

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: WESTGATE SCHOOL BUILDING EXPANSION - 500 SOUTH DWYER AVENUE -
PC #22-016
SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A PUBLIC SCHOOL ON SUBJECT PROPERTY,
AMENDMENT TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO RECLASSIFY THE SINGLE-
FAMILY DETACHED PORTION OF THE SITE TO SCHOOLS, VARIOUS VARIATIONS

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 25th day of January, 2023 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, can we do roll call, please?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Here.

All right, so the first item on the agenda is approval of the minutes.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll make a motion to approve the minutes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Second.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed or abstain?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have to abstain; I was not at that meeting.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I abstain --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Wait, we've got two people talking at once.

For the recorder, can we do it once at a time?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I abstain since I wasn't here.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you, Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I also abstain; I was not at that meeting.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Same here.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: You as well, Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: As well, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

Okay, let's see, we have our first item on the agenda is the Westgate School Building Expansion. Who is going to be testifying on behalf of Westgate School?

Everybody who's coming, everyone who's testifying, if you can come up so I can swear you all in at once, that would be terrific.

All right, first, have all public notices been given?

MR. HUBBARD: They have, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Terrific.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, great.

All right, who will be starting the presentation? All right, thank you.

Why don't you take us through it? If you could state your name and spell your last name for the record, please?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes. My name is Ryan Schulz, I'm the Director of Facilities Management for Arlington Heights School District. Schulz, S-c-h-u-l-z.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. SCHULZ: Good evening. The first project we're here to present tonight is Westgate Elementary School and the associated addition that we have going on for that project.

Just some additional initial background on why this project is going forward, it's primarily driven by the successful referendum that was issued earlier in 2022 to implement a full-day Kindergarten across District 25. So, this is one of the six sites that we'll be looking to expand across the district. The full-day K program is a portion of the addition at this site that it will accommodate. The building is also currently at full capacity, so 100 percent of the classroom spaces are currently used. So, regardless of the full-day K going forward, this building does need some kind of relief going forward for the general population of the school. So, full-day K plus the full enrollment of the building right now is guiding the additional classrooms.

This building also houses an IS, Integrated Services, program for the entire district. So, a number of students come from across the district and receive services specifically at Westgate for their specific needs. So, that again increases the amount of classroom spaces that are needed for that facility.

Again, our board, when we were looking at this going out to referendum, had a goal to not be coming back occasionally or regularly to come back and ask the voters for more space. So, they took in the fact that they wanted to have some buffer space into the building and that equates to about 15 percent of the rooms are going to be used for buffer space. These rooms are not going to be sitting empty, they're going to be used for support services and other needs of the building, so they'll be regularly used throughout the day for students to go in and flow in and receive services as well.

Again, as I noted, the school hosting will continue to host the Integrated Services program. The board is committed to staying there. Another portion of the project is the school needs a larger PE space, a gym, due to running two sections in the gym at once. Right now, the gym can only accommodate one PE section successfully, so we're looking to expand that gymnasium to make it bigger to allow two sections of PE to be run in the gym at the same time. It's consistent with Olive, Ivy, and Windsor projects, so the size of the gym is very similar to those in scope that we've done over the last several years. Also again, that is kind of the benchmark that we've set and that we'll be using going forward.

Ownership and notification. This is just kind of an outline of our ownership and notification. We have done a title commitment. We do own all the properties that were associated with this project. We did a neighborhood meeting on October 18th. The main focus of that meeting was five attendees.

The main objectives of those from those comments that we received:

- Were there any impact to the classrooms during construction? Again, our response at this

time is no. The existing classrooms will be impacted in the summer of '24, so that's when the shakeout and the reshuffling of the building will happen.

- Will there be any impacts to the playground areas and making them smaller? No, the new playground on the west side of the building was completed several years ago. We do not intend to impact the playground space at the facility, and we're also proposing to replace an existing play structure on the east side of the facility as part of this project.
- What will construction security look like? We intend to fence in the area, have it secured. We have cameras in the building so we'll be able to see a majority of the site security-wise. Again, we relayed to them if they see something they need to be calling the police or notifying the district that they're seeing things that are happening after hours.
- What will construction site logistics and staging look like? We're not fully there yet on what it will fully be like, but we will take over a portion of our site. Trucks will be entering the site most likely off at Dwyer or Grove. Most likely, it will be on Dwyer on the southern end of the facility just based on the site logistics layout, but we'll finalize that with our construction manager going forward.

On October 26th, we had the Conceptual Design Review meeting. We had unanimous support for the project to proceed and go forward. The Design Commission meeting was held last evening. The majority of the comments were regarding colors of the chiller screening and making sure that it was adequately screened, and then the height of the gym structure and how that would look from various elevations and locations on the site.

Tonight, we're here at the Plan Commission to go over the general consensus for the project. The Village Trustee approval will also come after this, and construction is anticipated to commence late this spring or early summer of 2023 for Westgate.

This is just a summary of the things we are proposing to go through tonight. I'm not going to go through all of them, this is just being used as a reference. But again, these are all the requested actions and variations that we're requesting for this site. Just based on the review with Sam and the Village Staff, this is the list of items we are looking to achieve tonight.

The first slide is our site plan giving an overview of the site. The first portion I would like to point out is where the addition is actually going. It is inside the red box on this floor plan. So, down to the southwest side of the site is where the additional classrooms will be going including the gym spaces, Sam is pointing that out there for me now. So, that is where the majority of all the work related to the construction of the site and building will be going.

If we start at the top, I kind of referenced some things in the site and also tried to include where the variations are required. We are showing some new trees in the west existing parking lot. We're requesting the variation to omit landscape islands in the parking lot that is existing to have a similar condition to what we have now. That will enable us to have more parking spaces and we believe that the adequate landscaping around the site is adequate already. The portions that we're adding as well for additional trees will suffice for that area.

We're requesting a variation to allow a new playground structure on the east side of the facility. Right now, the Village ordinance limits that to 300 square feet. We're looking to go up to 850 square feet even though we don't believe the full structure will be that big. We're just giving us a little bit of buffer space at the layout. We believe it will be similar in scope and size to the existing structure that's there.

The next portion I'd like to point out is the parking lot re-configuration on the east side. We are looking to re-configure that lot. The main driver of this re-configuration

is to close the entrance on the north end of the parking lot to vehicular traffic and only allow that for emergency access. What that will do is allow additional queuing space within the parking lot and get more cars off of the street. So, we're looking to have all the cars come in from the southern end, come through the parking lot and queue up, and allow more cars to queue up in the parking lot spacing and then also through the drive aisle. This is similar to what we did at Olive in 2015 and 2016, and it's done very well allowing traffic to flow through the lot.

We're also looking to improve by adding some parking spaces in that location. By re-configuring it, it allows us to have a net increase of six more parking spaces in that lot in addition to the site.

We do have a variation request for height. The height of the gymnasium space is approximately 27 feet where the Village ordinance right now limits that to 25 feet, so we're requesting a variation on the height of the gym.

We're also requesting a variation to omit landscaping on the western edge of the south parking lot. We believe that we need that space to allow snowplowing and maintenance operations to proceed in that location. Again, it's at the end of a drive aisle so there's no cars pulling up and parking in that location, so we believe that's a reasonable request.

We're also showing on this plan the new underground stormwater system. I'll get into that more later in the slides that are further into the presentation, but the underground stormwater system is intended to be a green space so it will be buried underground, and when it's done it will be usable green space for the site.

Finally, we're requesting a variation to omit the landscape islands and/or landscaping and islands in the southern lot and installing permeable pavers in the center of that parking lot to help with stormwater. Again, we believe that this lot in its existing state, it currently does not have the landscaping islands, we believe that permeable pavers are a sustainable way to achieve some stormwater management and also an attractive way to enhance that parking lot. I also want to point out on the east lot that there will be permeable pavers in that area as well, so we're looking to install some along that edge of the parking lot as well.

This is the general floor plan of the existing building with the overlay of the new addition. Again, the orientation has changed, north is now to your right. Again, the building addition is primarily focused on the southwest corner. The orange section are the new classrooms, yellow section the main areas, the gym with some support spaces as well, there will be new restrooms. There will be one new classroom that is built next to the existing gym. Then not clearly shown on this plan but there will be three classrooms built in the existing gym spaces. So, we'll be taking over the existing gym and three of the classrooms that will be constructed will be housed within the existing square footage of the facility.

So, Sam, were you able to point that out for the existing gym space classroom? Right up, yes, correct, up a little bit, your left. Right in that area, right there. So, those are the areas that we'll be taking over the existing gym and turning those into classroom spaces in addition to the new classrooms that are being built ground up.

This is a rendering, a 3D rendering of the addition. Again, this is looking from the southwest up to the northeast. It shows the gymnasium prominently in the center of the screen showing the limestone coping, the clear story windows that are higher up, the brick that matches the existing building. Again, over to the right is the classroom wing, the primary classroom wing that is being constructed. That is again all new ground-up construction classroom section. Then over to the left, you can see there is a lower portion or lower roof section, that is a newer section that will be housing classroom spaces, and the higher section is

the existing gym spaces that will be re-converted into classroom spaces by adding the limestone coping across there and new windows as well to give light into the space.

Again, the same kind of concept in the elevation plane, again just showing the different elevations of the facility in a 2D rendering. The one thing I do want to point out is on the second one, the elevation number two, west elevation, on the left side there is a chiller screen wall and that was the portion that the Design Commission was commenting on last evening. They recommended to change that from the sand tone color to a bronze tone color. So, we agreed that we would proceed with that as planned, to go forward with the bronze tone color.

In general, the elevations are very similar to the existing building. The design incorporates cues from the existing building and carries them along to the west side while enhancing the elevation a little bit. Where the gym sits currently, it's a large brick wall, lighting the windows and the stone coping, it helps break that up a little bit and make it more aesthetic.

Enrollment and staffing projections. As Sam said or we talked about earlier, the number of students will be going up at this facility, primarily driven by the full-day Kindergarten enrollment and then some enrollment growth in that neighborhood. So, a large majority of this is due to Kindergarten. The thing we see in District 25 is that Kindergarten enrollment is significantly lower than first grade, and that's primarily because we do have a half-day program now. So, parents seek outside services to have their kids in Kindergarten, and then once first grade begins and the full-day program begins for first grade, their students begin attending District 25. So, we anticipate a large portion of the students currently not attending Kindergarten will come to our schools now beginning in K.

So, again, the enrollment currently is around 600 students. We anticipate that to go up to 661 by the '26-'27 school year. The number of staff again, we're currently at 95 and we're projecting that to go up to 102 to just support the full-day Kindergarten and other enrollment needs of the facility.

The chart on the right side shows our current classroom availability of 34. The red bar is our current of what it will go to up to 44. Again, the gap between the red bar and the gray bars is the buffer that the board would like to see at our buildings for the foreseeable future so that we're not overfilling them.

Traffic and parking. Traffic again is a major concern around our schools with the capacity of students that we service and the times of day when they come into the buildings. So, I want to touch base on the drones, the traffic study with the aerial drone footage, the Village of Arlington Heights Traffic Engineering input, and the Village of Arlington Heights Police Department provided their input as well for the site. They did not see any current traffic problems that are outside the norms of a school. They don't see this as a high traffic area related to accidents, and they do not believe that the addition will provide any other concerns regarding traffic beyond what is normal for a school.

Parking at the site is current set up in three parking lots. The parking lot to the west is a drop-off and pickup aisle. The parking lot to the east is also a drop-off and pickup aisle with parking. The parking lot to the south is primarily used for staff. We do not use that parking lot for drop-off and pickup.

So, the total parking capacity at the site is 51 currently in the west lot. It's currently 18 in the east lot, we're going to be up to 24. The parking on the south lot is currently 45 and we look to maintain that. We believe that we'll have 120 parking spaces on site,

it will meet the requirement of 111 from the Village requirements.

During our parking survey currently, we believe 70 percent of the parking spaces were occupied throughout the day. Again, that was a spot check of capacity that we did through a traffic study. We also have two buses and eight taxis at the school. Again, with the large number of students that are serviced throughout the district, that's why we have the larger amount of taxis than we would at a typical school throughout the rest of the district.

This is kind of a stacking map of what we currently have for traffic arrival, again primarily using the west lot and the east lot for this traffic area, just using the pink line to kind of give you a dimensional view of the way it flows now. I also want to go over to the drone footage. So, this was done in September of 2022, giving drone footage of the traffic flow on the site. Again, it's just meant to give a general overview of how cars are flowing into the lot.

So, again, the drone is sitting up on the northeast corner of the site looking back to the southwest towards the main entrance of the school. You can primarily see the east main drop-off area of the school in this picture. If you look back to the west kind of tucked behind the trees, you'll see cars coming off of Grove and snaking into the parking lot along the west side as well.

So, in general, this is the typical flow in the morning. Again, this was done in September when the weather was pretty well, so again there could be a significant amount of cars more in the winter. We're aware of that but we have not encountered a major backup or concern at the arrival time at the school just based on this flow and the way the traffic flows into the site.

So, again, the arrival runs very smoothly at this facility by using two drop-off areas. It really helps break it up. Our concern at this site is always this intersection that the camera is currently sitting at. It's the intersection of Dwyer and Grove, that's where the intersection gets a little more congested at certain points of the day.

I am going to move on. I think that was relatively the time that students use, so that was, again, the time period was about 8:50 to 9:05 was the end of the video.

Traffic departure is a little bit different. The main difference in departure is that parents queue up earlier. So, the school releases at 3:35, you could have parents queuing up at 3:00 o'clock. It's a wide range of when parents get there and want to pick up their kids.

So, in general, this map was designed to show where, about eight minutes or so before student pickup is where the cars are really stacked up pretty heavily, right. So, the main majority of the stacking occurs on Dwyer, in the east drop-off and pickup lot, the west drop-off and pickup lot, and a little bit along Grove Street on the south side of Grove. There are some cars to the west of our site on Grove, and there's also some cars to the east assuming that the parents want to go that way towards the east after school. So, they park on the south side of Grove, east of Dwyer, because they're pointing to the east and most likely would head somewhere to the east after school.

The bus only parking is an indented area on Grove where the buses park. Again, we only have two buses, so they do both queue up in that area. It works well, it keeps them off the street and it doesn't interrupt the overall flow of this site for the flow into the drop-off and pickup lanes.

I'm going to move over to the departure video. Again, this was the same date in September showing the queuing and where the locations are for departure time.

Again, if you note the time, it's about 3:30 right now. You can see that cars are starting queue up on Dwyer and getting very close to the Grove intersection. That's why we feel that the enhancement to that parking lot will particularly help the departure time of the day by getting cars down farther on Dwyer and into our parking lot and allowing cars to stack up in the parking lot.

At that time, students are now being released at about 3:35, so we're a couple of minutes into that. You can see the traffic starting to flow through that east lot, and also cars are flowing through the west lot if you can see them kind of coming out of the back parking lot.

The intersection here at Grove and Dwyer is also controlled by a crossing guard as you can see. So, we do have traffic control measures in place in that location.

As you can see, it's about 3:45 and the site is generally relieved of traffic problems or traffic congestion in the site.

I wanted to show a stacking diagram, again what we have currently on the left versus what we propose on the right. Currently, we believe there's about 35 cars that can stack on site and a little bit on Dwyer. With the proposed additional queuing area, we believe that that will increase up to 53 total cars in kind of the general vicinity and the same areas. So, we believe that the re-configuration of the east parking lot will drastically enhance the amount of cars that can cue on our site and reduce congestion on Dwyer and up to the Grove intersection.

Again, this is just an aerial footage of how we believe this will work. Again, we're going to close it off where the red line is, that lot or that entrance will be closed off to vehicular traffic and only be allowed for emergency vehicles. It will allow cars to park in that location and queue up for the afternoon departure. Then cars will also be able to snake through the parking lot through the south entrance through the lot and back over to the drop-off and pickup lane.

I did just include again an aerial of Olive just to show what that looks like a little bit, how the orientation of that lot will work to give you a better understanding of how cars will flow through the lot. Again, this will be completed in '26. Again, you can kind of see where we close off the entrance, where students are walking up on the larger sidewalk areas. We're proposing that we'd have a concrete apron in that location with a gate that would allow fire and police access and emergency access in that location, but again allowing cars to enter the south and exit on the south and flow through the parking lot that way.

Just another view of the drone just put in a different location to see that.

The main portion that we're trying to accommodate on the site is stormwater and sustainability. Currently, stormwater actually flows tributary to the off-site Wilke-Kirchoff basin. Actually, the driving range that the Park District uses is where our water flows currently. So, we have water storage permitted there from the original construction of this basin. We have approximately two acre feet of storage allowed in that facility.

Working with the Village Engineering, they do not believe that there is any other capacity left in that facility based on high water rainfall events, so we will be proposing to install an underwater storm trap system on the site. On the right side, you can kind of see the southern end of our site. I highlighted that in a green box, kind of where we're proposing to put the underground storm trap. Below, you can kind of see again an accompanying rendering of what that would look like, somewhere out west I believe, but we would be looking to put a grass space over that area of the storm trap to make sure it's usable and flat for our students to use in the community.

So, again, we're looking to, the offset that we need for our site, that we need to accommodate on our site, we're looking to put that all on the storm trap system. In addition, we're looking to have the permeable pavers to help offset that as well, again so the water can infiltrate into the soil and doesn't have to flow through the Village system at all. So, again this system is meant to detain the water for a period of time, slow it down so it doesn't inundate the Village system once a storm event happens.

For sustainability, we will be implementing LED lighting throughout the site. Beyond the scope that we're doing here, we're looking to do extensive renovations at the facility to do LED lighting throughout. We're looking to do high efficiency HVAC with building automation, so we're looking to make sure that we could control the HVAC system, low flow plumbing fixtures, sections of permeable pavers as we talked about. We have several acres of green space that we're going to maintain so we have a large area of green space that people can enjoy and utilize throughout this site.

We have adequate bike storage and ridership. A lot of kids like to ride their bikes to our schools and we have tons of bike racks for them to use. Then we're also exploring future exploration of solar panels. Our board is exploring that future. We are not proposing that with this project. We'll be maybe looking at that further to offset some of the energy needs for the facility into the future. So, solar is something that we are exploring.

That is our presentation for the Westgate Elementary School project. We're open to any questions that you may have after Sam speaks.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you so much for your presentation. Have you read through the Staff report and do you agree on the conditions of approval?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, we do.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, great.

Sam, Staff report please?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Thank you, Chair Dawson.

All right, so all schools in the R-3 district which is where Westgate is located within the Village of Arlington Heights are required to receive a special use permit. Historically, Westgate Elementary has never received a special use permit, and so that requirement is triggered by the proposed building addition. Granting that special use permit will put them into compliance with the zoning code, and Staff is supportive of the request. It is the reason they are before you this evening for a public hearing.

In addition to the requested special use permit, they are, at the request of Staff, agreeable to amending the Comprehensive Plan which classifies a small portion of the southern part of their site as suitable for single-family detached residential. The remaining balance of the site is classified as schools in the Comprehensive Plan. The Village thinks that, to better align the existing uses and future uses of this site with what's envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan, that small portion of single family at the south of the site should be reclassified into schools classification.

Additionally, they are requesting seven variations which I will highlight and discuss, and Ryan did a great job of pointing these out as well during his presentation.

The District has undertaken three different activities to get them to the point they're at this evening. Again, you've heard about the neighborhood meeting that was held in October. They also appeared in front of the Conceptual Plan Review Committee in October as well, and there were no major concerns identified at that point. They received a recommendation

to move forward with a Plan Commission application.

Last night, they appeared in front of the Design Commission and they did receive a recommendation of approval. There were two items that the Design Commission commented on. One was a requirement to change the color of the RTU screen to a dark bronze, and they also recommended, but did not require, that the school district look into improving the existing RTU on the site with some screening.

So, here's an aerial of the site. You can see it bounded in yellow. The portion at the bottom of the site shaded in yellow, that's the portion that is currently within the single-family detached classification in the Comprehensive Plan that would be switched to schools to unify the classification within the Comprehensive Plan. The area shaded in red is where the proposed building addition would be. As you can see, the building addition is centrally located on the site and behind the building and between the building and the neighboring playground.

This is a corner lot, so by code, technically, the shorter of the frontages along the public street is considered the front yard. Although practically speaking, most people would probably consider the Dwyer side, the east side of the site, as the front yard, but from a code standpoint the front yard is on the north. I would point out that there are no setback variations requested as part of the approvals by the school district this evening.

Here's an aerial of the neighborhood. You can see it's overwhelmingly residential. A little bit farther on the west there is Princeton. So, on the west you can see Princeton. Harvard is to the south, and then farther down you'll see Kirchoff. Then of course to the north is Grove Street, and on the east side is Dwyer.

Here is the site plan. The colored area is where the proposed building addition will be located, which Ryan has already discussed. I'll point out some of the variations again. First, there is the variation for the playground equipment. Technically, the front yard is to the north, making this area the side yard. Playground structures are classified as accessory structures which are required to be located behind the rear of the building. This location being the side yard, it requires a variation. Staff is supportive of this variation because it is over 100 feet from Dwyer Avenue, it's screened to the north by the building, and it will not cause any undue adverse impacts on neighboring areas.

Additionally, there is the square footage variation requested. Accessory structures are limited to 300 square feet by code. A maximum of 850 square feet is proposed for this playground equipment. It will meet the 15-foot height maximum required by code, and the rubber area for the play area is going to limit the overall size of that equipment. So, Staff is supportive of that variation as well. We think it's very likely that it won't even get close to the requested 850 square-foot size.

You heard about the underground detention area, that area is shaded in blue on the site plan. Then you've heard about the revised parking lot area which currently enters in this way and exits that way. It's going to be re-constructed, closing off the north entrance, allowing for more stacking along Dwyer, and then cars circulating through the site will create more stacking room for pickup operations.

One of the things that Staff and the Fire Department worked with the school district on was the fire access through here. One of the conditions of approval as identified in the Staff report was to ask the school district to continue working with us on some circulation and egress issues. They have proposed keeping this entrance open which was originally proposed to be closed, as you can see here in this site plan, but they will be keeping

this entrance open and putting a gate here. Their most recent plans show the gate being within the public right-of-way. So, keeping this entrance open has addressed our concerns about circulation and egress for emergency services into the East parking lot, and so we're recommending an adjustment to that condition of approval just to keep that gate on the west side of the sidewalk and on the school district property.

Again, you can see here the building elevations. They are requesting a variation for the height of the gymnasium. It's proposed at 27 feet tall, code limits the maximum height to 25 feet tall, so it's a two-foot overage above code requirements. We are supportive of this variation. There is a legitimate need for quality indoor recreation opportunities for students which this gym would provide. Again, it's centrally located in the site, it's not immediately abutting any single-family homes, and then the minor scope of the variation at only two feet above code leads to the Village support.

Here's the landscape plan. I'll point out some of the variations again. You can see the first variation, code requires that any stretch of 20 parking spaces have interim landscape islands. The existing parking lot here will be re-constructed, triggering the need to update to code requirements which would require a median landscape island in the center because these two rows contain over 20 parking spaces in the row. We are supportive of this variation. The existing parking lot is constrained by the building to the east, property line to the west, and building at the south. So, there's not much room to expand it while keeping the same number of parking spaces but also providing the code-required island.

There is a legitimate need to maintain these parking spaces here. The parents use this parking lot for parking for pickup in the afternoons. So, to have these parking spaces, to have as many parking spaces as possible, will help to reduce some of the stacking along Grove Street. Additionally, there is substantial greenery in this area. There's a large, mature row of arborvitae on the west side of the parking lot, in addition to parking lot islands on the north and south of the row, and so we are supportive of that variation as well.

The other variations relate to the south parking lot. There is the screening required at the western side of the parking lot, and then there are landscape islands which are required by code. You can kind of see it a little bit better here on the zoom in of the plan, again the screen required on the west side of the parking lot and the islands in these locations within the parking lot.

We are supportive of these variations as well. As you've heard, this will be a permeable paver installation which has a better aesthetic than pavement and can slightly mitigate for the loss of the shade trees and parking lot landscape islands. Additionally, the expansive open space to the west of the south parking lot justifies the variation to the screening, so we are supportive of that as well.

Finally, drop-off, pickup and parking: Relative to code requirements, the site complies with code. 120 spaces are required, I'm sorry, are provided, and 111 are required, leading to a nine-space surplus compared to code.

You've heard about some of the drop-off and pick-up and stacking issues. You know, with the introduction of more students and the full-day Kindergarten, that's only going to further contribute to the existing congestion during peak times. One of the main items that Staff noted in review of the traffic study was that it was based on the 2026-2027 enrollment numbers showing 661 students and 39 classrooms. But as you've heard, the school district is building out beyond that estimate, 15 percent beyond that to include up to 44 classrooms. So, the traffic study was based on the scenario that's likely expected, but the school

is building out capacity for 15% beyond that.

So, Staff had a little concern that given the additional traffic for the Kindergarten, and then the potential for the school to have 15 percent over projected volumes as outlined in the traffic study, that there could be unforeseen traffic issues. So, as a condition of approval, we are recommending that if the school district finds this site to exceed the projected 661 peak student capacity, that they be required to notify us and meet and determine if there are going to be any drop-off/pickup issues or parking issues. If they can adequately address that with Staff, then that will be fine. But if we can't reach an agreement as far as, you know, there being issues and their ability to address those, then they would be required to amend the special use permit.

Otherwise, we are supportive of this application, recommending approval subject to the conditions within the Staff report and summarized here. Again, you'll notice that condition number four has been slightly adjusted to reflect the resolution of the egress and emergency service vehicle circulation within that east lot. So, that concludes my presentation and I'm happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you, Sam.

All right, Commissioners, do I have a motion to include the Staff report into the record?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll move to include the Staff report and the Petitioner's report.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And I'll make the second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed or abstain?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, great.

Okay, so before we open to public commentary, do you have any initial questions for the Petitioner? Let's start down here.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I do have one question I guess as it relates to the traffic.

Ryan, I guess I would ask you if the new traffic flow that you have where everything is funneling into the southerly egress point or access point on that site, when you showed your lines of movements, you were kind of showing everything kind of coming down from the north and then snaking in. Are we going to, there is permitted left-hand movements into that drive, and are there permitted left-hand movements out of that drive?

MR. SCHULZ: I know for sure in.

Steve, do you have any opinion on the out of the drive? Is there a left-turn permitted out of that drive? Steve Corcoran is our Traffic Engineer.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right. Could you come up to the microphone if you're answering? Yes, and just again, say your --

MR. SCHULZ: But, again, I do believe we anticipate that there would be left-turn permitted in the parking lot. I believe that we'd be open to discussing the left-turn out.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Can we get his name in the record?

MR. SCHULZ: Although we've seen that there, even with as much sign as we can and as much as we try to enforce it to prohibit the left-turn out of a parking lot or whatever way we're trying to, it's very, very, very hard to enforce unless the police are there regularly.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, and so my question would be, and maybe this is better suited for Steve, the setup you're putting in is, you know, let's call it free movement in and out. Has that been working? It sounds like that's probably been working in and out because it looks like you're replicating what's going on at Olive because it hasn't caused any issues at Olive so they may not cause any issues here. I'm sorry, Steve, you need to check in.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes, sorry. Before you speak, if you could say and spell your last name for the record?

MR. CORCORAN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. CORCORAN: Good evening. My name is Stephen Corcoran, C-o-r-c-o-r-a-n. I'm Director of Traffic Engineering at Eriksson Engineering Associates out of Grayslake.

To answer your question, the left-turn in is prohibited, the left-turn out is not prohibited, but from our traffic counts, it was I think five or seven cars making that left in illegally, so it's not really being violated very much at this point.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: And it has not caused any issues at Olive to date since we've made that change?

MR. CORCORAN: I don't think, there's no turn restrictions at Olive.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I guess that would be my question. So, thank you, Steve. I appreciate that insight. I'm sorry, I did have, I just have one more question.

I guess my other question would be for Sam here. On condition number one, I mean, if District 25 has an increase in students, there's not a whole lot they can do about it. I mean, the referendum people have spoken and we've got to go with some more space in the school. If it hits the 661, I mean, what are we going to do about it? We're going to meet with them and then, I mean, it's not like they have more land I mean to, I would imagine they're going to come to you, they're going to work with you and they're going to figure out, okay, this isn't working, we need to change the flow here. But, you know, if administrative approval is not granted, an amendment to the special use permit shall be required, I don't know what we expect the school to do. I mean, there's going so many kids, they've got the building they've got, we're going to work with them to try to enhance this, but I think it's a tough standard to hold the school district to in my opinion, and I don't know how we would even, what would we ask them to come back and do for a special permit?

I mean, it's going to increase traffic, right, there's more people, it's going to increase traffic, we know that. There may be more stacking, but what can we do about it?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. No, it's a fair point. I mean, I guess it's just for a worst case scenario; let's say their traffic exceeds all forecasted estimates and, you know, even with enrollment at 661 students, it's creating issues that we can't resolve. They meet with us, they say we're actually going beyond 661, and we say, okay, well, in order to address that, you need to do A and B. They say, well, we don't think we can do A, and B might not be feasible. So, in that case it would be, okay, you don't agree with Staff, we can't reach a resolution, now let's take it to the Plan Commission and the Village Board and see what we can resolve that way and potentially add, you know, additional conditions or analyses to solve that issue.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: And Ryan, you indicated that that condition is okay with the school district?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, we're accepting of that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other questions before public commentary?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No? How about on this end?

Yes, Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, I understand what you're saying about the new traffic flow and I had the same question as Commissioner Cherwin.

What is the population of Westgate compared to Olive?

MR. SCHULZ: The overall, you're just asking the overall enrollment?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, greater, lesser, what?

MR. SCHULZ: It is very close, but I believe Westgate is slightly more. Let me pull that up. I think it's very close.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, so it's not significantly more.

MR. SCHULZ: No, it's very close.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: That the traffic would be somewhat different and you might have more instances of people violating turns and causing accidents?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, go ahead.

MR. CORCORAN: Sorry. The difference between Westgate and Olive is Olive only has one parking lot for the drop-off. Here we have two. Currently, the west lot is only being used for the half-day Kindergarten drop-off. No one else is supposed to be back there in terms of the other grades. So, with the inclusion of that, anyone is going to be able to use the west lot and so they don't have to go through the east side. If they're coming from the west, obviously that's ideal. Then, obviously, we're making improvements to those lots --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'm a little skeptical about the west, yes, the west lot for everybody pickup because you do have the Integrated Services, and that's where the taxis are. I know there was a lot of discussion, I live in that neighborhood, my kids went to school there, there was a lot of discussion about restricting it because of age of the kids, how long it takes them to get into the car, the Integrated Services. I'm a little bit skeptical that you're going to open that all up and it's going to work A-OK, but I'll give you that. That was my only question as of right now.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, so then what we'll do is we'll open up to public commentary. Okay, so we're opening up for public commentary, I am not sure how many people are here to speak on Westgate or if you're just listening or if you're here for the next petition. So, what I'll do is start on this side.

Is there anyone here on the front row who wishes to speak on the Westgate petition? Front row?

Okay, if you could state your name, spell your last name for us, and if you're willing to give us your address it's optional, but it helps us to understand where you are in relation to the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY ON PC#22-016

MS. MUHR: Sure. I'm Christine Muhr, M-u-h-r. I live at 441 South Princeton, so backing up to the Westgate playground area. First of all, I want to say I am

impressed with just all the thoughtful planning that's gone into the project. I love Arlington Heights, I love living near Westgate. It's always been, for the most part, a very pleasant experience.

I just want to give the point of view of a neighbor to a really large addition to the school. I understand why, you know, 10 classrooms and a very tall gymnasium, but it will affect the neighbors around. There's a lot of noise that like ricochets off the wall of the back of Westgate, and the people on Princeton, we hear that. So, I am anticipating that that will, you know, be even more because we have even now, the building will be much closer to our homes and taller. So, I just wanted to bring up just that.

I'm glad to hear that the drainage situation is being addressed with the additional square on the property. I've lived in my home 21 years, so I was there when the whole thing was flooded numerous times. So, the additional drainage that has been put in around the playground area has seemed to work really well. So, I just wanted to say I hope that will stay where it is and I'm glad that we have additional drainage coming as well.

One question I had is based on the population of the school, what is the recommended blacktop square footage for a population of Westgate? I'm very happy about the east side playground going in. I think that will accommodate some of the students which I think is wonderful, because it is very, very, very loud on the west side of Westgate during recess and even after school and so on. There are a lot of students out there playing, and right along all of our backyards, right up to the fences, hanging on the trees, you know, all of that.

So, I'm glad to hear that there is that additional playground being put in. I do have a question. Is that going to be just for Kindergartners or will that also accommodate the older grades? Because if it would accommodate some of the older grades, that would be kind of nice to offset some of the population on the west side.

I don't know if this is the right place to bring this up but I'm glad to hear that there are some additional trees going in. I noticed that the kids don't really have too many places to go when it's really hot and sunny, and they end up congregating underneath our trees which are not that impressive. So, I'd love to see some trees for the kids.

I did hear tonight that the bushes are going to be taken out around the staff lot which I know is accommodating more space for cars and that's very important. But just for the natural aesthetics of the property, I hope that some bushes or trees will be put in as many places as possible just to help the area just look a little bit nicer.

That might be the end of it. I just had another question. So, the other three schools that have the gyms that have been put in recently, are those 25 feet tall or did those get special permits to be 27 feet tall? I'm just curious if this is taller than the other ones or is it the same height as the other ones.

Again, I just want to say that I'm very pleased with District 25 and Ryan's planning, but these were just some of the concerns and questions that I wanted to offer from a neighbor's perspective. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

Anyone else in that front row? Come on up. Again, state your name, spell your last name, and if you're willing to provide your address, please do.

MS. DOHENY: Nancy, last name is Doheny, D-o-h-e-n-y. I live at 501 South Princeton, also backing straight up to the playground at Westgate.

Again, I just wanted to say the same things that Christine said. There is a large echo that comes off those buildings right into our backyard. We don't have any bushes

covering our backyard. We have a wire, you know, fence, and I feel like with the building addition, it will push the kids closer to our property lines.

Right now I work from home and I do have to go outside and tell the kids to get off my fence because they do jump on it. They play football and they hit my fence. My fence is starting to show spots and wear from where the kids have fallen back into the fence. I just feel like if we remove that portion of the playground where the new addition will be, it will push the kids closer to our property line.

I don't know if there's any other areas to bring the kids out because there is, the land is not exactly flat. Again, like Christine said, with the trees and the shade, they do congregate towards our property line because we do have the shade that they are looking for during the hot days. So, I didn't know if there was any other investigation for possible shade structures for them, but again, I just wanted to give some comments from a neighbor's perspective.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

All right, anyone else in that row? All right, how about any of the rows behind there? Anyone?

Hi, all right. State your name, spell your last name, and provide your address if you're willing to do so.

MS. CAYER: Melissa Cayer, C-a-y-e-r. Did District 25 pay for the building permits --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: We're just --

MS. CAYER: -- or are they free?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: We'll address questions and comments. You know, it's just, if you could give your public comment, we'll address everything after.

MS. CAYER: All right. Also, I see a lot of these water retention/detention holes around Arlington Heights that look empty most of the time, and they have very little water in them. I'm worried about losing so much topsoil. What happens to all that topsoil? So, I would maybe get a second opinion about that. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Anyone else on this side of the room? All right, then I'll go over onto this side of the room. I think front row is all school district people. So, anyone in the back interested in coming up and speaking on the Westgate project?

Yes, come on up. Again, state your name, spell your last name and provide your address if you're so willing.

MR. BOODRO: William Boodro, B-o-o-d-r-o. I live on 827 South Roosevelt. I'm really hear to speak about the Dryden project but I do want to make a couple of statements about Westgate.

First of all, I looked at the plans for Dryden, and now I've noticed that I didn't find them in Westgate regarding this retention area. I was here in 2011 when this place was full with people who were complaining about the after effects and the deluge that we had in which there was massive flooding, not only on my street but particularly in the Westgate area. Now, one of the people who came up and spoke basically said it seemed like every two or three years Westgate was flooding.

A massive production like this is going to make flooding even worse. I read through some of the stuff online and I didn't see anything about what's the capacity, how much water can this retention, the storm retention, you know, take in. At the same time, I also

noticed that it not just that it takes it in, it slows it down, but it's still putting it out into the sewer system. So, there's still going to be flooding.

Back then in 2011, the Board of Trustees talked about some, I forget what name it was, but there was some report from the 1970s that I think they had to get out of storage. Essentially, this has all been basically predicted because of the way the sewer system is set up in the downtown area over here by Westgate and over here by Roosevelt, is that when we get a major storm, there's going to be massive flooding, okay.

I don't think this little storm pit, French drain, whatever you want to call it, is going to do anything to prevent that, not just for Westgate, but also over at Dryden. So, that's number one. So, I don't think, until you get more information, you're in a position to give District 25 any type of variances or permits, special use permits for either Westgate or Dryden.

Also, the population of both, of Westgate has decreased. I noticed that the figures that they used were from 2021, and I think they said there was 600 students at Westgate and the building is being perfectly utilized, 100 percent utilized. Well, that was from the year before. This year, there's 586 students at Westgate, so you've got a drop of 14, okay. In fact, the 661, I don't know where they get these numbers, but I have attended a couple of school board meetings and I will continue to go to the school board meetings because I guess I want to, I look at my tax bill, there are 16 entities that tax my property and the biggest one is District 25.

Just got my bills, 37 percent of my overall bill is for District 25. So, the number that they're using is down. In fact, if you go back, and this is from their own presentation, it's online, you can check it out, but the highest number of students they've had is 621 at Westgate and that's back in 2015. You're putting in, and the total number of Kindergarten students for this year for all of District 25 is 412. That's down from last year when it was 469. So, I don't know where the numbers are, where they're coming up with these numbers saying they're going to 600 and some odd.

This is like the field of dreams, build it and they will come. Well, I'm not so sure that's actually true. With the way that, you know, the storm is and the flooding may be, it may be wet fields of dreams as opposed to anything else.

But in addition to that, I don't know if, Jay over here talked about the referendum, okay. Well, the referendum, I'll be perfectly honest with you, I'm still trying to figure out how it passed, how we went from, I voted no. The reason I voted no was, as a friend of mine would say, there are things you need to have and there are things that are nice to have. Well, we have half-day Kindergarten.

I've been here since 2000, so I've been a resident for 22 years. Never heard an issue about half-day Kindergarten, but now we want to do full-day Kindergarten. So, now we've gone from something that we need to have to something that's nice to have. So, if you look at 412 students, you don't need 25 classrooms for 412 students if you put them full time. At most you need maybe 10 more classrooms.

But the reason I'm going back to the voting is because the voting, only 28 percent of the registered voters in Arlington Heights voted in the election. The yes votes came out 50 ahead, so 50 votes. So, this isn't something overwhelming. In fact, I was talking to one of the Village Trustees, he was telling me a few years ago, before my time, 1999, the Village had a referendum regarding I guess video gambling at the Arlington Racetrack. It won 51 to 49, but they still turned it down. So, they didn't have video gambling at the racetrack because it was too divisive an issue.

Well, I spoke at the school board; I was actually quoted in the Daily

Herald. You know, just because you can do something doesn't mean you should do something. They never should have sold the bonds that they sold but they did. Now, and the way it was set up for us was that it's going to raise your property rates on a \$400,000 home \$300. Well, it's always interesting how you use dollars when the dollars are low instead of percentages. When the percentages are low and the dollars are high, you use percentages. So, for the next 20 years, the average \$400,000 house in Arlington Heights is going to be assessed \$300. That's a 7.2 percent increase over prior year's assessment, okay.

In addition, they're going to also tax us 5.7 percent in the next budget. So, that \$300 is going to turn out to be about \$600. So, you're going to get a 12.7 percent increase, okay, and that 7.2 is for the next 20 years, and that 5.7 percent is basically cost of interest. So, then when you add these 25 rooms and you add, I think, I was at the meeting last night, they were saying it's going to add \$1.3 million per year for teachers for the full-day Kindergarten, okay. It's also going to add about \$970,000 I believe per year for custodians. So, you're talking about \$1.4 million that nobody told us.

So, the question really is would this referendum have passed had people known that they were going to have a 10 to 12 percent increase? That doesn't include the new re-assessment we're going to all have this year. Based on one of the properties that I looked at, it's going up about 409 to 470, so there could be a 15 percent increase next year on our property taxes. 37 percent of the overall tax rate is District 25. That means you're going to have five percent, so look at your tax bill from last year from December when you paid it and multiply it by your overall by five percent. Now, of course that doesn't include the Forest Preserve which got \$21 or \$20 which is a 33 percent increase.

So, the point is you don't have enough information here to grant these variances to District 25 and you shouldn't do it now until you know exactly how much stormwater, this stupid contraption, I call it a stupid contraption because I don't understand it, but what that can do. All it reminds me of is, I don't know if you remember back in the day, I think it was Mayor Daley when they had the constrictors that they put in the sewer lines in Chicago that was supposed to slow the flow into the storm drain. Well, everybody's basement flooded back in the 90's, didn't work.

I don't see how you can go forward with any of this stuff, particularly in light of the fact that, one, I think you have pie in the sky, illusory projections as to what the actual need is. You're overbuilding. You have 15 percent, so you're putting 10 classrooms at Westgate and four at Dryden, and you're not going to use it. So, you're going to have, so you're going to be building out space on projections that really don't meet what's actually happened because we never come close to what they're saying they project over the next five years as far as new population on any of these schools in District 25.

So, those are my comments. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

Anyone else on that side of the room?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, with that, we're going to close public commentary. So, we're re-opening then for questions. I know I have a list I wrote down of some of the various questions that were asked by the public. I'm hoping, I'm assuming some of us will be asking for information.

Why don't we start down then with you Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, at this point, I only have one question. I'd

like to have Sam comment on how the issue of stormwater is going to be treated, what the Village does, what the engineers do and so forth that might at least explain the process so we'll have some clue as to whether we're going to have anywhere close to the capacity built that we need.

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. So, there's been extensive work done on the stormwater issue to date. You know, there have been calculations on the expected stormwater runoff with the detention volume as required in order to meet codes, both Village codes and MWRD codes. The design put forth meets both Village and MWRD requirements given the underground detention basin which will capture water and store it before it slowly releases it into the Village system so that during high rain events when the Village system is at capacity, the water generated at Westgate will be stored on site there. Then when the high rain events start to drain through the Village system, stormwater is slowly released from the Westgate site into our system when our system is not at capacity.

So, we're supportive of the design at this point and we don't anticipate this to, you know, have any exacerbation on, you know, flooding or stormwater in the neighborhood. Oftentimes, it will improve. I know they're putting in a curb I believe on the western edge of the parking lot which will help with stormwater runoff towards the west. So, a lot of times these projects will actually improve drainage and runoff.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And I guess I do have one other question. Is there anything the Village can do or require to mitigate the noise that was mentioned by a couple of our residents? Whether requiring some landscaping beyond what's there in terms of trees or whatever, is there anything that we can do that will help with that noise issue and the issue of the kids climbing on fences, wire fences that are there?

MR. HUBBARD: I mean, I think that primarily, you know, with the climbing and noise, it's going to be up to enforcement of the school district and the teachers that are out there monitoring the kids' activities. The Village could certainly look into and ask the school district to consider some additional landscape treatments on the western side on the site. They could install a fence, which may only have a minimal impact on the noise and ricocheting echo effect, but I mean, any landscaping or fence, unless it is an 8' tall solid masonry fence, is probably going to have only a minimal effect on noise.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, at this point, I'll defer to others.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, to continue on to both items that Commissioner Jensen brought up, for one of the residents, it is an underground detention so it is not like some of the other detention basins where, you know, you actually see the detention. This is flat. It's all an underground system so there is not that empty look.

The other item was, is the arborvitae going all the way down to the southernmost portion of the property line or does it only go as far as like the concrete area?

MR. SCHULZ: The arborvitae are existing. If you see the asphalt play area on the west side of the building, just past that, just slightly past the playground. So, right where Sam is, right there, roughly in that location is where the arborvitae are at right now. I believe that the arborvitae were installed when the addition was put on in the mid-90's, again, as a screening to the parking lot and the main asphalt play area. So, I think that was the condition that was done in the mid-90's on why the arborvitae had to be put in.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, well, to address issues that maybe you're hearing for the first time from residents, I would ask that you consider putting additional arborvitae all the way down to the southernmost edge of the property line.

MR. SCHULZ: We would be open to exploring that. Again, we will get

varying opinions from different neighbors on their views, so we would have to take that into consideration as well. Some may not want it, some will want it, so we would take that into consideration if we would continue to explore that.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I've got a few questions for the school district. Mr. Boodro made some good points about the projections. Can we hear your side of the argument?

MR. SCHULZ: You're just asking for how did we get to what we're showing that are projections?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SCHULZ: We use a professional demographer every two years or so. We hire a professional demographer to look at everything in Arlington Heights, and specifically for each school. They take into account changeover in housing new housing that will be coming in, birth rates, housing turnover, various numbers of calculations that go into this program. We've been using, they give us a range of where the projections will come in at, and we typically have been going with the projections for enrollment at the facilities.

So, we anticipate that these numbers will pan out. Again, a large portion of these numbers coming in will be from the Kindergarten enrollment bump that we're going to be seeing coming in from the facility from Kindergarten program to get up to that 661 in several years. We believe in year one that we won't have that full match with the first grade. We think it will still be probably a little bit short of that first grade number because people will be getting used to the new Kindergarten full-day program. But we anticipate by years two, three and so forth that that number will get extremely close to matching the first grade enrollment.

I'll have Stacey Mallek add any comments that she may have, Assistant Superintendent for Business for District 25.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Could you just state your name, spell your last name? Thank you.

MS. MALLEK: Yes. Stacey Mallek, M-a-l-l-e-k. I'm the Assistant Superintendent for Business for the school district.

The enrollment increase at Westgate is also due to, over the next five years, a number of new developments that have already been approved by the Village. We work with the Village to estimate the student counts based on a variety of formulas, but then our demographer also considers that information in that area. So, out of those developments, I believe there's about 50 additional students coming just out of those new developments over the next five years.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you for that. Could you also, the Integrated Services, could you tell me what that's all about? Some examples?

MS. MALLEK: So, Integrated Services is one of our special education programs. It's students all over the district that meet the, have the needs that are serviced by the Integrated Services program where they spend a portion of their day in an instructional classroom. Special ed classrooms are limited in the number of students they can have for class, anywhere from seven to 10 is the maximum number of students, special ed students that can be in a classroom. For a portion of the day, they are then integrated with their typical peers in either a regular classroom if that's something that works for them, or into art, music and PE so they can have the best experience that they can have with their typical peers but then get their regular instruction in the environment in which they best are serviced.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

Sam, a couple of questions. Going back to the stormwater, so the building, I assume the building is pretty well designed. Is there some hiccups that went into satisfying the stormwater requirements?

MR. HUBBARD: No. On a preliminary basis, we're very comfortable with what we've seen. Final engineering has not completed so the final design has not been finalized, but it's substantially there and we're comfortable with it meeting all of our requirements.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and we've had a lot of meetings amongst us about landscaping and we're very strict on landscaping requirements, especially the islands with trees in them. Now, you mentioned that some of the south end is being waived because of the landscaping that's there already or that exists, but could you explain again on the northwest parking lot, why we're giving --

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, so it's an existing parking lot. You know, there is a requirement for two landscape islands, one on each row right here. It would be hard to extend the parking lot any and expand it so that you could maintain the number of parking spaces while also installing the code-required islands. So, we felt that was a hardship. There is a very mature dense row of arborvitae on the west side that provide some screening for the parking lot already, and there are landscape islands on both ends of the parking row that provide the code-required tree.

So, we felt, given that this is just a re-construction of an existing lot, they're not expanding it and they really don't have any room to expand it, we felt they met the standards for approval.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and why do we have to go 27-foot for the gym here and only 25 for Dryden?

MR. HUBBARD: I guess that will be a better question for the school district in the design.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, 27 feet is the standard for a gymnasium clearance. Again, Don or, maybe he'll answer that a little bit further for relative heights in the gym. 25 feet at Dryden is matching existing, so that's why. That's currently an existing gym and the structure is already there, so we're matching the height that's existing at Dryden already. You've heard of the grade, that's the height at Dryden, so that's the difference. Don Hansen would best --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, that's fine, that's fine. Thank you.

MR. SCHULZ: Okay, sure.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Could you, just to piggyback on it, there's another question about comparison to other additions, 27 versus 25.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes. To my recollection, there were variations requested on other sites for the heights of the gyms.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: If you can answer that, if you could state your name and spell your last name for us?

MR. HANSEN: I'm Don Hansen, H-a-n-s-e-n. I'm with STR Partners, Architects.

So, the gymnasium at Olive School was at 25 feet. The gymnasium at Thomas Middle School was actually at 30 feet. So, there we met the volleyball clearances below the structure.

You know, the Westgate gym, it's just a little bit higher than the existing gym and we think the height will help with athletic activities and physical education.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Do you recall the Windsor height?

MR. HANSEN: I don't recall the height. We matched the existing height of the school.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, so that one may have also been 25.

MR. HANSEN: Quite possibly.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Likely, okay.

MR. HANSEN: I don't know that it exceeded 25.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, any other questions?

Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Just a couple of technical questions, maybe Mr. Corcoran, one on traffic and the circulation. Are there any apps that are available to parents to kind of stage the pickup of their children? The point is that some, you know, park at 3:00 o'clock and some, you know, come later. So, if there is any way that there's some communication or some technology that can lessen the concentration to some of the congestion?

MR. CORCORAN: A couple of my, excuse me, a couple of my school district clients do have apps specific for their school where when the parent gets to the pickup area, they get the number in the app that shows up in a gymnasium. That number comes up and a teacher then sends that child or family out to get picked up.

We haven't investigated that for this location. I think the difficulty may be that normally, the ones I've seen it done have a gym that has doors adjacent to the parking lot pickup area so the kids can all wait in the gym en masse. I'm not sure the building here is quite set up for that, for the two drop-offs that we have.

So, that's an operational thing we can look at, but --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'm just looking, you know, in the future, you know, you're building for today but, you know, that can be 15 or 20 years that --

MR. CORCORAN: Oh, 15-20 years --

COMMISSIONER DROST: -- making sure you get the right child, the security issues, the whole waterfall of, you know, those issues.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: If I can just interject on the parents' communication? As a mom at Windsor, but not any longer, it's been years, believe me, the school continually tried to express to parents to not arrive early. Good luck telling parents not to do it. So, the school tried and tried and tried, there were constantly e-mails, and the parents still continued to show up. So, unless we can get the police I guess, I don't even know if we could, I would say the school district and the schools are very good at trying to alleviate that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Good to know. Then on the demographics, when you're looking at projections and sort of solidifying what you are preaching right now, thank you, is there any way from past history to prove out the consultant's prophecies? Give us some re-assurance that when you're coming up with 661 and, you know, making these projections into 2026, that something in the past was there to support those calculations.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, I believe seven or eight years ago, a different demographer was used for some of the studies and we saw that their numbers weren't accurate. So, they went back to Carta, and his numbers have been highly accurate on the E level of projections for the district, across the district at various buildings. Also, they have been very close. Again, I don't know off the top of my head what percentage range, but it's usually within several students that he's been accurate for all of our elementary schools and middle schools.

So, again, using that demographer is very helpful. He's been very valid and helps us on staffing, helps on projecting with building usage. So, again, those numbers

have been very accurate and helpful.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I think that's important, you know, when you're looking at taxpayers and, you know, I think most of us pay real estate taxes here, that that's important as an issue.

Last question is with regard to the noise, and this is the noise-o-meter technology. Isn't there a way to kind of control that? I'm thinking of the neighbor, not Christine but Nancy, and this probably goes along the whole block on Princeton. If the noise level, there's ways to regulate those and that somebody is supervising, you can almost have an immediate reaction to when things get out of hand. So, it's really an enforcement issue and it seems simple if you've got the technology. Again, working on the technology side of this stuff. So, if she can call or press the button where you've got a decibel reading that says, hey, it's too high.

MR. SCHULZ: I mean, it was tried at one of our middle, or elementary lunch rooms. There was a stoplight that would go on and turn red when the loud sound got to a certain level. It just wasn't enforced properly and it was actually removed. So, it wasn't effective. Again, I'm not aware of anything. We'll have to look at the building administration on that a little bit more. I'm not fully versed on how they would enforce that more at recess.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, it's a management issue.

MR. SCHULZ: It is.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I mean, those are solvable because, you know, you can maybe control the kids, but we like the idea, too, of them using the bikes and walking and getting healthy and getting together again, making this post-pandemic experience meaningful and official. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, I have, Mr. Schulz, one question, and more out of general curiosity with the whole referendum for the full-day school. It seems like there's a lot of additional stuff that's been added into that. It's not just the full-day school, right?

MR. SCHULZ: The referendum was intended to again support these additions to do the full-day Kindergarten. The other portion of it is to maintain our existing buildings. So, there's a large capital spend that will be coming with this to renovate the interior buildings that are in need of repair, from galvanized piping to HVAC to flooring, a large thing, roofing, a large contingent of items across the district that are being addressed with that money as well. So, again, a portion of it is to support full-day K but another large portion is to support the existing buildings that we have to get them up and make sure that they're maintained into the future.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and with this school, the 10 additional classrooms, are those going to actually be used by the Kindergarten classes or will some of your overflow be in those?

MR. SCHULZ: Not necessarily. So, again, we are building these classrooms to be K-5 classrooms. They will not be solely dedicated to Kindergarten. It will be up to the building administration on how they want to stack their building and where Kindergarten needs to go in relation to restrooms or where it works for them to flow into the building. So, we don't know that yet, but again the building, the classrooms are to provide capacity for the building. Where the administration decides to stack K through 5, that will be up to their decision and where to put their support services and things like that. Again, we don't know where those all will be right now but we know they need the spaces.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so these 10 classrooms might not be

used for the Kindergarten program at all.

MR. SCHULZ: May not.

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

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have no further questions. My questions have been already addressed.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, Commissioner Cherwin?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I have just a few follow-ups on what some of our neighbors have said here. One, if I may ask Ryan, I think there's a question of permit payment. I mean, I don't know if that's something you can --

MR. SCHULZ: Yes. So, again, as a public school district of Illinois, we do not seek a building permit per se through the Village. We seek that through the Regional Office of Education which is an Illinois body. We do seek permits for stormwater and other things that are in the public right-of-way, so we do have a payment that we typically make on permitting for those types of items. So, again it's usually limited in scope, so the amount is very low in general because, again, we're not seeking a formal building permit which is done through the state.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, and there was also a question about topsoil runoff. I guess my thought would be, you know, with development and everything, you have to apply for a stormwater pollution prevention plan. Is that going to be part of the whole process?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, that will be with our construction manager, and that's to maintain any silt fencing or any other pollution prevention or requirements through the construction process will be part of that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: And a question quick for Sam, we talked about stormwater a couple of times. We have an underground vault coming in. You're comfortable with the engineering plans the Petitioner has put together with their technical experts. Our folks have reviewed it at least at this point in the process, and then I guess the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District as well. Those are all right now in line with expectations?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. In our review of their preliminary engineering plans, we are satisfied and comfortable with them moving forward at this point.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, I think, you know, from our perspective, with the level of technical expertise, we are required to, you know, rely on those and, you know, so I think that's very helpful.

The other, you know, as far as the noise, I guess I'd follow up on George's issue, you know, I want to know how you parent your kids because if you can keep them that quiet, I need to know because my house is very, very loud.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, well, the solution here in our family is duct tape.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Duct tape, okay, I appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Both around the wrists and the mouth.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I appreciate that, George, that's on the record. So, you know, I just don't, I mean, this is like a school, so noise, lights, traffic, you know, if it's a huge problem you just move somewhere else. You know, you're like moving next to a school, so there's naturally going to be a lot of that, I think we just have to understand that. I do agree that we should make an effort to accommodate the neighbors to the extent we can on landscaping.

I think one of our neighbors had mentioned, too, some additional

trees, and I think we really addressed that. But consider, even maybe if it's on the westerly side of that south parking lot, some tree lines that might give them some, you know, shade that we talked about, and I think those are some simple accommodations we can make to maybe mitigate that. Then as Mary Jo said with the arborvitaes coming south, I hope that you can work with the neighbors and the Staff to do that.

Then, I mean, the last thing I would say is, you know, to be addressed is, you know, this issue about the referendum and everything. I mean, that's, you know, at this point, we're not here to litigate the propriety of that referendum. The referendum passed and that's, you know, the school district, I mean, will have to act on that, and that's what they're doing here.

I think the demographics, this is not an exact science. They're doing I think the best they can with the expert to project. I guess one last question I have on the demographics, I mean, these things kind of fluctuate. I mean, one person with like a huge family moves out, that could throw things off. So, I think, you know, you're doing the best you can to accommodate for future needs. It's not always going to be optimal, sometimes it's going to be sub-optimal but that's just, you know, you can't just build every time you have. You know, you're building for what could time.

With demographics, there's a giant, I mean, doesn't Westgate go all the way up to Northwest Highway? My understanding is the boundary of Westgate comes --

MR. SCHULZ: It's very close, yes. It's very close.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, so there's a lot of like apartment buildings, condo buildings, people moving in and out.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I mean, a giant vacant parcel of property here that could bring a lot more people into Westgate at some point. Is that even, is that accounted for in the demographics?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, that is being accounted. Again, as Stacey mentioned, we reach out to Village Staff and we look at when those are projected to be implemented. So, those are included in the demographer's study.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, I think one thing to keep in mind is when you have a lot of housing, you know, like that, there's some volatility in that, right? People moving in, they have families, maybe they don't have families, it's really hard to project when you have that many units.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes. So, they look at the units like what they're projected to have.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. SCHULZ: One-bedroom studio, you know, two-bedroom, and they take that out, the demographer takes that all into account as projections.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I think that's the best they can do, but it's not going to be a perfect science. So, I think you guys are doing the best you can. That's all I have to say. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No, no, no. Thank you, that's what we're here for. Okay, so just a couple of comments or questions that didn't get addressed yet.

There was questions about the playground and whether or not that was going to be the new playground and how that was going to be allocated. One just for Kindergarten? Would that be spread out?

MR. SCHULZ: Again, I think you're talking specifically about the east playground, the one that's already there?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

MR. SCHULZ: That will, right now we're intending that that would be dedicated to Kindergarten just on the play structure size. That is way – now, but that's what our intent is, so that would be pretty much solely a Kindergarten playground. If the building administration sees a need or want to go over there, they could use it, but again, the intent is to relieve some of the Kindergarten, kind of giving them a more dedicated space.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, so one of the comments was that might alleviate some of the noise and congestion, so something for you to consider and look into.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: One of the comments that was somewhat, you know, not concerning but I think should be addressed is the kids damaging the fence. So, I know it's hard to monitor these kids and all of that, but I would presume that there's a way for the neighbors to communicate to the school district the damage to the fence is taking place and to have that remedied?

MR. SCHULZ: Now that we're aware, we'll bring it up to the building administration to see if they can monitor that more. Again, I would encourage them to contact the school if the notice that when it occurs, and then we can review it in more detail. But we will bring it up to the administration of the building.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Chair Dawson, I just note, too, that maybe with the screening that might take care of that as well, if you put some arborvitae or whatever south of there that may limit access to the fence.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: It might. I just have a tendency to, I'll rely on the school district to know the best, but trees are not necessarily always the best thing when you have kids running around. They have a tendency to like to hide behind them and it becomes a better place for, you know, their games and all of that, and climbing trees can then become a nuisance and, you know, or maybe not. I'm not an expert in that area.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Full disclosure, in the mid-80's, I jumped over those fences a lot because we played baseball.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, I was going to say, I mean, you know, these are kids and we have to rely on the school district to know what's best for the safety of the children, but also keeping in mind the issues and concerns of the neighborhood around them for sure. So, working with the neighbors I think is important.

There was a question about the recommended blacktop square footage, how do you determine based on size how much blacktop?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, there definitely isn't a standard on that. We've done to take a look at it from a district standpoint, we feel that that's a pretty good metric, so we looked across the district, kind of averaging out by the number of students. We actually feel that Westgate is a little bit short of where we'd want to be to give them adequate space for primarily when there's bad weather. I mean, that's the primary when you need it type of area, right? If there's not bad weather, you can send them out in the grass and they can pretty much go anywhere, but when the weather is bad it gets muddy.

So, we are looking at a little bit of asphalt space in the grassy area of

the current playground. You can see there's a little island of grass there that we're looking to put it there. The reason that we're looking to put it there now with the addition going in, we'll have a clear sight line to monitor that. The reason when we did the addition or the playground renovation in 2018 that we didn't put a playground out there was because it was really hard to monitor with the large U-shape. So, again, we're looking to get that a little bit closer to give them some more space for the muddy time to give them that space for the asphalt.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so one question that was asked that is concerning to me that it was even asked was that why are we changing from half-day to full-day Kindergarten. I don't know if the school district wants to speak to that. I know how I feel about that.

MR. SCHULZ: Programmatically?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes. I mean, that was just one of the questions that was asked. Why are we bringing that in?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, I can't speak to that in my role particularly, but again, maybe Stacey can add a little bit of feedback on why that decision was made.

MS. MALLEK: Yes, again this was the, I think third time, I've been in the district since 2006, I think this was the third time that it was brought to the superintendent and the board to investigate implementing and moving forward with full-day Kindergarten. I know back in 2015 when we did some of those building additions, we made it very clear at that point we are not building for future full-day Kindergarten because at that time there was not, based on initial surveys done, we didn't feel there was community support. But at this time around, there was more and more input to the board and the superintendent that they wanted the district to pursue this. I believe it was actually an issue during the board elections the last go around, a big topic of conversation as if you're brought in, will you support a full-day Kindergarten program?

So, the board talked about it for, we started conversations I think in late spring of, I don't know, with the referendum in '22, late spring of '21. We talked about it through the referendum in June of '22. So, that's my understanding is it was from the community as it had been previously before but just hadn't moved forward.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, as a working mom of three kids, who put three kids through the half-day Kindergarten, I absolutely applaud the school district for bringing in full-day Kindergarten. The burden on two working families with just half-day Kindergarten is extreme, and that burden falls largely on the moms. I experienced that personally and I struggled with that personally, and I am so happy that finally the school district is waking up to the need and the burden on working moms and our need for full-day Kindergarten.

What I'm hearing is that the school district was open to it previously and the community was not supporting it. So, I am really thrilled to hear that our community is now recognizing that impact on the families with two working parents and how difficult it is to raise children without full-day Kindergarten. So, thank you for that. I very much appreciate that and I'm very concerned that anyone with concern would question whether or not there was a need for that in this community.

Some of us can afford to pay for full-day Kindergarten. Many people who live in this community cannot afford to pay for full-day Kindergarten and very much need those dollars that they miss out when their kids cannot be in school. So, I applaud the school district for that.

The only other question that I had was the new addition that you're putting in, does it allow for if it was needed to build up if additional space was needed? Windsor

being a school that has two floors, so I was very familiar with kids going up and down in elementary, but I know many of the schools don't have that.

MR. SCHULZ: I do not believe we are incorporating any second floor potential with this building. Some of the other sites we are just based on the way the staircases are, the elevators and how the building orients. This addition in particular we are not proposing that just based on the orientation of the site.

So, again, if that would ever come to fruition down the road, hopefully a long, long, long time, we'd have to look at other options.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, because at some point you're going to run out of room to expand.

MR. SCHULZ: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: And the only way to go is up.

MR. SCHULZ: Possibly, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, that is all my questions and comments.

Any other additional questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, I have a couple of other things. Just in terms of the stormwater, I do also want to remind everybody that in addition to the underground detention, they are also putting in permeable pavers which do take in a significant amount of stormwater. So, it is not just the detention that is helping with that.

Someone also made a comment about that we shouldn't approve the variances because of, you know, the number of classrooms and all. I would just like Sam maybe to comment that the variations they are requesting have nothing really to do with the classrooms, and if it wasn't parking lot or traffic flow or whatever --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Or height of the gym.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: -- we wouldn't even be here. They would be able to add those classrooms without requiring variations?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, they would need to go before the Plan Commission for these new classrooms just for the simple fact that it doesn't have a special use permit.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, but in terms of variations like, you know, the amount of open space and the size of the classrooms and setbacks and all of that, that none of that, outside of the fact that this is a special use is --

MR. HUBBARD: Right. If they could have potentially designed the building addition to comply completely with codes, the only building related variation was relative to the height of the gym. Otherwise, all of the other variations were for the site; the playgrounds and the landscaping and so forth.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: And then the last thing I wanted to ask in terms of the issue that Commissioner Cherwin had, that if it does become a problem at 661 students, what could you possibly do? Could you possibly, based on the balance of populations at schools, move the Integrated Services from Westgate to another school that maybe wasn't at as much capacity?

MR. SCHULZ: I mean, that's always an option. It just depends on the capacity of the rest of the buildings, right? But we just don't --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, but that is something that could potentially be done?

MR. SCHULZ: Again, it was explored for even this referendum. The board

made the decision that the staff and this was the best site to host it, so it has been looked at. Again, you just have to make sure that you have the space to supplement it somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Those are all my comments.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, any other comments or a motion?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#22-016, a Special Use Permit to allow a public elementary school on the subject property, an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reclassify the single-family detached portion of the site into the schools classification, and the following Variations:

1. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.6, to allow a 27-foot tall building where building heights are restricted to 25 feet.
2. Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2, to allow an accessory structure (play equipment) in an exterior side yard where accessory structures are restricted to rear yards only.
3. Chapter 28, Section 6.5-7B, to allow accessory structures (play equipment) no larger than 850 square feet in size where code restricts the maximum size of accessory structures to 300 square feet.
4. Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2B, to omit the required landscape islands at each end of the two central rows of parking within the south parking lot.
5. Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2B, to omit the required landscape islands at the western end of the northernmost parking row within the south parking lot, and on both ends of the southernmost parking row within the south lot.
6. Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2B, to omit the requirement for interim landscape islands within parking rows containing more than 20 parking stalls within the west parking lot.
7. Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2A.2, to omit the requirement for a six-foot tall landscape screen along the western side of the south parking lot.

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. If enrollment at Westgate Elementary School exceeds or is projected to exceed 661 students within the proposed building, the school district shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Village Staff that adequate onsite parking can accommodate peak demand and drop-off/pickup operations will not create unsafe vehicular or pedestrian movements. Improvements needed to satisfactorily accommodate such increase shall be implemented upon administrative approval by the Village. If administrative approval is not granted, an amendment to this special use permit shall be required.
2. The Petitioner shall continue to work with the Village and neighbors to address any drop-off/pickup concerns.
3. The Petitioner shall continue to work with the Village to provide stormwater information to verify compliance with all MWRD and Village regulations to the satisfaction of the Village.
4. The Petitioner shall revise the proposed gate for the northern emergency access drive within the east lot to be on the west side of the sidewalk and on school district

property.

5. **Compliance with the 1/24/23 Design Commission motion shall be required.**
6. **The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any discussion before we go to vote?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

All right, so on the Westgate presentation, you have unanimous approval. Again, we are just a recommending body and the purview that we focus on is much smaller than what the Village Trustees consider when going through the application. So, you'll be moving forward to the next stage. Sam will let you know about that.

(Whereupon, at 8:58 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)