



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025

M. Werden, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

Roll Call

Present: J. Kapadoukakis, J. Miaso, A. McSwane, J. Borkgren, M. Werden

Absent: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, M. Sarwas, G. Koziol

Also Present: Kristy Stone, Planning & Development Services Director, Andrew Barna, Associate Planner, Brian Krause, Associate Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the October 13, 2025 meeting minutes.

Motioned by: A. McSwane

Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

Ayes: J. Kapadoukakis, J. Miaso, M. Werden,

Nays: None

Abstain: J. Borkgren, A. McSwane

The motion carried.

Public Forum

M. Werden opened the public forum. No one from the public came forward. **M. Werden** closed the public forum.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025

(#25-08) Bartlett Mart – 331 S Main Street

Special Use Permit – to sell package liquor (beer, wine, and liquor)

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

The petitioner, **Shashikant Patel** 331 S Main Street and the petitioner's attorney, **Timothy Hoerman** 323 N Washington Street, Westmont came forward and were sworn in by **M. Werden**. **T. Hoerman** stated that the petitioner is here requesting a special use permit to sell beer, wine and liquor at the Bartlett Mart at 331 S. Main Street. **M. Werden** I had stopped in the store the other day and it noticed it is not a very big space. Are you going to display most of your other merchandise with liquor or how is that going to work? What percentage of the store will be liquor? **S. Patel** it would about a 50/50 mix of grocery and liquor. It would not be all liquor. There will be groceries also like milk and bread, and everything else like any other convenience store.

M. Werden opened the public hearing.

David Bhesnia 233 S. Main Street, I own Town Liquor & Food. There are so many liquor stores in Bartlett. Every block has a liquor store. There is Town Liquor, CVS, Aldi and Armanetti's. I do not know how many liquor stores you can put on a block. It is surprising how this planning and zoning works. I have been here for 15 years and I do not think there have been any complaints. I am already suffering with my business. This year my business is down 30% because of the economy. I have not taken a salary for 7 to 8 months. My store is part of the Village and if you are putting in the same business this will be more competition, and someone has to go out of business. I do not know what planning is going on. Is the plan to put out businesses and make it worse? That is my main concern. It is hard to survive in this economy. You are the intelligent people. You know more about how to improve the Village and what to do to keep businesses running, but if you want to make things go out of business, then this is good planning. I do not know, what is the plan? Every block has a liquor license starting at Main Street with more liquor licenses coming. Every block has a liquor license. This is concerning to me. If there is no criteria for granting a liquor license then a bank or a barber shop can apply for a liquor license. Why do they need to go through Planning & Zoning? **M. Werden** that is why we require a public hearing. **D. Bhesnia** you have to take all factors into consideration. Thank you very much for listening. **Dan Patel** 217 S Main Street, I bought the Bartlett Town Center in July of this year and my goal was to improve that center and to bring in more tenants and businesses to Bartlett. There are 1 or 2 empty spaces now and 1 major space which is about 7000 square feet. I already have leased that space and there is another vacant space next to the bakery that I am planning to lease. Mr. Bhesnia is my tenant in Town Center. He has already requested that I lower his rent because he is struggling this year with the business. He is going to be affected by this. I am here in support of my tenants. By approving this special use, which is not far from Town Center, the existing business at Town Liquor will be affected by



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025

25%. He will struggle to pay the rent. I could lose one of the major tenants in my center. Right now, he is paying, but if this is approved, my tenant will suffer and will not be able to pay his rent. I want to support my tenant.

J. Kapadoukakis added, when I first saw that the convenience store had opened I was very excited because it looked like a family-friendly mart. I am surprised to hear that you are requesting to make the store 50/50. Have you not been successful with getting families coming in and children riding their bikes to the store? Is your business suffering? **S. Patel** without beer and wine, we cannot be successful. Any other convenience store has beer and wine. Every 7-Eleven has beer and wine. This will not be 100% a liquor store. Customers are asking us if we are selling beer. **J. Kapadoukakis** asked, when you opened as a convenience store, you probably knew that you would have to apply for a special use permit to sell liquor. How did you plan to run your business? Did you plan to add this from the start? **S. Patel** no, I was just not successful selling only chips, candy and soda. That is why we are applying for beer and wine, and liquor. This will not be 100% liquor. I opened to sell milk, cheese and bread. I am not focusing only on liquor. I want to give good service to my customers. People are asking for beer and cigarettes, and groceries. **M. Werden** I am not sure that this is in the best interest of the Village of Bartlett because we do have quite a saturation of liquor-type stores. The purpose of this public hearing is for things to come out and you have heard from your nearest competitors that have stores and the competition is going to be pretty stiff with so many retailers selling the same product close together. You are at a disadvantage that you are small. **T. Hoerman** I think that the distinguishing feature between Bartlett Mart and the other businesses that are nearby is that this is much more of a convenient mart than a liquor store. The other locations that were talked about are liquor stores that have incidental food sales. This is a convenient store that is not going to exceed 50% liquor and would not solely be selling liquor, beer and wine. The special use request is to help with the sales of the other products. **S. Patel** I am not only focused on liquor. I am trying to focus on convenience for all of our customers. **J. Kapadoukakis** it seems like the percentage is high at 50%. I have visited your store looking for milk and there was no milk in the store. **J. Patel** sometimes, we can run out before our next delivery. It depends on when we get our deliveries. I have everything there now. **D. Bhesnia** I tried to carry some groceries at Town Liquor and Food. I had things like milk, cheese, bread and butter, but those things were expiring. It was not worth it for me to sell things other than liquor. Whatever I carry, CVS and Aldi carry the same things within a block. **J. Miaso** I have inspected this and gone through it. We cannot stop everyone. Other people sell liquor and the petitioner should be able to sell liquor as well.

J. Miaso made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#25-08) Bartlett Mart** at 331 S Main Street for a Special Use Permit to sell package liquor subject to the conditions and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.



**Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025**

M. Werden closed the public hearing.

Motioned by: J. Miaso

Seconded by: A. McSwane

Roll Call

Ayes: J. Kapadoukakis, J. Miaso, J. Borkgren, A. McSwane

Nays: M. Werden

The motion failed to pass with a 4-1 vote.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025

(#25-12) 200 Primrose Lane

Variation – Impervious Coverage to allow an increase in the maximum impervious surface coverage from 35% to 40%.

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

The petitioners, **Nadeem Parker** and **Amy Parker** 200 Primrose Lane came forward and were sworn in by **M. Werden**. **N. Parker** we did our backyard about 3 years ago and there is a section of the backyard that is 5% over the allotted permeable service. We were not aware of the 35% allotment until we had already purchased the tile to do the backyard. Also, at the time we were doing this, my mom was living with us and we wanted the backyard to be level and a solid surface between the pool and the pavilion instead of grass or pavers. We did this 3 years ago and with the way it is pitched and designed, there have been no issues of flooding or damage to our yard or to our direct neighbors. We have a pond in the backyard. Any time we have rain the rain goes down the hill and away from the house. There was an anonymous complaint so here we are just hoping to get this approved. We have neighbors here that are directly next to us who will state that they have had no issues or damage to their yards from anything that has been done. **M. Werden** how did we discover that this was 5% more than zoning allows? **B. Krause** the permit for the pool deck and pavilion patio was initially approved with the condition that it was at the 35% allotment for this size lot. For every property in the Village with this size lot, 35% is the maximum impervious coverage allowed. When the applicant first applied for the permit there were 4 reviews that went back and forth between the applicant and staff where the proposals did not meet the requirements. The first application was at 53%, then 50%, and then 49%. The permit was finally approved in March 2022 at 35% by just 24 square feet. The conditions of approval were that that applicant had agreed to replace the driveway and front walkway with permeable pavers. Those are materials that allow water to go through and do not count against the impervious requirement. The applicant also was required to shrink the sizes of the 2 patios to meet the requirement. On the approved plat of survey, the area between the 2 patios was to remain grass and remain a permeable area. After we received a complaint in August 2025 that the area had been filled in without a permit, for which staff has not received permit application to date, we calculated the size of the area and added that to the impervious coverage. This brings the total to 40%, as opposed to the 35% maximum allowed coverage or 556 square feet over in the area that was supposed to remain grass. **M. Werden** asked the petitioner, why did you fill in that area without a permit? **N. Parker** we just wanted to. We had the tile. We wanted to blend it together so it would match. I did not think there would be an issue because it has not caused any damage. The way it is pitched and designed, the water does not go into anybody's yard. It does not flood our yard. **M. Werden** did you do the work yourself or use a contractor? **N. Parker** we used a contractor. **M. Werden** typically, a contractor would know that they need to get a permit for work like this. **N. Parker** agreed.

M. Werden opened the public hearing.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025

Maggie Deniec 204 Primrose Lane, I live directly next door. These improvements have not had any negative impact on my property. We have not noticed in the last 3 years any difference in how the water drains either onto or away from our property. Our yard is pitched and drains more towards the pond that is behind us. I feel like the petitioner's improvements are very tasteful. They have enhanced the look and the value of our neighborhood. Given that this has not caused any damage or any drainage issues to them or to us as their next-door neighbors, I would propose that they are able to keep the improvements that they have made.

Sharon Ford 196 Primrose Lane stated that they have absolutely no issues. The work that was done is impeccable. **M. Werden** I think it is commendable that there are neighbors here that have seen the changes that are in favor of this. That is the purpose of the public hearing.

Hanadi Dib 188 Primrose said that they live in the same cul-de-sac and also want to reiterate that this has not impacted any of the homes in the neighborhood. They have done a great job and it looks great aesthetically. We do not have an issue with the small percentage that was added and it has not impacted anything. We are here to support them. There was no ill-intent when the petitioner added to that area.

Mike Hanadi 188 Primrose added, I think that backyard looks stunning and it has added to the value of the house. I do not think it is going to affect any of the neighbors especially with the pond.

A. McSwane in your application, you stated that your hardship is the placement of the pool and the pavilion, but you added the pool and pavilion, correct? **N. Parker** yes. **A. McSwane** you created your own hardship. I am glad that your neighbors are in support of this, but you knew about the 35% standard, it was on the permit, but then you went ahead and added the extra tiles. I do not have concerns about drainage, but this just rubs me the wrong way.

J. Borkgren I am conflicted about this because of what Amy just said. You contracted for the initial work for the 2 improvements and you knew you were at 35%. **N. Parker** yes. I did not know the exact percentage, but I knew we were close. **J. Borkgren** had you bought the material already? **N. Parker** yes, we had the tiles. **J. Borkgren** why did not choose to use the same material that was used on the driveway for the patio? **N. Parker** it just aesthetically would not have looked right. **J. Borkgren** if your property was 109 square feet less, you would be in conformance with the 40%. If the north property line was moved south 11 inches, you would be in compliance. You are here asking for forgiveness for what you did. **N. Parker** yes, absolutely. **J. Miaso** the patio is done tastefully, your neighbors are here with no complaints, and the drainage is fine.

J. Miaso made a motion to pass along a **positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#25-12) 200 Primrose** for a variation to allow an increase in the maximum impervious surface coverage from 35% to 40% subject to the findings of fact outlined in the staff report.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025

M. Werden closed the public hearing.

Motioned by: J. Miaso

Seconded by: J. Kapadoukakis

Roll Call

Ayes: J. Kapadoukakis, J. Miaso, J. Borkgren, A. McSwane, M. Werden

Nays: None

The motion passed.



**Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
November 6, 2025**

Old Business/ New Business

K. Stone it does not look like we will have a case for the December meeting, but we will see you at the holiday party.

M. Werden asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

Motioned by: J. Miaso

Seconded by: A. McSwane

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm.