

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: BMO BANK - 630 WEST NORTHWEST HIGHWAY - PC #21-022
SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW DRIVE-THROUGH IN B-2 DISTRICT

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 12th day of January, 2022 at the hour of 7:47 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUSAN DAWSON, Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
MARY JO WARSKOW
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
JAKE SCHMIDT, Assistant Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, second item on the agenda is the BMO Bank. Is the Petitioner here? Great, thanks.

Jake, have all public notices been given? Sorry, let me let you get your microphone.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Didn't mean to rush you. Okay, terrific. Who will be speaking on behalf of the Petitioner this evening?

MR. NOSKEY: Hello, my name is Mark Noskey, I will be. I'm the architect of record for the project.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, anybody else who will be speaking?

MR. NOSKEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I just want to swear you all in at once if you could all --

MR. NOSKEY: Yes. The other people with me are Luay Aboona from KLOA; from Storebuild, Dan Slattery which is the owner's rep; and Oz from Civworks which is the civil engineering person.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Perfect, all right.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, thank you. All right, Petitioner, would you like to begin your presentation?

MR. NOSKEY: Well, I don't have a presentation.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, that's fine. Perfectly fine.

MR. NOSKEY: I wanted to tell you that we're here for the special use permit for the drive-throughs on this one-story bank that is about 4,177 square feet. It is a single-story building made up of basically face brick and metal panel. There is an enclosed refuse enclosure and essentially parking and the three-lane drive-through with the bypass.

Essentially, you know, we've been before the Design Committee already, and I guess that would be part of the presentation, but we've already been there and addressed their comments and concerns. So, now we're really kind of in the next step for us.

So, I'll be here and, you know, the team is here to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, have you read the Staff report and do you agree to the conditions of approval?

MR. NOSKEY: We do.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Terrific. All right, so no presentation, because last time I was jumping the gun and thought they were done. You're good?

MR. NOSKEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, so with that, I will ask Jake to provide the Staff report.

MR. SCHMIDT: Certainly. The address of the subject property is 630 West Northwest Highway. The proposed use for the site would be a drive-through banking facility. The subject site is on B-2 General Business District, which does allow bank facilities but requires a special use permit for drive-throughs.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Jake, are you speaking into the mic?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. Is it --

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, it was a little muffled.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Just a little closer would be good.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, right.

MR. SCHMIDT: No problem. The requested action specifically is a special use permit to allow a drive-through in the B-2 District. The Comprehensive Plan designates the site for commercial purposes. The proposal is compliant with this designation. One variation is required as part of this petition, that being a variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2b to waive the requirement for landscape islands equal in area to at least one parking space at the end of each parking row.

The proposed use would be a BMO Bank facility with three drive-through ATM lanes. It would operate from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, with shortened morning hours on Saturday. The bank will be closed on Sundays. The bank would employ seven to eight persons, with a peak number of seven on site at any time.

The Design Commission did review and approve this project with required changes on November 9th, 2021. Overall, the design of the building is nicely done.

The Petitioner has provided a written response to the special use permit criteria. With respect to the first criterion that the said special use is deemed necessary for public convenience at this location, BMO Harris Bank plans on closing its 1007 West Euclid Avenue location, necessitating a new location at the subject site. With respect to the second criterion that such case will not under any circumstances be detrimental to the welfare of persons in the vicinity, BMO Harris Bank is a widely-known and recognized national banking association. It will not in any way be detrimental to persons within the vicinity. With respect to the third criterion, that the proposed use will comply with applicable regulations as specified in the ordinance and granted as part of the authorization from the Village Board of Trustees, the Petitioner has stated that the proposed bank will comply with all applicable regulations and conditions as part of any authorization from the Village Board. Staff believes that these responses are satisfactory and that the special use permit request is justified.

The subject site is bordered to the north by Euclid Avenue, and to the south by Northwest Highway. It is a through lot with frontage on both streets. It is just east of the Euclid Avenue and Northwest Highway intersection, and it's just west of Ridge Avenue.

The site is currently developed with a former Firestone Auto Service facility. The Petitioner is proposing to demolish the facility and construct a 4,177 square-foot building with a 15-space parking lot. Two-way circulation will be provided on the east side of the site with a one-way entrance off of Northwest Highway, one-way circulation will be provided on the west side of the site, three of the drive-through lanes exiting onto Northwest Highway.

Both exits on Northwest Highway and on Euclid Avenue will be right out only. The Petitioner has reached out to both IDOT and Cook County as part of this process and designed these driveways based on feedback from each agency. The entrances to the site on Euclid Avenue and on Northwest Highway would be full access along both eastbound and westbound traffic to access the site.

Of note on the site plan before you right now is a slight modification from the plans posted on the agenda, specifically, a change to the southeast corner. Staff did have concern regarding one-way traffic entering a two-way drive aisle, especially since the one-way traffic entering is closer to the southbound traffic that would be circulating within the site. The Petitioner has moved a parking space from this eastern row and moved it to the north side of the building allowing for an extended driveway to allow additional space to avoid any potential conflicts. Staff does encourage Petitioner to explore opportunities to shift the driveway farther

APPROVED

east.

There are a couple of engineering concerns Staff has that are yet to be resolved, although the Petitioner is responsive. The first would be related to stormwater detention. The Petitioner's detention plan captures only 1,287 cubic feet of the required 10,455 cubic feet of stormwater storage. The site does drain into the Village's combined sewer system, and the Village is sensitive to the stormwater entering the system. A storage vault may be needed to accommodate additional stormwater detention. The Petitioner shall work with the Engineering Division as part of final engineering permit review plans to develop an acceptable stormwater detention system to the satisfaction of the Village engineer.

Additionally, a full fire truck turning exhibit shall be required prior to an appearance before the Village Board that demonstrates adequate fire apparatus access is provided to the site. Petitioner did provide a partial turning exhibit as part of review, but a full turning exhibit would be required in order to review that adequate access is provided by the Engineering Division and the Fire Department.

A traffic and parking study was required and provided as part of this petition. With respect to traffic, the study indicated that the proposed access drives will be sufficient to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed facility and that development of the site as proposed will not have a negative impact on adjacent roadways or intersections. With respect to the drive-through, the study noted that stacking will be provided for four vehicles. Peak stacking at similar facilities was four vehicles.

With respect to parking, per code a total of 14 spaces are required at the site. As the site is proposed to be developed with 15, this results in a code required parking surplus of one space. The traffic and parking study did indicate that up to 15 spaces could be needed. The proposal would provide adequate capacity in this instance. Two bicycle parking spaces are required and a bicycle rack is proposed at the northeast corner of the building close to the front entrance. Staff has no concerns regarding parking or traffic.

With respect to site landscaping, screening is proposed along the east property line as well as along public roadways. Full-sized trees will be provided in landscape islands with dwarf trees along Euclid Avenue. The Petitioner is also proposing a fence abutting the residential home to the east which would screen the parking lot.

Of note is missing landscape islands in the northwest corner. This requires a variation to waive the requirement for a full-size island at the end of each parking row. The Petitioner did provide a written response to variation justification criteria to the satisfaction of Staff. Staff supports this variation due to ample site landscaping and the desire to maintain adequate site parking.

In conclusion, the Staff Development Committee recommends approval of the application subject to five conditions, the first being that as part of final engineering during the permit review process, Petitioner shall work with the Engineering Division to develop an acceptable stormwater detention system to the satisfaction of the Village. On-site detention shall be provided as determined by the Village engineer. Secondly, IDOT approval shall be required for the proposed modifications to access along Northwest Highway which is under their jurisdiction. Cook County approval shall be required for the proposed modifications to access along Euclid Avenue which is under Cook County jurisdiction.

Prior to appearing before the Village Board for review, the Petitioner shall work with the Village to explore options for either eliminating the southern parking space, which they have done in their most recent plan, but also explore opportunities to shift the driveway farther east if feasible. The Petitioner shall also, prior to appearing before the Village

APPROVED

Board, provide an updated fire truck turning exhibit to the satisfaction of the Village demonstrating adequate fire apparatus access. Lastly, the Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state and Village codes, regulations and policies.

That concludes my presentation. Happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, thank you.

Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Motion to accept the report.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right.

MR. HUBBARD: You could just do a --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, all in favor? I'm so used to roll calling.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, terrific.

All right, thank you. Commissioners, do we have any initial questions? Yes, thank you, before we open up to the public.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Once again, just a clarification. Jake, can you bring up the slide that has the old Firestone building? Is there another one that has that as well? What I'm trying to get at is that, yes, that might, that's better. When Big Angie's came before the Plan Commission and the Board, they had a problem with parking spaces and they worked out a formal or informal arrangement with Firestone to use three parking spaces that are going to be to the west of the building because they were not used by Firestone. Those are going to go away obviously with this, I assume with this development.

Does that create a problem for the restaurant next door?

MR. SCHMIDT: The Big Angie's agreement with Firestone was informal and not in perpetuity. They do have a longer standing agreement with the Park District across the street, so if they need additional parking they can utilize that agreement for those spaces.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Great, so this will not be an issue based on that.

MR. SCHMIDT: No.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Great, thank you very much. That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other questions before we open to public? Any questions on this side?

Yes, Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Lynn, you and I are following the same lines here. In addition, and I remember from the Big Angie's the agreement they had with Bridgestone, with Firestone, there was also a drive aisle through there where they shared a line. Is that going to go away? Is there going to be a wide enough drive aisle behind their building to the east of their building there for cars to go through?

MR. SCHMIDT: The Big Angie's site shouldn't be negatively impacted. The proposed site plan does show the site, or the access aisle on the west side of the bank coming right up to the edge of Big Angie's property, but the drive aisle shouldn't be disturbed as is.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, but they won't have any parking over there?

MR. SCHMIDT: No.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Then if we could go to the Staff Development report? There was an attachment to that. No, below this.

MR. SCHMIDT: Which attachment are you referring to?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here, I can --

MR. SCHMIDT: There was an attachment --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: This attachment. I think it might have been a response, written response to zoning code variation justification. Okay, if you can't access it --

MR. SCHMIDT: I don't have that immediately available.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: We frequently have a question in justifying a zoning variation. We talk about a property has been vacant and I'm not sure if it's just that it's been vacant or if it's been idle and can't be developed at what it's at, which I believe is what the real intent is of that provision to justify a zoning variation. I don't have a problem with what's going on with this project, but I think that this is something that comes up quite often and we see it's been vacant.

Whether the property, has this property been on the market for sale or they couldn't sell it?

MR. SCHMIDT: It has been listed for quite a while.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Has it? Okay, because recently we've had some other properties that we said were vacant as a justification for, in one case a very significant zoning change, on Rand Road and Waverly. That property, subsequently I found out, had not been on the market. It was owned by the apartment complex, and I'm wondering why we would have used that as being blighted and it needed to be changed to get it to be developed.

Am I wrong in saying that it should be blighted and it can't be developed as what it's been zoned as or just that it's vacant?

MR. SCHMIDT: So, that attachment is just related to the variation request for parking lot islands. Our land use variation justification criteria are the same as our zoning code justification criteria. So, in the instance of a zoning code variation, it's not as critical. We rely on that criterion for deciding to grant the zoning code variation. If it's something along the lines of granting a variation from the use allowed on the site, it's more important to consider that other uses that are compliant haven't been able to locate onto the site.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Whereas I think this is pretty much, it's compliant. It's not that big of an issue --

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: -- but where we've used it in the past for big zoning changes --

MR. SCHMIDT: Correct, if they're land use variations.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Should we be looking more stringently at vacant and not developable under its current zoning?

MR. SCHMIDT: This request isn't seeking a land use variation. So, that's not a major player in this.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: It is a compliant proposal and the only additional zoning approval that's required is a special use permit for the drive-through. As long as it meets those special use permit criteria --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And I don't want to take up the time at this hearing to discuss that, but I think as a Commission, it's something that we should maybe address so we better understand the point that I'm getting at, if that makes sense.

MR. SCHMIDT: Understood.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's all I have, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other questions before we open up for

APPROVED

public commentary?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, just one question. This is to the Petitioner, what has become of the 007 property? The one 007? Euclid.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Euclid.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, the current?

COMMISSIONER DROST: That would have been, that was supposed to be closed? Was that part of the --

MR. SCHMIDT: He's referring to the current location on Euclid Avenue.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: If you're going to speak though, if you could come up to the --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I just wanted, that was a point of clarification because in 2019, that was part of the deal, wasn't it? That that was going to be disposed of and then the new facility was going to be developed?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, the Euclid building?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, Euclid, right. Just for the record, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: If you could state your name for the record before you speak?

MR. PEIRCE: Mike Peirce, Storebuild. Their current location, they are a tenant, and I don't know if you recall but they had the roof collapse last year, but they are going to be vacating their tenancy there. So, the current owner probably will re-lease it or replace it with another user.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so, I mean, it was redeveloped. It's near the post office. It has sort of a common, the Arlington Heights 60606 post office. The question was, you know, it looked pretty workable, so you guys are basically abandoning, not abandoning but terminating that relationship and moving to 630 Northwest Highway, correct?

MR. PEIRCE: Correct, you know, obviously the modernization of banking, they want to adapt and, you know, sometimes locations get functionally obsolete, so the drive-through lanes and all the technology and just their operational prototype they have now, they can service the community better at this location.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, we've heard about technology.

MR. PEIRCE: Absolutely, you know.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, go ahead. And even in banking.

MR. PEIRCE: Yes, absolutely, without a question.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, can we open to public commentary then? So, is there anyone in the public who wishes to speak about this? All right, sure, if you could come up to the podium? State your name and spell your last name for us. If you're willing, please provide your address.

MR. MANNELLA: Yes, hi. My name is Steven Mannella, M-a-n-n-e-l-l-a. I own a home in the neighborhood kind of just north of Euclid, east of Northwest Highway. So, this site is on my route to the train station that I go to downtown, so I pass it very often walking. So, I have lots of thoughts as I'm, you know, thinking about it. I've seen the site plan. I'm happy to see that something is happening because right now it's, you know, it's not fun to walk through or by, right?

When I looked at the site plan, I was wondering, that second driveway that is on the northern part, the exit, it seems like weirdly close to that drive aisle. I don't know if that's a public alley or if that's part of, you know, if that's part of the parcel or not. Was it

APPROVED

considered to put the exit into that drive aisle just to minimize curb cuts? You know, it seems like it's already there I believe, so you know, if there's a way to do that site so that we can use that?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Could you show which one you're speaking --

MR. MANNELLA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I think you went too far.

MR. MANNELLA: The site plan slide I think shows it well.

MR. SCHMIDT: The one on the east side?

MR. MANNELLA: The one with the new, well, with the --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: The one with the arrows?

MR. MANNELLA: Yes. So, that, I guess that northwestern driveway, I mean, it's right next to another driveway, right? That cut? So, it's hard for me to understand why it would be like or even driving, I feel like you could right hook a car. So, I'm just saying was it considered to have the driveway come out into that north-south drive and then, you know, and so then to get rid of that northern driveway that's part of the development? That's just a thought.

Then for the landscaping that's facing Northwest Highway, I understand it's nice to have landscaping and trees. It's also very uncomfortable obviously to walk on that sidewalk as you're inches away from, you know, trucks. Is it possible, is there any precedent that like you could widen the sidewalk or a walkway into the property I suppose? So, at least for that short stretch, there's a little bit of a reprieve for a pedestrian that's going to the train station to get a little bit farther from the street at least for sometime?

I think that concludes my comment, so thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, thank you very much.

Any other public commentary?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, at this time we're going to close public commentary.

So, Jake, could you speak to I think the traffic, his comments regarding the exit. I'm still confused by which one we're talking about. Then also, I'd like to see kind of the walkway, what he's talking about there, yes, thanks.

MR. SCHMIDT: So, to combine driveways on shared property, it would require cooperation between the two property owners, reciprocal access. Redesigning of the parking lot could add significant cost, and the neighboring property owner wouldn't be obliged to allow shared access. Cook County does have jurisdiction over that northern access road, and they're comfortable, in preliminary talks, with this configuration. The south side is a similar configuration where there's an outbound exit lane on the property to the east, and then inbound exit lane on the subject property.

These aren't atypical configurations. On busier roads, it's not uncommon to try to pursue shared access, but in this instance, that's not something that the Engineering Division commented on pursuing. Cook County did not make a comment on it looking at preliminary plans.

Then the comment regarding the sidewalk, on the south side there is a sidewalk that's right up against the roadway. It's a carriage walk. In the past, there have been times the Village has requested sidewalks be moved off the property line. This is a tight site. It's something we could look at, talk with our Engineering Division about. It would require either an easement on the property to allow perpetual use of that sidewalk, or it would require a dedication of land in order to put that sidewalk on the subject property as opposed to currently on the edge of the roadway.

APPROVED

It would be up to IDOT, too, depending on how the actual crosswalks need to be provided into and out of the site. They have jurisdiction on review of that aspect. So, it's something we can review, it's not something that was identified as necessary as part of this petition. That's something we can definitely look at.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Would you show the landscape plan? Because I think he was commenting on the landscaping there as well. So, there really isn't anything that would be pushing out almost into the sidewalk to make it even smaller, right?

MR. SCHMIDT: No.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, and the property just south of that, not south of that. East? What is this, it's the directional, right? East, right?

MR. SCHMIDT: East.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right or left, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right. I mean, so I understand the point. Really, I think it's a great point. If the sidewalk is too narrow, I mean, it is close to the train station, and it is pedestrian, and it's such a busy intersection that if we could consider a way to make it a little bit safer and wider, that would be great, but if all we're going to be able to do is get this property, it's not going to do really any good. So, I'm just curious, could the, the property just next to it, is that getting developed? There is not really any room to ask people to expand, correct? I mean, how would you even go about that?

MR. SCHMIDT: Correct. They would have to have some potential future access. If it was pushed back on this property from the roadway, it would have to bump back to the current location of the sidewalk before transitioning. To the west, that's Big Angie's, you know, they're a stable business. To the east, that site is now a dental office. That was recently reoccupied. They've invested in that site. It's not likely that they will want to redevelop any time soon. So, you wouldn't be looking at any immediate redevelopments in the area to link up that sidewalk at that same location. It would just bump in at this site if that's something that was considered.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, I think it's an excellent point and something that, as we're trying to encourage more walking unless car traffic, that the Village could look at, but I don't know that we can do anything about it today.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What is the width of those sidewalks?

MR. SCHMIDT: Five feet.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: How much?

MR. PASTRANA: I'm Oz Pastrana, the civil engineer on the project. So, IDOT actually requested that we make that sidewalk seven feet wide. So, we are going to have to extend into the property by a foot.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, interesting, okay.

MR. PASTRANA: So, we will have to dedicate some kind of easement to the Village for that one foot section, but that's an IDOT requirement, that carriage walks such as this one be seven feet wide. So, we are, it's currently about 5.5 feet wide, so we're going to add a foot-and-a-half to it.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so it is expanding a little bit. So, that's --

MR. PASTRANA: Yes. There will be more room for walking.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: That's good to hear, and then perhaps it's something the Village could keep on its radar. If we're ever able to redevelop more property there, we can try to keep that consistent.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Does that apply to both roads? Euclid and --

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No, I think just Northwest Highway?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: But they're both state routes, right?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, only Northwest Highway is under IDOT jurisdiction. Cook County is responsible for Euclid Avenue.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, well, that makes a lot of sense. Sorry, sarcasm. It doesn't work so well with masks.

MR. PASTRANA: Just another quick comment. I mean, the Petitioner wanted me to comment on the question regarding the access drive, you know, like Jake said, we can't share an access drive with the adjoining property owner. It would be nice if we could keep that and exit out of there, but we can't. IDOT has specific requirements as far as how far we would have to be from the property line.

To Mike's point that he asked me to point out, we are significantly reducing the curb cuts out there. Right now, I think there's about 50 feet of curb cut to access the existing building, and we're reducing it to just these two small entryways. So, it will provide a nicer walk for the pedestrians I think, not having to go through those larger access points anymore.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Well, it's a little bit wider and it will be definitely more pleasing with the landscaping and the new building.

MR. PASTRANA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, so --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Sue, as long as the civil engineer is up there --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, one engineer to another, you want to have a conversation?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, Joe is engineering.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, just a concern or a comment. This is a pretty tight site. Do you think you can get a fire truck turning radius fit in there?

MR. PASTRANA: Yes. So, we expect the fire truck to be able to get into the site from every direction. We have to provide some more movements that the Village has asked for, which we will. A fire truck can definitely not circulate around the entire site. They won't be able to exit through the exit from the drive-throughs, but they will be able to enter and stage and then, you know, they may have to back up and do three-point turns to get out of there, but the modeling shows that it is feasible.

So, it's, you know, not ideal, I mean, it's a very small site like you said. It's very tough to get a hundred-foot ladder truck in there. But the modeling shows that they can definitely enter the site and stage, and then, you know, by the time they have to leave, the emergency is over so they can, you know, maneuver as needed to get out of there. You know, the access on Northwest Highway is entrance only but, you know, in an emergency situation, the fire truck could use it as an exit with no concerns.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I mean, there's quite a deficit on drainage.

MR. PASTRANA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: How are you going to solve that issue?

MR. PASTRANA: So, drainage, we have to, I have to talk to the Engineering Department about it. Obviously, there's a lot of concerns or issues for providing that much drainage on such a small site. The main detriment on this site is that we're kind of at a high side, so we're at a high point in the Village. So, the existing storm that we have available to tie into is very shallow, so it's only about three feet deep I think on Northwest Highway. The one on

APPROVED

Euclid is even shallower, it's only 2.5 feet deep I think those catch basins.

So, that puts us into a situation where the largest size of an underground system that we can put in is either a two-foot high box culvert or a two-foot diameter pipe system, which when you consider 10,000 square feet, or 10,000 cubic feet in a two-foot diameter system, you've got pipes underneath two-thirds of the parking lot in this case, which is not ideal. I guess that's kind of it, so we're looking for a discussion with Engineering to kind of have a happy medium. I know the system we proposed does contain, collect, and release the 100-year storm event adequately without any real overflow. So, the entire 100-year storm would be contained within the site.

It's always difficult, I don't know, you as an engineer know that it's very difficult to provide detention for these small half-acre sites. I mean, it's just, they don't fit into a perfect box where you can easily provide detention. For the longest time, the threshold was one-acre sites before you had to start providing detention for that very reason, because it's again very difficult. This site has a lot more constraints than others.

The groundwater table is I think only two feet below, or three feet below the surface. So, that's a detriment as well. We can't put detention below the water table. Again, there's potential for some contamination from the old tanks. You don't necessarily want to excavate two-thirds of the site if you don't have to and disturb contaminated soils.

So, again, just a lot of constraints on the site. We're doing the best we can and we'll definitely coordinate with the Engineering Department on what they would like to see. You know, like I said, maybe we'd come to a happy medium and provide a good system for the Village that, you know, answers everybody's concerns.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

MR. PASTRANA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other questions?

Commissioner Jensen and Warskow? Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, I just wanted to get on the comment on the sidewalk. That's going to be a big project because that whole distance is not in really good shape. It's sort of add-ons and sort of gerrymandered and it's not a straight shot, and then you've got the south end of it with no sidewalk because of the parking and the railroad commitments there. So, I feel your pain, Mr. Mannella.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I have a question of Sam or Jake.

These two issues that we're just talking about, the fire truck access, turning radiuses and so forth, and the stormwater detention, shouldn't those have been resolved and solved before they come to the Plan Commission?

MR. SCHMIDT: With respect to the fire truck turning exhibits, the Fire Department did see the initial exhibit which showed the truck access through the site. They were just missing movements from Euclid Avenue and Northwest Highway, and they did not have any initial concerns. That one is not severe to Staff.

With respect to stormwater detention, it is something that can be decided at a later date. Engineering Division does offer fees in lieu of detention once they look at a site and talked to site engineers to see what actually can be accomplished, which is why this is something that Staff is comfortable with occurring as part of final engineering during the permit review process.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: At that time, the Village engineer and the engineer for the subject project will come to a determination on what can be done, what's acceptable to the

APPROVED

Village, and that can be addressed at that point.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, thank you for clarifying that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't have anything else.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I don't.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, I have a couple of questions. While we're still on the engineering concerns with the deficiency in the stormwater, is that any different on how it currently exists? I mean, we're not putting any, we're not taking away greenspace and adding on more cement, I don't think, right? Like it's --

MR. PASTRANA: No, we're actually increasing --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, there's a current deficiency. So, anything you do is an improvement to what we currently have?

MR. PASTRANA: Yes. So, everything we're doing is an improvement to what we currently have. The site is a 100 percent blacktop. There's no landscape areas. So, all the landscape areas that we're adding are a benefit. There's currently no detention. There aren't even any storm structures I think on the site, so all the rain just runs off to either Euclid or Northwest Highway every time it rains right now.

So, like I said, the system we proposed, while it doesn't meet the volume requirement, it does, you know, all the calculations do show that it does contain the 100-year storm event the way it should without overtopping any structures. Again, you know, Mike asked me to comment with regards to what MWRD would require for a site like this. MWRD has a retention component which would be a small amount of volume. But because we're adding all the pervious area, all the new landscaping, it's more than 15 percent of the site, so MWRD would not require any volume for that storage. MWRD requires detention volume for commercial sites that are three acres or larger, so this site under MWRD rules wouldn't require any volume storage. So, the volume storage is specifically a Village requirement at this point.

But to your point, yes, we're improving the site a lot more, you know, it's going to be a lot better than what's there now in terms of stormwater management.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right. So, right now it's all blacktop and you are actually adding some pervious surface areas to it and working with the Village to see if there's additional that you can do.

MR. PASTRANA: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, we're not creating a worse situation that exists.

MR. PASTRANA: No, no, definitely not.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, then could you put the parking, or the traffic? I've got a question about the traffic. Not that slide, the one with the arrows. This one, thank you.

When I see, I don't know who wants to talk about traffic, but when I see the straight arrow, does that mean that you can do a right or a left into that? So, that's Euclid, correct? This white car is on Euclid with the arrow?

MR. PASTRANA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, that car could turn right into the space, but if someone was on the other side of the street, can they turn left into that space?

MR. PASTRANA: So, the access on Euclid is left in, right in, and right out. The access points on Northwest Highway, the southern one is entrance only so people could do

APPROVED

a right-in or a left-in, and then the access point at the drive-through is this exit only but it's right-out only. So, you can only turn right.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, right. So, that's why I wanted to make sure I was reading that right. So, when it's straight, that means that there is more than one access.

MR. PASTRANA: Yes, both motions, a right turn in and a left turn in.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, I guess I'm more concerned at the Euclid end than the Northwest Highway end though I suppose I should, but that is such a congested area at rush hour and even not at rush hour. Plus, where do the roads, where does it go down to one lane? It's like --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: It's right there.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right there. So, you know, obviously, everyone has looked at this, so now you guys know better than me. I'm just pointing out that that concerns me, that you can make that, the right turn doesn't bother me, but that left turn, due to the congestion in the area and how it's going to block up traffic. Have we looked specifically at that? We don't have concerns? If for some reason it becomes an issue, what can we do?

MR. SCHMIDT: Considerably we could add a condition that if there are accidents at the site, we could restrict left-turn movements in. The Engineering Division did not flag this as a concern. The developer did review this with IDOT and Cook County, and there were no issues with that movement that they flagged. They obviously had some feedback. They restricted outbound movements to right only, but they didn't have any restrictions it seems to left turns in.

So, based on the feedback of the governing agencies for those roads and our own Engineering Division, we're comfortable with that movement being proposed.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: If we don't put a condition in but there suddenly becomes a lot of problems at that site, do we have any options, or do we have to put some sort of condition in?

MR. SCHMIDT: We could prevent left turns or --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: But I mean, do we have to put that condition in or five years from now can the Village go to them and say we have a problem here we need to fix? Or does it have to come from us? Do you see what I'm saying? If we don't put a condition in, can something still be fixed if it becomes a problem?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: That's all I wanted to know. So, you guys know what you're doing. I'm comfortable with that. I just want to know that if it becomes a problem, we can address it and that this Commission doesn't have to take some sort of action now to make sure that we have that opportunity later, okay? All right, that was it. Those are my questions. Any other questions? A motion? Oh, you want to say something, sure.

MR. PEIRCE: I want to make a quick comment to your concerns. Today it's full access on both Euclid and Northwest Highway with much larger areas of access. So, I don't know what the history has been as far as any issues, but we are severely reducing access to the point to where if you're just proposing more changes, especially getting into it, if you're coming from the west there would be no way to get in, if you eliminated one of those left-ins. So, it's as severely reduced as we can make it work, especially for the tenant.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sure, I understand. Again, I'm not suggesting any changes.

MR. PEIRCE: Sure.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I respect that people much better educated on this point than myself have reviewed this and are okay with it. I just had to voice a concern.

MR. PEIRCE: Okay, totally understand. I just wanted to point that out, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes. All right, do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #21-022, a special use permit to allow a drive-through in the B-2 District, and the following variation:

- 1. A variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2B to waive the requirement for landscaped islands equal in area to at least one parking space, protected by durable materials, and containing at least one live shade tree at a minimum of four inches in diameter, at the end of every parking row.**

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. As part of final engineering during the permit review process, the Petitioner shall work with the Engineering Division to develop an acceptable stormwater detention system to the satisfaction of the Village. On-site detention shall be provided as determined by the Village engineer.**
- 2. IDOT approval shall be required for the proposed modifications to access along Northwest Highway, and Cook County approval shall be required for the proposed modifications to access along Euclid Avenue.**
- 3. Prior to appearing before the Village Board for review, the Petitioner shall work with the Village to explore options for eliminating the southernmost parking space of the eastern parking row and expanding the adjacent landscaped island, as well as shifting the southeast driveway farther east to reduce the chance of vehicular conflict.**
- 4. Prior to appearing before the Village Board, the Petitioner shall provide an updated fire truck turning exhibit to the satisfaction of the Village demonstrating adequate fire apparatus access.**
- 5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, we have a vote.

Roll call.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

All right, congratulations! Unanimous approval. Again, we're just a recommending body, you've got to go to the Village Board. Obviously, you've got some work to do before you get to the Village Board so you probably don't have an idea of when we get you on the agenda, but we'll be moving you along. All right, thank you. Congratulations!

Okay, do we have any other business?

MR. SCHMIDT: We do not.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No other business. Do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I make the motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, everybody wants to make a motion tonight. All right, Bruce Green was the loudest voice on that.

Who is second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

MR. HUBBARD: Before we take the vote, I will mention that I believe our January 26th meeting is going to be canceled. Another evening off.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Wow, there's just not a lot going on these days, okay.

All right, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Terrific, thanks. Good to see everybody.

(Whereupon, at 9:00 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)