted driveway width to 20 feet.

The applicant has the option to expand their garage to 2 or 3 car capacity, which would permit driveway widths of 23 feet and 26 feet, respectively. Additionally, the petitioner could relocate their 1 car garage elsewhere on their property to provide space behind (south) the house to create a turnaround area in this part of the property. This could be accommodated within the property as it is a comparatively large lot (~9,965 sq.ft. and 60 ft x 167 ft). Staff understand the above alternatives involve additional cost, but they objectively are alternatives available to the petitioner.

Regardless of the possible alternatives outlined above, no alternative would permit a 30-foot-wide driveway.

Standards for Variation: The following is a discussion of standards for variations from Section 12-3-6(H) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposal would satisfy the standards is provided below and in the petitioner's response to standards. The PZB may use this rationale toward its recommendation, or the Board may make up its own.

- 1. Hardship: No variation shall be granted pursuant to this subsection H unless the applicant shall establish that carrying out the strict letter of the provisions of this title would create a particular hardship or a practical difficulty.**

Comment: The petitioner states in their attached narrative they feel backing onto Touhy Ave is dangerous and the permitted driveway's 20-foot width would not provide sufficient turning radius to do a 3-point turn to put vehicles in a forward movement orientation onto Touhy Ave.

- 2. Unique Physical Condition: The subject lot is exceptional as compared to other lots subject to the same provision by reason of a unique physical condition, including presence of an existing use, structure, or sign, whether conforming or nonconforming; irregular or substandard shape or size; exceptional topographical features; or other extraordinary physical conditions peculiar to and inherent in the subject lot that amount to more than a mere inconvenience to the owner and that relate to or arise out of the lot rather than the personal situation of the current owner of the lot.**

Comment: The petitioner's property is not uniquely shaped or developed when compared with adjacent residential properties immediately adjacent to the east and west. The only possible difficulty is the current configuration of the existing house, garage and driveway dimensions and layout. It is true that Touhy Avenue is a primary 5 lane heavy traffic corridor in this part of Des Plaines, but the petitioner's current property design/layout and the Touhy Avenue's traffic volumes have existed for many decades and were existing conditions when the petitioner acquired the property in 2011.

- 3. Not Self-Created: The aforesaid unique physical condition is not the result of any action or inaction of the owner or its predecessors in title and existed at the time of the enactment of the provisions from which a variance is sought or was created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of this title.**

Comment: There have been no natural force of government action affecting the subject property that could warrant this variation request as the subject property's layout and the Touhy Avenue traffic volumes have existed since the petitioner acquired the property.

- 4. Denied Substantial Rights: The carrying out of the strict letter of the provision from which a variance is sought would deprive the owner of the subject lot of substantial rights commonly enjoyed by owners of other lots subject to the same provision.**

Comment: The most likely alternative to permit up to a 23-26 foot wide driveway would require increasing the size of the garage parking capacity, which objectively could be a significant cost.

- 5. Not Merely Special Privilege: The alleged hardship or difficulty is neither merely the inability of the owner or occupant to enjoy some special privilege or additional right not available to owners or occupants of other lots subject to the same provision, nor merely the inability of the owner to make more money from the use of the subject lot.**

Comment: Granting this variation could afford the petitioner a special privilege, but forward vehicle movement is a safer method to access Touhy Avenue than reversing onto the street.

- 6. Title And Plan Purposes: The variation would not result in a use or development of the subject lot that would be not in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title and the provision from which a variation is sought were enacted or the general purpose and intent of the comprehensive plan.**

Comment: The City Code and Comprehensive Plan are generally predicated on maintaining and enforcing the City's health, safety and welfare, so allowing an adequate turnaround area on the subject property and thereby permitting the safer forward vehicle movement onto Touhy Ave could be considered harmonious with the City Code and Comprehensive Plan.

- 7. No Other Remedy: There is no means other than the requested variation by which the alleged hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the subject lot.**

Comment: The *Consideration of Alternatives* section above outlines some alternatives that could prevent the variation, but staff understands they could involve significant cost for the petitioner.

- 8. Minimum Required: The requested variation is the minimum measure of relief necessary to alleviate the alleged hardship or difficulty presented by the strict application of this title.**

Comment: The variation request for a 30-foot-wide driveway may not be the minimum

necessary relief to alleviate the petitioner's alleged hardship since as little as 22 feet of width could likely accommodate an area for safe 3-point turns within the subject property's front yard.

PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions: Under Section 12-3-6.G.2.b (Procedure for Review and Decision of Major Variations) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB has the authority to *recommend* the City Council approve or deny the major variation request. Consideration of the request should be based on a review of the information presented by the applicant and the findings made above, as specified in Section 12-3-6.H (Standards for Variation) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Member Catalano asked why this area can't be replaced with geogrid and grass instead. Ms. Doytchinova wouldn't park on it and it would allow them to turn around. It would just be grass that could support a vehicle without it becoming a swamp. Assistant Director Mendel states there are explicit restrictions on driving on grass. If it looks like lawn, it can be hard to enforce consistently compared to it being pavement.

Member Weaver asks for clarification on the numbering of the attachments. Assistant Director Mendel provided these as alternatives from the applicant. On page 9 is the owner's preferred layout and the only option staff analyzed. Ms. Doytchinova wanted each alternative to be provided in the packet.

Member Weaver discussed the 22-foot requirement for the three-point turn and asked what is that related to. Assistant Director Mendel states it would be analogous to a 22-foot two way driveway and back into a parking space and point out.

Member Weaver asks staff if the requested relief is more than the minimum required and clarifies the width. Member Weaver asks if it could become 28 feet deep. Assistant Director Mendel stated that a reasonable 22-foot driveway width could accommodate a three-point turn maneuver, but Ms. Doytchinova proposes 30 feet wide. The 22 foot width could be considered a minimum necessary variation to accommodate the proposed hardship as opposed to 28 feet or the proposed 30 feet.

Member Weaver stated their opinion that a 22-foot width could accommodate the minimum required permeable lawn separation between the front walkway and the proposed driveway, thereby removing the requested Sec. 12-7-1.C variation. Assistant Director Mendel stated that reducing the proposed driveway width to 27 feet total would remove the walkway separation variation.

Member Fallico stated if the driveway width is 22 feet total, there would not be an issue with backing onto the neighbor's driveway. Assistant Director states that we can't be certain, but an experienced driver should be able to do that without backing into the neighbor's driveway.

Member Fallico asks if the neighbors contacted staff. Assistant Director Mendel stated they have not received written comment from the neighbors.

Member Zadrozny asks who is responsible for maintenance. Assistant Director Mendel states that a private driveway is the responsibility of the owners on either side of the lot line when there is an effective shared driveway.

Carl Sanders, 2031 E Touhy, the east neighbor, is sworn in for public comment. He states he has seen decades of traffic on Touhy Avenue for 50 years at his property. He states Ms. Doytchinova parks on the lawn and it creates visibility issues on Touhy. If Ms. Doytchinova did not park on the grass, Mr. Sanders would not have issues. Someone could be hurt or killed because of negligence with Ms. Doytchinova's parking.

Member Fallico asks if they are next to the shared driveway. Mr. Sanders says no. He states they have parked on the grass, they have parked a car in their back yard, and they do not use the garage.

Member Fowler asked if they added the parking pad, would that block the view. Mr. Sanders says when they park on the grass, it would block the view of eastbound traffic. He clarifies that the request would not block his view. Ms. Doytchinova clarifies that when they park in the driveway, he will still have trouble seeing.

Member Fallico asks if they park on the grass. Ms. Doytchinova states they did park on the grass in the past, but they do not park there now. Ms. Doytchinova states that the neighbor's objection to the request does not make sense because the driveway already exists.

Member Fowler states the neighbor's concern is that Ms. Doytchinova parks on the grass. She asks if Ms. Doytchinova will be parked on the grass if they add this parking pad. Ms. Doytchinova states no, they will not park on the grass.

Member Fowler asks why Ms. Doytchinova parked on the grass in the past. Ms. Doytchinova stated they did not know one could not park there and did not have this issue in Glenview where Ms. Doytchinova used to live. Member Fowler expresses doubt that they could park on the grass in Glenview.

Chairman Szabo asks Ms. Doytchinova if they block the private walkway when they park. Ms. Doytchinova states they do not.

Member Zadrozny asks how many cars they have in the household. Ms. Doytchinova states they have three cars, two in the driveway and one in the garage.

Member Weaver asks if there is a door that leads to the driveway from the west. Ms. Doytchinova states there is a door at the front and the back of the house. Member Weaver asks Ms. Doytchinova why they are unable to park cars near the house, further from the sidewalk, so as not to not block the neighbor's view. Ms. Doytchinova states they park near the garage door. They need a space to back up and leave safely.

Ms. Doytchinova says every 2 seconds there is a car on Touhy Ave. Member Weaver states it would appear visibility issues from neighboring properties could be reduced if they park in a different location on the property.

Assistant Director Mendel clarifies with the PZB the driveway and parking rules in regard to the sight lines on the property for the neighbors may be immaterial. If Ms. Doytchinova's garage was larger, they could have a wider driveway and it could be parked closer to the sidewalk. Parking on grass is prohibited regardless. If this request is granted, then the grass between this area and the public sidewalk would not permit parking and would result in code enforcement issues. The issue of sight visibility for traffic may be less of a logical nexus for the request than the particular nature of their request. The Board is reviewing the eight criteria for the variation.

Member Weaver states there are many houses with driveways on busy streets in Des Plaines. The case does not seem unusual and wonders how many similar cases there would be related to this issue.

Chairman Szabo states he is not sure we have had a lot of cases like this one. It depends on how people drive and their feeling of safety.

Assistant Director Mendel states that variations do not set precedent, so if a neighbor is granted a variation, every property is considered unique from a legal perspective. It does not mean all similar variations have to be granted.

Member Weaver asks staff if they make a motion to grant approval, they can specify an alternative. Member Weaver recommends City Council approval for alternative 1, without the second variation for abutting the front walkway. That would force alternative 1 to become shorter and force compliance with requirements adjacent to the walkway.

Assistant Director Mendel clarifies they would need separation and it would need to be specified. The Board debates the width requirement and alternative designs and decides to reduce the proposed driveway width variation to 27 feet wide instead of the proposed 30-foot width.

Member Weaver makes a motion to recommend City Council approval for a variation from Section 12-9-6.B.3.b.(1) to allow a maximum driveway width of 27 feet at the turn around point and require a grassy or landscaped separation between the driveway and the walkway and Member Fowler seconded the motion.

AYES: Szabo, Weaver, Fowler, Fallico
NAYS: Catalano, Zadrozny
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

2. Address: 2861 Scott Street

Case Number: 25-063-V

Thomas Didier requests Major Variations for a new detached garage larger in area and a taller building height than permitted.

PIN: 09-33-400-007-0000

Petitioner/Owner: Thomas Didier, 2861 Scott Street, Des Plaines, IL 60018

Chairman Szabo swore in the petitioner Thomas Didier.

Mr. Didier explains the request for the garage and related utility easement issues. A garage could be attached to the house, however the utility easement and layout of the house, particularly lighting, would be affected. A section of the basement and the stairs were recently rebuilt by the homeowner due to a structural issue.

Mr. Didier explains the garage is larger than allowed. Due to being a caretaker for his grandmother recently, he realized it is important to have a garage that can accommodate a larger accessible vehicle. The lot is larger and allows more permeable space compared to other lots. Mr. Didier wants to improve the driveway in a next phase after the garage is completed, due to budget. The height is taller than what is allowed. The house has a steep roof and Mr. Didier wants to have a similar roof and pitch. Due to the steepness of the house roof, it has prolonged the life of the roof due to the pitch.

Assistant Director Jonathan Mendel presented the staff analysis.

Issue: The petitioner requests major variations to permit a new 900 sq.ft. and 16.7-foot-tall detached garage.

Ward Number: #6, Alderman Mark Walsten

Existing Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential

Existing Land Use: Single Family Residence (residential)

Surrounding Zoning: North: R-1, Single Family Residential District
South: R-1, Single Family Residential District
East: R-1, Single Family Residential District
West: R-1, Single Family Residential District

Surrounding Land Uses: North: Single Family Residences (residential)
South: Single Family Residences (residential)
East: Single Family Residences (residential)
West: Single Family Residences (residential)

Street Classification: Scott St. is classified as a local road under City of Des Plaines jurisdiction.

Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan illustrates this site as residential.

Property/Zoning History: The subject property was developed by at least 1960 using available historical aerial imagery. Since then, the subject property has been a single-family detached residence and has had a two-car detached garage on the northside of the subject property in essentially the same layout as it is today.

MAJOR VARIATION

Request Description: *Overview*

In mid-2025, the petitioner submitted a permit application for a new 900 sq.ft. and 16.7-foot-tall detached garage. Staff reviewed and required resubmittal because the proposed garage area and building height exceeded the maximum permitted 720 sq.ft. garage area and 15-foot building height for this size lot.

The petitioner requests these variations to permit sufficient space within the garage for parking a specific large and accessible vehicles.

To seek this design petitioner requests major variations from:

- Sections 12-8-1.C.1 & 5 of the City Code limit the subject property's detached garage area to 720 sq.ft. and the detached garage building height to 15 feet.

Consideration of Alternatives

Section 12-8-1.C.5 of the City Code permits the following for accessory structure types:

- One detached garage or carport up to 720 sq.ft.; and
- One detached additional accessory structure (such as a shed) up to 225 sq.ft.

If the petitioner built both a maximum-sized detached garage and shed, there would be 945 sq.ft. of accessory structures on the property. This permitted by right total would be more than the petitioner's proposed single 900 sq.ft. detached garage while also functionally accommodate the petitioner's desired vehicle parking plus other typical accessory structure uses.

Standards for Variation: The following is a discussion of standards for variations from Section 12-3-6(H) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposed use would satisfy the standards is provided below and in the petitioner's response to standards. The PZB may use this rationale toward its recommendation, or the Board may make up its own.

9. Hardship: No variation shall be granted pursuant to this subsection H unless the applicant shall establish that carrying out the strict letter of the provisions of this title

would create a particular hardship or a practical difficulty.

Comment: The petitioner states the additional 180 sq.ft. (900 vs 720) of detached garage area is required to park certain vehicle types (see attached Petitioner's response to staff comments) and other typical accessory structure uses. To compare volumes between maximum permitted accessory structures and the proposed detached garage, the following outlines the cubic foot volumes of the permitted structures versus The petitioner's proposed accessory (assuming the maximum permitted 15-foot building height):

- Permitted by right 225 sq.ft. shed (3,375 cubic feet) + 720 sq.ft. detached garage (10,800 cubic feet) = **14,175 cubic feet**
- Proposed 900 sq.ft. garage = **13,487 cubic feet**

10. Unique Physical Condition: The subject lot is exceptional as compared to other lots subject to the same provision by reason of a unique physical condition, including presence of an existing use, structure, or sign, whether conforming or nonconforming; irregular or substandard shape or size; exceptional topographical features; or other extraordinary physical conditions peculiar to and inherent in the subject lot that amount to more than a mere inconvenience to the owner and that relate to or arise out of the lot rather than the personal situation of the current owner of the lot.

Comment: The petitioner's property is not uniquely shaped or developed when compared with adjacent residential properties immediately adjacent to the north, south, east or west since the immediate neighborhood properties have lot areas that only permit the maximum permitted 720 sq.ft. detached garage.

11. Not Self-Created: The aforesaid unique physical condition is not the result of any action or inaction of the owner or its predecessors in title and existed at the time of the enactment of the provisions from which a variance is sought or was created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of this title.

Comment: There have been no natural forces or government actions affecting the subject property that could warrant this variation request as the subject property's layout has existed since The petitioner purchased the property in 2018.

12. Denied Substantial Rights: The carrying out of the strict letter of the provision from which a variance is sought would deprive the owner of the subject lot of substantial rights commonly enjoyed by owners of other lots subject to the same provision.

Comment: The most likely alternative of two permitted accessory structures (such as garage and shed) could be the same or less cost than the proposed 900 sq.ft., 16.7-foot-tall detached garage and designed in a manner to permit The petitioner's specific vehicle parking and other typical accessory structure uses similar to the rights enjoyed by neighboring lots subject to the same regulations.

13. Not Merely Special Privilege: The alleged hardship or difficulty is neither merely the inability of the owner or occupant to enjoy some special privilege or additional right not available to owners or occupants of other lots subject to the same provision, nor merely

the inability of the owner to make more money from the use of the subject lot.

Comment: Granting this variation could afford the petitioner special privilege by allowing total accessory structure area greater than permitted for similar neighboring properties. The variation would not automatically restrict The petitioner from constructing a 225 sq.ft. other accessory structure as well. If the 900 sq.ft. detached garage is approved and The petitioner also installs a 225 sq.ft. shed, this property could have 1,125 sq.ft. of accessory structures versus the maximum allowed 945 sq.ft. permitted by right on neighboring properties.

14. Title And Plan Purposes: The variation would not result in a use or development of the subject lot that would be not in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title and the provision from which a variation is sought were enacted or the general purpose and intent of the comprehensive plan.

Comment: The City Code and Comprehensive Plan are generally predicated on maintaining and enforcing maximum property development across similar or like properties and uses. The proposed 900 sq.ft. garage plus the permitted by right 225 sq.ft. other accessory structure (which the petitioner still has available to them regardless of these variation requests) could be considered a significant deviation from the maximum codified norm.

15. No Other Remedy: There is no means other than the requested variation by which the alleged hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the subject lot.

Comment: The *Consideration of Alternatives* section above outlines a possible reasonable alternative that could prevent the variation.

16. Minimum Required: The requested variation is the minimum measure of relief necessary to alleviate the alleged hardship or difficulty presented by the strict application of this title.

Comment: The requested variation from maximum accessory structure area and building height may not be the minimum necessary to alleviate the alleged hardship as the proposed 900-square-foot garage is 180 sq.ft. greater than the maximum permitted 720 sq.ft. Additionally, a detached garage could be designed in some manner other than proposed to accommodate the specialty vehicle the petitioner desires to park while still complying or seeking a lesser variation amount.

PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions: Under Section 12-3-6.G.2.b (Procedure for Review and Decision of Major Variations) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB has the authority to *recommend* the City Council approve or deny the major variation request. Consideration of the request should be based on a review of the information presented by the applicant and the findings made above, as specified in Section 12-3-6.H (Standards for Variation) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Szabo asks if they will remain under the 30% building coverage requirements with the approval. Assistant Director Mendel states that they would.

Member Catalano wants to know the garage size of 2811 Scott. Staff states it is exactly 720 square feet.

Member Weaver asks staff to clarify if the requirements are different if it is attached. Assistant Director Mendel states yes, the limitation for an attached garage would be 30% building coverage.

Member Weaver asks for clarification on the garage door configuration. Mr. Didier clarifies it is a three-car garage and can fit all three garage doors.

Member Weaver asks if they can make a variation that limits whether they can prevent an additional 225 square feet of another accessory structure. Assistant Director Mendel states that it is possible, but there are limitations with enforcement over time.

Discussion ensues on the requirements. Staff states that 720 square feet is the limitation for residentially zoned properties. Chairman Szabo states that it is more common to see larger garages. Member Fowler states it makes sense for a larger garage in this location.

Neil Deacon, 22580 Cheshire Court in Deer Park Illinois is sworn in for public comment. He added briefly that he owns a business and works in many locations. Several neighbors were asked about this garage variation. Neighbors communicated kind things about Thomas and his grandmother. Mr. Deacon says this is his first time seeing the tax dollars at work and it is interesting to see. Chairman Szabo states the tax dollars do not go to the PZB.

Member Fowler moved and Member Catalano seconded a motion to recommend the City Council approve major variation for an oversized detached garage as requested and presented.

AYES: Catalano, Szabo, Weaver, Fowler, Fallico, & Zadrozny
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chairman Szabo introduced the draft 2026 PZB meeting schedule for review and approval by the PZB.

Member Weaver asked whether election day is a PZB night. It is not. The Board discusses the calendar

Member Catalano moved and Member Fallico seconded to approve the 2026 PZB meeting schedule as presented.

AYES: Catalano, Szabo, Weaver, Fowler, Fallico, & Zadrozny
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

CASE NO. 25-046-TPLAT-PPUD
CASE NO. 25-061-V
CASE NO. 25-063-V

PRELIMINARY PUD & TENTATIVE PLAT
MAJOR VAR.
MAJOR VAR.

25-046-TPLAT-PPUD
2019 E. TOUHY AVE.
2861 SCOTT STREET

Chairman Szabo asked if there was any additional items to discuss. Staff requested information on attendance for the November 25, 2025 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Szabo adjourned the meeting by affirmative voice vote at 8:20 P.M.

Sincerely,

Samantha Redman, AICP, Senior Planner/Recording Secretary

cc: City Officials, Aldermen, Planning & Zoning Board, Petitioners