

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: DRYDEN SCHOOL BUILDING EXPANSION - 722 SOUTH DRYDEN PLACE -
PC #22-017
SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ON THE
SUBJECT PROPERTY, 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 8:58 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: Okay, so we have another school, right? Okay, so would you like to come up to, Sam, do I have to re-swear him in or does that work for the whole meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: It works for the whole meeting.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, that's what I thought.

Okay, would you like to now walk us through the Dryden presentation please?

MR. SCHULZ: I would.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. SCHULZ: This is the Dryden Elementary School project. Again, similar to the Westgate requirements, the primary driver behind the addition at Dryden is related to the full-day Kindergarten program and to support the current enrollment at the facility. We do see a small increase of the general population at this facility but it's very minimal. It's even negligible compared to the enrollment increase that we are going to expect to see for the full-day Kindergarten portion. So, again, the full-day Kindergarten portion is the main driver behind this project.

We are also looking to do a gym expansion at this site, expanding the current gym to make it bigger. That will facilitate the building getting its own dedicated commons and lunchroom space. Currently, half the gym is flex space used for lunch and common space. That's the only building in the district that does not have the dedicated standalone commons. So, by expanding the gym, we'll still have a movable partition in that space, but it will allow them to have a dedicated lunchroom space that they won't have to be flipping over for PE. Again, with the addition of full-day Kindergarten and the changes potentially in PE requirements for the school district, we are going to need to be running two sections of PE at once so that lunchroom is a prohibiting factor into implementing the PE portion of that program.

So, again, those are the main components. We're also looking to do a front office expansion, primarily to improve the lobby space of the facility, improve flow for visitors, and also improve security for the site as well.

Again, ownership and notification, the title commitment searches again show that we are the beneficial owner of all the PINs that are involved with the site. We had a neighborhood meeting on October 19th. We had one neighbor attend.

- What is the potential impact of stormwater from the site? Again, we'll get into that a little bit later.
- Will rooftop equipment be screened? Yes, we will get into that and show you as well where the rooftop screening is going to cover any mechanical equipment.
- Will there be any impact on playground spaces at the building? This site in particular, anything west of the sidewalk that goes north-south on the site where the tennis courts are, the pickleball courts and the playground are actually Park District owned property, so we have joint venture agreements in place with the Park District to install that playground. We're looking at potentially replacing that playground in conjunction with this project, but since it is owned by the Park District, we're not seeking any variances with that at this time through this project. That will most likely have to come through in some way with the Park District. So, there may be something down the road where we're looking at doing the improvements to that playground structure that is jointly used with the Park District and

ourselves.

- Will the traffic pattern for the school be impacted after construction? Again, our thought was, at that time we weren't fully aware of what the traffic study would encounter. We are proposing to leave this parking lot generally the same way as it is now. We did explore closing the north entrance of that parking lot similar to the other sites. The reason that's prohibiting us at this site primarily is buses. There are four buses at this site that will queue up and we queue them up in the parking lot to get the students and then it opens up for parent traffic after that. So, again, the buses were the prohibiting factor on changing the traffic flow on the site and we'll go through that at the traffic section.

The Conceptual Design Review meeting was held on October 26th. We had unanimous support for the project.

The Design Commission meeting was held yesterday. The primary driver behind this again was the screening of the chiller. Again, we're using a brick structure to enclose the chiller at this site. The other question was the door colors on the south end of the building. We proposed a sand tone color, and after review with the Commission, they proposed doing a bronze tone color. So, we're going to accommodate that and change the color of the doors to a bronze tone. Again, these are the doors in the south elevation that I'll point out when I get to those slides.

Again, we're here at the Plan Commission. Notifications were given for the community members, excuse me, in the neighborhood. Village Trustee approval, we'll work with Sam on when that will happen. Again, with this site, construction is anticipated to begin in the late spring-early summer of this year.

Here is a summary of the requested actions, again the requested actions that are required for the site and the variations that I'll walk through with the slides. Again, we can use this as a reference if you need me to go back to it.

Here is a site overlay plan of this site. Again, on the east side of the site is Dwyer, and up towards the north is, I'm drawing a blank, Steve. North Street? Rockwell. Rockwell Street is farther up on the north. Again, our site is primarily on the east side of the campus. If you see the white space on the left side of the plan, that is again Park District property that extends all the way down to the south, it has the baseball field, the playground structure, the tennis courts, pickleball, and a portion of the parking lot on the north end is their parking lot.

Again, I want to point out that the addition is the darker yellow space in the south end of the building, so they will be offsetting the majority of the asphalt play space that is currently there and we're proposing to install it again to the south after the addition is installed.

We are proposing some new trees up in the north parking lot. Again, this is a very small parking lot that several of the staff members can park in. We're currently working with the Park District, we are prohibiting our staff from parking on the Park District side due to the new pickleball courts and their increased use. So, we've dedicated that, they can keep using their spaces as they are. There is an agreement in place that we can share that lot but we have currently instructed our staff to stay out of that lot just to allow the community to use those parking spaces adequately for pickleball.

We're looking for a variation for that north parking lot to omit some of the landscape islands due to the size and the orientation. We're looking for a variance on the existing building on the north setback. Again, that addition was done years ago and part of the building was done a long time ago, so we're looking to get the variation for the setback on that

side of the building for the existing portion of the building. The existing building variation on the east side of the site, a small portion of the site extends over the setback limit along Dwyer. The existing building variation we're requesting on the back side for 29 feet to 30 feet on the west side of the facility, allowing the building to be 40.5 building lot coverage versus I believe 35 percent lot coverage for this site. So, we're seeking a variance --

(Audience participant speaks from the gallery.)

MR. SCHULZ: This is Dryden.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, sorry, the public, there is no, I understand that you're clarifying, but there is no public commentary at this point.

MR. SCHULZ: For the Dryden site, the variation request is to allow the building addition to be 25.3 feet to match the existing. We are proposing some new trees along the new building addition within the parking lot area. We're also seeking a variance on this site as well to omit the landscape islands and structures in this parking lot as well to ensure we maintain adequate parking space. We believe with the screening and trees and the central island that we have installed already, by enhancing that with some additional trees, that that will suffice to mitigate to not have the landscape islands that are code-required.

Allowing the sport court outside of the rear yard in the side yard, again the way the site sets up is we consider the side yard where the asphalt play area is. It's in a similar location to where it is currently, so we're proposing to install it and seek the variance for the play area.

We're also seeking a variance for parking. The reason we're seeking a variance for parking is that we currently do not have enough parking spaces on our site, but we do have a licensing agreement with Southminster Church to the south that gives us more than adequate or enough parking spaces. So, we are seeking a variance on parking to that aspect of that. Again, we have that agreement in place for an extended period of time. We think that it's adequate and supports the building and not encouraging us to add more asphalt that we can joint venture in use efficiently for the building.

I also just wanted to point out the proposed section of the new underground stormwater system, similar to the Westgate system but a different system. This one is called StormTech. It's a plastic corrugated chamber system that will be going underground, but again, the finished product will be similar to other sites where it's underground, flat, green usable space that can be used for the site.

The plan here shows the overall floor plan of the addition. Again, all the addition is going to the south. The orientation changes, the north now is to the right side of the page, so again showing the gray spaces are existing. The yellow space shows the gym addition, so a portion of the gym, the basketball courts and the athletic courts will be in the existing portion of the gym and the addition will absorb the rest of that. So, when you look to the dash line on there, that will divide the lunchroom common space from the gym space that will be proposed to go forward.

We do have four classrooms in orange shown on primarily the southern and eastern edge of the site. Then the yellow box near the main entrance, that is where we're looking to have some office expansion to give some more space and floor area to the main office area at the facility.

This is a look from the southeast looking to the northwest. Again, we're looking to use some box bay window styles to supplement the existing building. Again, majority of the building was built in the 1950's and 60's. There was a portion put on the 1990's.

So, trying to blend that all together and would make it all look nice and neat across the facility.

Again, the doors that I referenced before are on the left side of the picture, again currently showing in tan. We bounced that around a couple of times architecturally, but we did agree with the Commission last night that we would put those in as a bronze tone color door system.

Again, just showing the 2D elevations. The top one is the eastern elevation looking back towards the main entrance. So, again showing the classroom spaces with the stone fascia, the limestone fascia above the windows. The classrooms are primarily behind those glass windows, and in the back you can see the parapet wall for the screening of the chiller. The higher section again is the continuation of the gym space and the new gym section that matches with the existing gym space.

On the middle one, again, just pointing out those doors that are being referenced to be changing in color. Then the bottom one, the west elevation, that's kind of looking from the tennis courts back at the building. The elevation matches up well and meets the design needs of the facility.

Similar to Westgate, this is our projections for enrollment going forward. '21-'22, we had 478 students in the implementation of Kindergarten and the general enrollment to the building. We see that now we're going up to 526 students. The number of staff would go from 56 to 61 primarily to support the full-day Kindergarten enrollment. Again, we need full-day Kindergarten staff to support the additional sections that will be for the full day, so that's primarily where that number is being driven by for the staff.

Then we're looking at classroom spaces. The blue bar again is the current capacity with 24. The red bar is the new capacity at 28, and the gray bars on the right are the projected sections needed for the future up to '26-'27. So, we project between 24 and 25 classrooms are going to be needed for the facility, leaving us three classrooms open for support services, resource, interventions, things like that at the facility.

We did a traffic study for this site as well with an aerial drone footage. We had traffic engineering input from the Village Staff. Again, the Police Department had similar comments that they do not anticipate traffic problems at this site. They have not seen an increase of accidents or do not anticipate anything else with the addition of this site.

Going through parking, again as I noted on the north end of the site, we have a small parking lot that is primarily used by several staff members. There are eight parking spots that come off of, I believe that's Lincoln, and feed into the parking lot to give them eight parking spaces to load from the north side. The south lot primarily has 49 spaces, and the church lot is kind of our overflow space that we have 130 spots that we have access to that we have a licensing agreement in place for larger events or if there's staff overflow or needs for the facility. So, again, the church parking lot provides a large capacity for the facility to use. Again, we are seeking the variance due to not having enough parking spaces on site, but we believe that licensing agreement is more than adequate to provide for the building.

Currently, the parking lots were 26 percent occupied during the parking surveys. Again, that is taking into account that overflow parking, so that's why that number looks low. That lot is very large considering once you add it up into our total site. The site again does have four buses and zero taxis.

This is the current stacking capacity along, excuse me, Dryden Street that goes into the parking lot and it reaches up towards Rockwell. Currently, we believe there's about 42 parking spots that they can queue up in, and I will go to the video, it should be this one.

Again, this is the parking lot, the main parking lot at arrival time. Again, similar timeframe in September when these studies were done where you can see the bus dropping off in conjunction with parent drop-off at the site. Note that the time is about 8:55 so the parents are starting to queue up again for the 9:05 start of school. So, I'll let this play for a little bit just to give a better understanding of the congestion and traffic that would occur here at the site.

(Short pause while video played.)

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, as you can see, again cars are primarily leaving again the site on that south entrance. They are going in and out of that lot, going again southbound and northbound out of that portion.

During departure time, the primary portion of the site that is used again for queuing is Dryden Street and Rockwell. That's where cars queue up to. The Bus Parking Only is because we have four buses that we queue up there, we feel that's the safest area for queuing buses to make sure students can get on safely. Again, this red area kind of shows the areas where we believe that it's pretty continuous and that's where we see the queuing line up for school. The large majority of it is along our property, but there are some that again back up onto Rockwell waiting to move up towards the school.

This, again, is departure just showing that we have our four buses in the lot and also some after-care program buses that are also picking up students. You can see also that there are some parents that are queued up on Dryden Street waiting for their students to come out to the parkway.

(Long pause while video played.)

MR. SCHULZ: About there, that's again 3:43, students get out around 3:35. That's pretty much the major traffic portion of this site.

I just wanted to show the traffic departure stacking, again, primarily along Dryden Street. 10 vehicles to the south, nine vehicles are kind of in the central section, and there's a capacity for 25 vehicles up to the corner of Rockwell.

They provided one other street level, this was again completed last week at the school. Again, it was colder out but no weather in that day, but again, it was a colder day just to give a better perspective from street level how the traffic flow is, where cars are stacking, and kind of the capacity for the streets to absorb the school traffic.

(Short pause while video played.)

MR. SCHULZ: So, here we're approaching one of the drive entrances and the main entrance to the school, heading north still until Rockwell, the intersection of Rockwell will be coming up here, and then we'll be heading west, currently riding north on Dryden.

As you can see here, there are several cars queued up to the north on Dryden, and then there's a few cars again parked to the east here at this intersection as well. Again, we'll be turning to the west on Rockwell, and you can see that the queuing on the south side of the street ends fairly quickly. There are just several cars that are waiting, and then after that the street clears up pretty quickly.

So, that was traffic and parking that we're proposing for the site.

Moving on to stormwater sustainability, again, similar to Westgate, we are proposing an underground storage facility for the site that has been engineered and reviewed with Village Staff Engineering as well. Again, we believe that they are supportive of the current plan for the engineering. Again, this structure will be a chamber system that will be put underground with stone infill, and then again it will look very similar. You will be barely able to tell that it's even there, very similar to the grass area that's currently there for the site. So, again we'll

be working with Village Staff, Village Engineering to finalize those plans, and then we'll also be seeking permitting from the Village, and then also congruent with the MWRD which will require their receipt as well.

Again, according to sustainability, trying to address some of those items, it's LED lighting, high efficiency HVAC with building automation, low flow plumbing fixtures, sections of permeable pavers I do not believe we have here, I apologize for that, several acres of green space, adequate bike storage and ridership, and future exploration of solar panels. So, again this site is one of our primary ones that we're using as our basis of design for solar. We feel that this site is most conducive to solar because of the relatively open area, the southern exposure that we're going to be having with the addition. So, if our board decides to go forward, this most likely will be the first site that would pilot solar for our district. So, we are considering this, we have our study in place for this site specifically, and we'll bring more forward to our board to make those decisions if they're going to pursue that further.

Those are the items that we have to present for Dryden Elementary School. We are open to questions after Sam.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, well, thank you very much. Wait, before you sit down, have you read the Staff report?

MR. SCHULZ: I have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: And are you in agreement with all the conditions of approval?

MR. SCHULZ: We are.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you so much. All right, Sam, Staff report?

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, and since I didn't swear them in, I did not ask if all public notices have been given. So, if you could address that while you plant your report, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, all public notices have been given.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, so similar to Westgate School, Dryden School is within an R-3 Zoning District. All schools in R-3 Districts require a special use permit approval. Dryden has never received a special use permit, so the proposed addition triggers a need for a special use permit approval.

The entire site is listed as schools on our Comprehensive Plan, so the proposed future use and existing use as Dryden Elementary is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan.

They are requesting nine variations along with the special use permit. Two of those relate to the existing building, two of them relate to landscaping, and then there are miscellaneous variations as you've heard related to parking, setbacks, lot coverage, accessory structures and building height. I'll talk a little bit more about those throughout this presentation.

They have appeared at two public meetings and hosted their own neighborhood meeting. The neighborhood meeting was back in October of last year, and the Petitioner provided a summary of that meeting as part of the applications transmitted to the Plan Commission. You heard the summary this evening.

Additionally, in October, they met with the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. Discussion was limited, mostly related to drop-off/pickup operations. There was no

major issues identified during that meeting, and the Conceptual Plan Review Committee recommended they proceed forward with their Plan Commission application.

Last night, they appeared before the Design Commission and received a recommendation of approval subject to one condition and one recommendation. The requirement was a condition to change the color of the exterior store room doors to make them a little bit less prominent, and then one recommendation to improve the existing screening around the RTU.

So, again, here is the site within an aerial. North is to the top. To the west of the school which is bounded in yellow is a portion of Dryden Park including the playground and the tennis courts. To the north are single-family homes, and a little bit farther north is Rockwell. To the east is Dryden Place, and to the south is Dryden Park and a small Village-owned portion containing some detention and then a very small piece of land that the school district owns adjacent to the detention area.

Here you can see shaded in red the proposed location approximately of the building addition. It's mostly centered on the site. The school does touch or get close to the western property line, and the addition will maintain that existing setback along the west.

Here is the larger neighborhood aerial showing where Dryden School sits within the neighborhood. Again, you can see to the south there is the Southminster Church lot which their 130-space parking lot that the school district has an agreement to use. The neighborhood is overwhelmingly residential. A little bit farther to the west is Beverly, and then on the east side you're going to see Roosevelt, and then farther south is Central.

Again, here is the site plan showing the proposed addition which has coloring. As you've heard, also they're re-constructing their parking lots. They're not making any changes to the parking lots, they're just re-constructing them in their existing locations both on the east side of the school and then the smaller parking lot to the northwest.

There are two variations being requested relative to the existing building. The first variation is on that south side where the building is located about 22 feet from the, I'm sorry, not the south side, the east side where the building is about 22 feet from the eastern property line. Code requires a 24-foot setback in that area. There is no change to the building. This is just a variation to formally allow the existing non-conformity, so we are supportive of that variation.

A similar variation is required on the north side of the building where the building is set back about 10.7 feet from that northern property line. The setback in that area is based on 10 percent of the overall lot width. The overall lot width is quite wide, so that setback is quite substantial at 72.7 feet where the existing building is 10 feet set back. Again, we are supportive of that variation, it's just to formally allow that non-conformity. There is no change proposed to this area of the building and we are recommending approval of those two setback variations.

Additionally, there is a setback variation to the west which is considered the rear yard. That requires a 30-foot setback. The existing building is set back approximately 29 feet from that western property line, encroaching one foot into that required setback. The proposed building addition would maintain that setback at 29 feet, and so they are requesting a variation for that existing and proposed encroachment into the 30-foot setback.

We are supportive of this variation as well. It's minor in scope at only one foot. They are matching that existing building setback. In addition, this area to the west is not directly abutting any residential homes. There is that portion of Dryden Park with the tennis

courts and playgrounds in this area.

Another variation required is for the re-constructed asphalt area technically considered by code as a sport court. Sport courts are only allowed within residential districts where they're within a rear yard. That rear yard behind the building is not suitably sized to accommodate for a sport court, so that's being relocated to this area to the south of the building which is technically the side yard.

We are supportive of that variation as well. We acknowledge that children need adequate opportunities for outdoor recreation. These outdoor areas positively contribute to their development and growth, so they need these opportunities. There is no real other opportunity in the rear yard which would comply with code to accommodate for the sport court, so it does have to go in the side yard. It is replacing generally an area where the existing sport court is located. The existing sport court is where the building addition will be and we, at the Village level, are not aware of any issues that have been created by that existing location in the side yard. So, we are supportive of the variation to allow it to be re-constructed within the side yard.

Additionally, there is a variation required to the building lot coverage. In residentially zoned lots, building lot coverage is restricted to 35 percent of the overall lot. Given the proposed building addition, this site will be at 40.5 percent building lot coverage, requiring a variation. We are supportive of that variation as well. When you take into account the open spaces to the south of the site, and additionally, that small piece of land owned by the school district to the south of the site which is used as open space which was not factored into the calculations here, we feel like there will be suitable open space in this area given the park area to the south. Additionally, if we're to avoid this variation, they would have to utilize the existing building footprint and not expand, so that would essentially mean a second floor addition to accommodate for the new classrooms and the proposed gym. Dryden School does not currently have a second floor, so a second floor addition really would not be practical, and locating a gym on a second floor would most certainly create the need for a substantial height variation. So, again, we are supportive of the proposed building lot coverage excess.

Finally, there is an underground detention vault, as you've heard, proposed in the southern green space shown by that blue square within the site plan.

There is an extremely minor variation needed for the height of the gymnasium addition. It's calculated at 25.3 feet in height where code restricts maximum heights to 25 feet. So, it's a very minor variation, minor in scope, it would almost be impossible to notice, but technically does require that variation. We are supportive of that variation as well. They are maintaining the existing building height so we don't anticipate this to be a hugely negative impact.

Relative to the landscape variations, on the left-hand side of the screen bounded in green you'll see the northwest parking lot. They're re-constructing the parking area there which triggers the need to update to current code requirements relative to landscaping. One of the landscape islands is missing along that small row of two parking spaces on the eastern side of the parking lot. There is existing, in this location, a transformer and dumpster enclosure which would make it infeasible to add the code-required landscaping. So, we are supportive of that variation in this application.

Additionally, in the parking lot on the east side of the school, those parking rows are 26 and 27 parking spaces long. So, it does require the interim median landscape islands in the center shown by that red circle. Again, we are supportive of this variation as well. They are just re-constructing the parking lot in its existing location. Parking for

the school is critical because it does help with the drop-off and pickup operations and helps to keep cars from further stacking on the Village street system. Additionally, they do have a robust landscape screen along the eastern side of the parking lot which does help to screen the parking area. So, again, we are supportive of this variation.

Lastly, this leads us to parking and drop-off/pickup. As you've heard, they do require a variation to the parking requirement. 67 parking spaces are required, 62 will be proposed on the site. They are creatively finding ways to pick up some parking in their existing parking lots without physically expanding the footprints through some creating striping and utilizing existing paved areas for parking that haven't been currently striped for it. So, they are slightly improving the parking situation, but again they fall short of code requirements.

We are supportive of this variation because they do have that license agreement with the church at the south to use that 130-space parking lot. But if they do ever find that that ability goes away at some point in the future, if for some reason the church does not continue to extend that agreement or if the church is to change hands and be sold and the parking is not available, we are recommending a condition of approval that they work with us to make any improvements necessary to accommodate for parking and drop-off/pickup operations, improvements to the drop-off/pickup operations. That parking lot within the Southminster Church is utilized by families, some of them park there and walk up to the school to pick up their kids. Others park there and wait in their car for their kids to walk and meet them. So, it is used and it is integral to the success of their pickup operations.

Similar to the Westgate School, the traffic and parking study was based on the projected future enrollment of 526 students for the 2026-2027 school year, and also that would include 25 classrooms, but again, the school district is building for 15 percent beyond that capacity. So, being that there are, like at many schools, issues most notably during pickup in the afternoon on the surrounding street network related to congestion and cars backing up and potentially clogging the intersection, most notably Rockwell and Dryden, we do recommend also the similar condition that if projected enrollment is to exceed 526 students, that the school district will work with us to implement any changes. If we can't come to an agreement or if there is such a substantial issue that substantial changes are needed, it would have to go back to the Plan Commission and Village Board ultimately for approval.

So, that being said, we are supportive of the application subject to the six conditions as outlined in the Staff report and summarized here. That will conclude my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Motion to include the Staff report into the record?

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

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Opposed or abstain?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, motion passes.

So, let's start down here. Any initial questions before we open up to public commentary?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think I'll wait until we hear public commentary.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No questions.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No question at this point.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'm good.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, with that, we are going to open up to public commentary. So, then similar to last time, step up, state your name, spell your last name, and if you're so willing provide your address, but it is optional.

Anyone here that wanted to speak, front row, on the Dryden petition? Step up to the microphone, just state your name, spell your last name, and address if you're so willing.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY ON PC#22-017

MS. VICARS: I'm Mary Cosenza Vicars, and I live at 801 South Beverly Lane.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Can you spell your last name?

MS. VICARS: Vicars, V-i-c-a-r-s.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. VICARS: So, Beverly is just to the west of the school and the southern part of the school. My main concerns are aesthetics, how is the school going to look from my backyard, and it's also flooding. I know when you increase paved surfaces as they're going to do, and you increase the building size, you run the risk of flooding. I think it was probably the Park District, I'm not sure, because there's Park District property there and there's District 25 property there, when they put a path in and some berms, there is some water that comes into our yard now. So, whenever you change something, there always is the possibility that you can get water into your backyard.

So, I have a couple of questions. The storm flex or, you know, retention, whatever you want to call it that District 25 is going to do, that's going to be on school district property, I think. But because you're increasing the size of the building and the paved surfaces, is the Park District going to also put some storm protection for the neighbors they back up to? I think that's reasonable for the neighbors to ask who live behind the school there. So, that's a question.

There is a, so we back up to, I found this out this summer because there was a tree that fell on my back fence, and I called District 25 and they said no, I don't know if that's our property or not and it was Park District property. So, it's kind of confusing a little bit, you know, what's Park District property and what's District 25. So, beyond my fence though is a strip of land probably about four or five feet that is Park District property, and then I understand that the playground which I back up to is jointly owned, right, by the Park District and District 25? I think that's right.

I want to know if that strip of land is still going to be owned by the Park District, because that gives me a little bit more protection, right? Then I know the school district can't build anything there, right, because that's Park District property. So, I want to know if that land is still owned by the Arlington Heights Park District. That gives me a little bit more of a buffer with the school.

Well, in terms of parking, you know, I know you have, I think you said

130 spaces at Southminster Presbyterian Church, that's pretty far from Dryden. It's been my experience, you know, living here that parents picking up their kids are not really going to park at Southminster Presbyterian Church because you've got the school, you've got the parking lot, you've got the baseball field, and then there is the church which is on Central. So, you know, I think we've got to be careful with parking because those 130 spaces that Southminster has that is letting the school district use that isn't really a viable option or alternative for District 25.

So, you know, I want to make sure about the flood, oh, and another flooding, you know, I think I have this right. There's nine variations and a special use permit, and I guess my question is, you know, we have these ordinances and why don't we try to build the school and the parking and whatever else we need and stay within the ordinance, because if we have all these variations, then what's the good of the ordinances? So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Anyone else? Did you, anyone else in the front row?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No, all right.

Second row? Yes. Again, I know you spoke earlier, but if you could again state your name and spell your last name? Thank you.

MS. CAYER: Melissa Cayer, C-a-y-e-r. There are a lot of holes in Arlington Heights that were built in the name of managing water, but to me it looks like the topsoil is being stripped. It is unwise to strip so much topsoil for water management.

Also, in several years, we're looking at property taxes, we're looking at the compounding effects of increases in property taxes coupled with the diminishing spending power and wonder why we weren't more frugal with our property tax.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

Anyone else on that side of the room?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, so on this side of the room? So, I know you spoke earlier, but again just state your name, spell your last name and provide your address again if you're so willing.

MR. BOODRO: William Boodro, B-o-o-d-r-o. It's interesting how no one asked how much water does this system hold. I mean, does anybody know? This system that's going to be put into Dryden? Because I live on Roosevelt. I've already talked about how in 2011 we had the major flooding. It's always interesting how major flooding, it's always at 3:00 a.m. I remember getting a call at 3:00 a.m. from my neighbor saying he had seven feet of water in his basement back in 2011.

That was the first time, but a year ago, we had more flooding, and it comes from Dryden School, crosses Dryden, goes through the backyards on the homes on Dryden on the east side, hits the west side, covers up Roosevelt and hits the east side of Roosevelt. I had many neighbors with seven feet of water in 2011. I had other neighbors who got more water in, I think it was 2021. So, this is major flooding. A lot of it has to do with the fact, as there's already been one addition to Dryden before, I think where the variations are, their 22 feet. That's an addition that was put up I think in 2009-2010, then we had the major flooding.

So, in reading the report with regards to stormwater, it says that currently the site is only served with underground pipes to divert stormwater runoff into the Village storm sewers and the site does not have an underground stormwater vault. While the Petitioner has preliminary demonstrated that the proposed stormwater system will be able to comply with all

MWRD and Village requirements, final stormwater calculations are needed and minor details and modifications must be incorporated on the engineering plans prior to site development permit issuance. The Petitioner shall continue to work with the Village.

So, we really don't know the final numbers and how much water, but I can tell you that based on past experience, it was as if we had Lake Michigan on Roosevelt and we're, what, one street over from Dryden and Dryden Elementary. It seems to have to do with the way that the addition was put on and the way grading is because it all goes down towards Dryden. In fact, I had a friend who used to live on Dryden across from the school, and he said it was like a waterfall running down from the school.

So, the question then becomes is if you're up there on the north and you've got water coming off from where this addition was put, it's probably not going to drain into where you're going to have your underground water storage, okay. So, I'm not necessarily sure, I'm not going to go through with the other stuff because it seems like I got attacked here for all the facts that I brought forth as to Westgate.

Ms. Dawson, if you want to attack me, okay, please use my name, William Boodro, okay. Just because I have a disagreement on whether or not we should be funding all-day, full-day Kindergarten, doesn't mean you need to attack me for having a different opinion. In fact, if you go back to the referendum, there were 5,177 people who voted against full-day Kindergarten. 5,227 I think voted in favor. So, it's pretty equally divided.

So, I'm more than happy to take the hit for the 5,177 people who voted against it. The question is, as far as the burden that it places on a family with working mother and a working father, I've been there, okay. So, and the question becomes it's not a free lunch, you're either going to pay for it by going to a source where you put your kids into full-day Kindergarten and you spend whatever the amount of money is for that one year or you pay for it for 20 years at \$300 per year which is \$6,000. So, one way or the other, we're all going to pay for this. The question is who's going to pay for it, you're going to pay for it now or you're going to pay for it later?

I'm a little older. So, there was an old commercial -- you can pay me now or you can pay me later. So, the question then becomes, you know, I don't need to be attacked, okay, in my presence.

Also, as far as the demographics go, Arlington Heights is losing population. Not only that, about 25 percent of the population of Arlington Heights are over the age of 65, which includes me. There are a lot of people who are in their homes and are only staying in their homes because they can't afford to move elsewhere. The fact that property taxes continue to go up and up is going to force a lot of people to end up being put out of their homes if it continues that way.

As far as the demographics which I'm also being, you know, attacked on that, I'm not going to say attacked, but pretty much comes across with Westgate, owner of Westgate is, but it seems to me that we're building more apartment complexes, apartment units in Arlington Heights, not single-family homes. I don't know, but studio apartments and one-bedroom apartments aren't necessarily conducive to families with children who are going to need the services of District 25, and there are other options for that.

My wife and I put our kids in full-day Kindergarten. We were living in Des Plaines, and we did it by putting them into the parochial school, a Catholic school, and I still had to pay for after-school care because my wife wasn't there and I wasn't there at 3:30 to pick them up. So, there's still that cost no matter what.

So, it's a question really of who pays for it? Who subsidizes it? Do you subsidize it for one year when you have your child in Kindergarten and then another year with your second, or do you pay it all over 20 to 30 years? So, I would appreciate the next time you want to disagree with me and you want to say it in public, use my name. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, anybody else on that side of the room that wants to come and speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No? All right, with that, we are closing public commentary.

So, then any additional questions? I'll start down here with Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No, not really. I mean, I looked at these, I have no problem with the variances. You know, I think just to address Ms. Vicars' questions, you know, on the variances, you know, I think it's a good question. You know, these ordinances are drafted very roughly and, you know, virtually any type of development in magnitude, I mean, we would not exist, I mean, we would not get the 'huge salaries' that we get, we could not get the "big bucks" if there were not variations from the ordinance.

So, I think, you know, with any kind of, and I say that jokingly of course because we are voluntary positions but, you know, essentially any kind of development of size is going to require variations. There's just no way to predict by ordinance on these large developments, you know, what exactly the framework is going to be, you know, 10, 20, 30 years down the road. You know, it's just, I personally do this in a lot of different municipalities, and any kind of project of this size is going to have a lot of variations.

I think what they've presented are minor. I'm in favor of them. I think the school district has done their best to accommodate, you know, the requirements. They're relatively modest departures.

I know there's been a lot of issues around the stormwater. Again, I would just say on the technical side, you know, as far as what the runoff is and what the rate is and what the detentions are, we are, if there's an issue with that, I think, Mr. Boodro, it's a larger issue of, you know, is the ordinance appropriate. For this particular, you know, project, we're given the requirements that need to be met and there are technical experts, our technical experts require the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, those are all being considered and factored in here.

You know, if for some reason there's other issues that are going on in the neighborhood that are ancillary, you know, maybe that's a more at-large issue, but I think as far as the Petitioner is concerned, they're doing what is asked of them to provide that level of technical support to review the detention system. So, that all I'd say.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I just have a question regarding the underground stormwater detention system. Now, I don't know if the design team can answer it, but you have two different systems here. On the first one, the Westgate, you had a precast storm trap system, and this one here had a, I think PVC semi-spherical system. Is one more efficient or better than the other? I don't know why there's two different underground stormwater detention systems.

MR. SCHULZ: I'm going to introduce Josh Cap, he's our Civil Engineer on the project. So, I'll let him answer the question.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, again, state your name and spell your last

name for us please.

MR. CAP: Josh Cap, C-a-p, Project Manager with Eriksson Engineering, responsible for the civil design and the stormwater management provided for these sites.

Currently, right now, yes, you are correct, we are showing two different systems. With the volatility of the market and construction materials right now, basically either system could be used at either site. Our job is to make sure that we are providing the required volume in these systems. Ultimately, it will come down to pricing of the product itself as to what is used and the final condition with that. That will be provided for final engineering review and approval for both the Village and the MWRD.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, you may change them, one or the other?

MR. CAP: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, I think the PVC semi-spherical is probably more cost effective?

MR. CAP: Honestly, it largely depends on the cost of materials.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, thank you. I don't have anything else.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'm not sure if you might be the person to answer my follow-up, but Westgate, with the concrete retention system, it appears that there's a drain that will take that to the stormwater detention pond in the area; is that correct?

MR. CAP: Again, you're referencing Westgate?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'm sorry?

MR. CAP: Westgate? Are you referencing Westgate?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. CAP: Yes. So. there is a control structure at the end of that unit that will control how much water comes out of it.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. CAP: And then it will flow into the Village system at some point once it reached appropriate levels.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. CAP: And it is restricted to the flow rate. So, again, that unit will store the water for a long period of time, and then it will slowly release it into the Village system so as not to inundate the system.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, here, is there a similar type of mechanism that will allow this? And where does it flow into?

MR. CAP: Yes, a similar outlet control structure will be used. It will be directed to the existing Village storm sewer that's running along South Dryden Place.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And what kind of control is there to limit that until the municipal storm sewer can take, you know, additional water, you know, in a large downpour?

MR. CAP: So, within these outlet control structures, there's typically, the Village requires a four-inch minimum opening. With that, you know, it kind of gets really technical as to if the Village sewer system is full to capacity such that the streets are flooded, our system is going to be holding water because the hydraulic head will not allow our system to discharge. It's not until the Village system has the capacity to take in additional flow that our system can discharge out.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, when the, Sam, this might be a good

question for you. We had one of the neighbors indicating that in 2011, that a lot of the stormwater was flowing two blocks over. That's not necessarily a problem of this facility, of the school. Are you aware of any other detention problems in the area?

MR. HUBBARD: This is an area, you can kind of the small, little depression here. This is used for some stormwater detention. It's a Village-owned parcel if I'm not mistaken. The school district owns a small --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Sam, I can barely hear you.

MR. HUBBARD: Sorry. The school district owns a small sliver of land just to the north, approximately here, and then the rest of the balance here is owned by the Park District. So, the Village is currently studying expanding this detention area and increasing the capacity to address some of the neighborhood issues.

Relative to any flooding that's occurring at this corner here, you know, that seems to be an existing condition within the neighborhood. This, you know, expansion and the school district project is not responsible for addressing the historic issues within the neighborhood. It's only responsible to accommodate for the stormwater runoff that's going to be generated by the proposed building addition, and they have adequately demonstrated that they will meet codes in that regard.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, thank you. That's all I've got.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I think we need a motion to extend the time on the meeting for 15 minutes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, I thought it was --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Until 10:30.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes, I mean, let me check my notes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: I think it's 10:30.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, I don't have any questions.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes, it's 10:30 that we need to extend.

COMMISSIONER DROST: 10:30, okay.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I'm just, actually it's more in the way of a comment. A lot of the issues that have been raised really are beyond the scope of this project and beyond the scope of what this Commission can deal with. I think they're appropriate for the Board to deal with them, especially yours, Mr. Boodro. I would encourage the Village to perhaps have the Village Engineer or the appropriate technical people speak to those issues relating to this project at the Board meeting. I think they should be there to try to deal with that, and maybe some of the demographics needs to be, you need to have people who can speak more directly from the school district's point of view on the demographics. You've said a lot of things, but I think we might want to hear directly from the demographers or they may want to.

I think it's important to make the point that's been sort of made by a couple of other people that there may be neighborhood issues that have nothing to do with this project. It's not the responsibility of the school district to take care of all the neighborhood problems such as flooding or this or that or the other. Now, the Village Board is the place where you need to lodge that complaint or make your comments, and hopefully they will be able to address it. But there's a set number of things that we are confined to deal with, mainly this project and the criteria that we need to look at in evaluating whether we should recommend it be

approved or not.

So, this project and this Commission can't solve all of the problems that have been existent or been extant for a large number of years. So, I think the appropriate place is for you to go to the Board and express your concerns and see if they can be addressed there.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: My only question is just to, you know, just double check to make sure the grading that is going to be accomplished with this addition is grading towards whatever inlet there is for that detention. Yes, okay, that was my only question.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I pretty much agree with everything that's been said so far. Sticking with the stormwater, so, yes, you're only responsible for upgrading this detention for the addition being added, but like any project, when you start something new, you've really got to bring everything up to code.

So, my question is, Mr. Cap, the existing storm detention system or the existing drainage system for the property, the way it sits now, does that meet our codes?

MR. CAP: Currently, the only detention that exists on this site is in the form of parking lot storage on the south parking lot. With the updates that the MWRD has gone through as well the Village updating their requirements over the year, years, excuse me, and the fact that so much of this site is built prior to stormwater management being at the forefront of anybody's mind or being required by the Village or the county, currently, no, this site does not have the modern day required capacity for stormwater management if it was built new.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Sam, is there any requirements to bring things up to current codes?

MR. HUBBARD: No. As part of this project, they're going to, you know, be accommodating the expected, you know, capacity needed for this addition which will, you know, improve other areas of the site but, you know, as far as bringing the entire site up to compliance with code, I don't believe that they will be doing that.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, well, as Commissioner Jensen mentioned, this is a bigger problem for the whole neighborhood, and it's a project for the whole Village, all right, to take care of. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so going through some of the questions that I don't know if were addressed yet, there was a question about parking with the church. Is that a long-term parking arrangement?

MR. SCHULZ: I believe there's two years left on it with a five-year automatic renewal, but we would have intent to extend it beyond. We just did that with Orchard Church where we extended it to 10 years and then have a renewal period. So, we would look to extend it. We don't have any indication that they would not extend the agreement at this point.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: What would happen if they don't?

MR. SCHULZ: Then we'd have to look and talk to the Village and see if we have to accommodate it with the appropriate amount of parking or if we'd have to accommodate with something else. So, I think that's where we would have to look at it a little bit further, or based on the variance if that would be adequate in the variation that we'd be requesting.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Is there available space to put parking, the needed parking on the property as it exists?

MR. SCHULZ: I think we could explore it. Again, I haven't studied that yet, but I think there would be opportunity in some of the green spaces to add some additional parking spaces, possibly taking over some of the drive aisle for the drop-off and pickup and putting some

parallel or, what should I say, angled parking spaces in that location, where we did that at Greenbrier School where we took up a part of the drop-off aisle and put some angled parking spaces in. So, we could look at something like that at the site. Again, we would have to explore it further engineering-wise to see if there were some additional spots to put that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: How much parking is taking place at the church?

MR. SCHULZ: On a day-to-day basis for staff for that, zero. At the evening pickup time, there's, again I don't know if we know the exact count but there are people parking in there. I don't know if you noticed from the video when they're driving through, there's a number of cars parked in there, queued up for the thing. I don't have the number off the top of my head, but it is used for afternoon pickup primarily.

Again, we don't typically see staff parking in that lot. If we have a school event, it definitely is used for parents to go there, if there's a play or something else going on at the school, but again, not for staff or anything like that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, I think I misunderstood. I thought earlier you said that that was for staff. So, all of staff parking is accommodated on the site?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, and so that is used for pickup/drop-off, for if a parent is coming for the day or something to that extent.

MR. SCHULZ: If there's not a spot. There are some visitor spots and things like that, the lot does seem to have the capacity to absorb that. Again, primarily we see that lot used at the end of the day when, you know, a parent needs to stop and pick up their kids or for a school event where there's a large quantity of parents going into the building.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, all right. Okay, so that's been addressed. So, one of the questions that I had relative to the water, stormwater, which I know has been addressed a lot, but to me this is a much different project than Westgate. Westgate, there were people in the audience that spoke to, that there had previously been a water issue that seemed to have been addressed and had been improved. So, there seemed to be less concern from the neighbors over that.

But in this situation, we have existing non-conformities, right? So, I get that we're not fixing the entire neighborhood, but did any of these existing non-conformities cause the water issues? Because that's what was stated was that this addition went in in 2009 and 2010 and then significant water issues began in 2011.

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, again stormwater is highly complex. It's not as simple as one single pipe coming out of the site.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, yes, we're well aware. We hear that all the time.

MR. SCHULZ: So, again, there's a lot of neighborhood concerns, streets come into play. Our site obviously is a part of that as well. It's a big thing, right, it's the whole neighborhood that comes into play.

Again, with this project, we're going to be addressing this from what is required for the addition as well as bring up the parking lot. I don't know if that was clear, that the parking lot on the east lot will be brought into compliance as well. So, we're going to improve the detention for that lot in that structure. We're also going to be doing an offset for the parking lot that's up on the north side. Since it's not tributary and flowing into that structure that way, we're going to be taking some of the water off the existing building and flowing it into that structure.

So, there is more improvement than what's kind of required, but we're bringing some things up to the modern code beyond what is currently there. So, we are trying to address that with the re-construction of the parking lots and the size of the storm trap. So, it's bigger than just for the addition.

MS. MALLEK: Can I add on? Do I need to state my name again?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No.

MS. MALLEK: Okay, so I was here for the building addition at Dryden. Back at that time, again I started in '06, might have been around '09, might have been a little earlier, I can't remember. But at that time when we were starting that building addition, the neighbors across the street were coming, complaining at that time there were already water problems in the community before that building addition started. The neighbor right across the street may have been the same one Mr. Boodro was referring to. I can't remember his name off the top of my head. He was very active with us.

We did put in some restrictors in the parking lot down to the south, but those issues were there prior to that building addition that's nonconforming. Whether or not that's important, I think it's been stated that that causes some of this, but that was there before that as well.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I appreciate that, but if we didn't address it then, right, so if there was already a problem that we then exacerbated with the addition, I do think that if you're asking for another addition, now is the time we have to try to correct that. I don't know that, I mean, I don't agree with the comment that we're not here to fix any preexisting aggravation that was caused by that addition.

Did it come through the, I mean, I was on the Plan Commission then, did it come through here in 2011?

MR. SCHULZ: So, there was a major change to the statewide zoning ordinances.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay.

MR. SCHULZ: I mean, in '16 I believe it was. So, prior to that, schools technically didn't have to. There was kind of a running, standing order that schools didn't have to go through zoning review fully. There was kind of a cursory review, talk to the Village about certain things if you needed to just so the neighbors would be on the same page with the Village. In 2016, they kind of drew a line in the sand saying yes, you have to go forward with Plan Commission and Village approvals from the State Supreme Court decision. So, that did come down around 2016, and that's why it was -- it was, right?

So, MWRD requirements have been in place since the 1970's I believe, so those have gone through various phases of approval and changes. Those have changed over time as well, so that's what the buildings were built on, based on those things. A number of these buildings were built in the 60's, possibly prior to the standardization of MWRD and Village ordinances on some of those topics. It's no different than some homes in the neighborhood with the way they're built in the ordinance. So, again there's varying different levels of when these buildings were built and what stormwater requirements are required and how they accommodate that now with the newest codes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, and Mr. Boodro, no, I'm sorry, public commentary is closed. I didn't want to just not acknowledge you because you seem to be taking personal offense by my commentary or lack thereof. So, no public commentary so we can't, it's not me not letting you speak. It's the rules that I'm following, public commentary is closed so I

can't reopen public commentary at this time.

So, okay, so I guess I'm just asking for, it seems that this new addition that is being added is being addressed, from what I'm hearing. I'm just concerned about the previous condition and did we, is there anything that, maybe it's a different code or what have you, but now we see what that building did to the neighbors, is there anything that we can do to try to alleviate that for the neighborhood? You have come up to speak to that.

MR. CAP: So, what I can say from the record drawings that I have seen, when that north addition was constructed, the detention that is provided on that parking lot to the south was done in conjunction with that addition. So, detention, although that north addition is not necessarily tributary to that south parking lot, we deal with this kind of stuff all the time. We say we are providing the detention required for this addition, here is the area that is tributary to it that we are detaining for, basically saying, you know, the runoff produced from the new addition is equivalent to the runoff produced from the existing condition.

So, detention was provided when that addition went forward. I can't speak to the permitting process that it went through at that point in time, a little bit before my time but, you know, as Sam also indicated, you know, a lot of these issues that are occurring within the surrounding residential areas are issues that it is not on the school district to mitigate, provide detention for. Again, you know, we know that the Village is under or in process of doing studies for this area for potentially a new facility. Now, I can't speak to all the details to that because I'm not a Village employee, but the Village is aware that there are flooding issues in this area.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Chair Dawson, may I say something?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, the other thing I'd just bring to attention, and you know, being a long-time resident as well, when I was growing up, a lot of these houses around Beverly, I think the lot coverage ratio on those was a lot smaller so we'd get a lot more, you know, residential. These houses around Beverly are a lot bigger than they were if you were looking at an aerial from 1984. Scarsdale of course didn't even exist, that was a forest back then, you know. Obviously, that affects, all that stuff affects. That was all, Dryden was there before that stuff happened, that changed after Dryden was there.

So, in my opinion, again kind of putting all this into perspective, there's a lot macro changes to this neighborhood compared to --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, I completely agree. I'm not stating otherwise. I'm just stating that if there is any aspect of the condition that was aggravated by this addition, I think we should address it. That's all I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Agree.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Chair Dawson, if I could?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: As I understand what you're saying, Mr. Schulz, is that while you may not fix everything in the neighborhood, you are trying to do something to ameliorate the condition, not only from what you're doing for the petition, the project you're bringing before us, but you're doing things that will accommodate or reduce some and improve some of the situation with things in the neighborhood at large. That's what I heard you say if you said that.

MR. SCHULZ: That's right. Yes, by this structure going in, we anticipate that it's going to help alleviate some of the water that would be coming off of our site and

detaining it long enough that it will not add additional water to the Village system.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, if your engineers and the engineers with the MWRD and the Village agree that you are at least making the situation better than it had been, that should be viewed as a plus, not a negative, in my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Absolutely. I think there was also something in the report that showed that there was additional, or less impervious surface space with the addition? I saw it in the, I'd have to find it again, in one of the reports. I'm assuming it was one thing you put together because it had to do with the drainage, if I can pull that back up.

But, okay, so, oh, here it is. There's so many reports in here. Okay, all right. Anyway, the other thing that I heard, and to jump off of what you were saying, Commissioner Jensen, is that this is an ongoing discussion, that we're still looking for more solutions. We're still working with the Village. We're doing the best we can for this project, but that doesn't mean this is the end. It seems like you're still discussing other options.

MR. HUBBARD: Preliminary stormwater detention has been reviewed by the Village. The finalization of what, you know, the actual application is going to be has not been done. But on a preliminary basis, they have satisfactorily demonstrated that they can design the site to comply with all codes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, okay.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Just another question. From the point you made before, you can double the size of the storage but if the sewer in Dryden Street is full and can't take any more, so that's a bigger problem than just storage on your site.

MR. CAP: Correct. It becomes kind of a Village issue and a lot of this is common, you know. Chicago, Chicago land area, stormwater just was not the practice that it is today. Sewers are undersized, we know that now and now we're trying to fix the problems of the past.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right. All right, I appreciate that. Okay, let me see, I think that that was all the public commentary that hadn't been previously, that's according to my notes.

So, any other comments, questions, motions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll make the motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#22-017, a Special Use Permit to allow a public elementary school on the subject property, and the following Variations:

1. Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4, to allow 62 parking stalls where 67 are required.
2. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.6, to allow a building addition at 25.3 feet in height where building heights are restricted to a maximum height of 25 feet.
3. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3A, to allow a 22.1-foot front yard setback for the existing building where a minimum 24.1-foot setback is required.
4. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3B, to allow a 10.7-foot side yard setback (north) for the existing building where a minimum 72.7-foot setback is required.
5. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3D, to allow a 29-foot rear yard setback for the existing and proposed building where a minimum 30-foot setback is required.
6. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.5A, to allow a 40.5-percent building lot coverage where maximum building lot coverage is restricted to 35 percent.

7. Chapter 28, Section 6.5.2, to allow a sport court outside of a rear yard and within a side yard.
8. Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2B, to omit the required landscape islands at the southern end of the easternmost parking row within the north lot.
9. 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 south parking lot.

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. If enrollment at Dryden Elementary School exceeds or is projected to exceed 526 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. Should the parking agreement with the Southminster Church expire, additional drop-off/pickup loading areas and/or parking may be required at the discretion of the Village. Additionally, operational changes to address parking issues or drop-off/pickup issues may also be required, which changes must be implemented to the satisfaction of the Village.
4. 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.
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 LORENZINI: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other commentary before we go to vote?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: 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 Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

Okay, so another unanimous approval. Again, we're just a recommending body. Our purview is much smaller than what is considered at the Village Board. Sam will give you more information about next steps.

Okay, so with that, we move on to the last item on our agenda which is general public comment. Do we have any items for general public comment? Okay, just a reminder, say your name, spell your last name, and public comment is limited to three minutes.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTARY

MS. CAYER: Melissa Cayer, C-a-y-e-r. Vote against tax increment finance districts because they cause schools to forgo property tax money and speculate that future students might get more and current students have to go without resources in the hopes that maybe future students will get more. So, vote against tax increment finance districts so the schools do not have to forgo property tax money.

Plus, on the joint review boards, the schools have a representation, the Park District has representation, the township has representation, but the township only gets a very small amount of money compared to what the school gets. The school has to put up, let's say 750 bucks where the township is only putting up a penny. So, they really shouldn't be getting, you know, a full vote on a joint review board for something that's serious because theirs is like, educated guess, \$8 million in the Village tax increment finance district bank accounts.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

Any other public commentary?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Public commentary?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, but --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: We don't get to speak in public commentary.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: -- I would like to make a remark. I would like to ask Sam.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, okay. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Sam, we've had an issue that's been developing with properties that we're approving involving the medical properties, in the medical zoning, and the parking issues. This is something that's been periodic for the last, it's been going on for years that I've sat on this committee. I think that we, as a body, should get together and address this and see what we can do to try to minimize the problems that are out there.

MR. HUBBARD: Point well taken. I'll raise that with the Director and see what we can do.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, I know you guys have a lot going on now, but I'm seeing more of these come up within the community, very similar to what we had last week involving other properties. It's going to get worse unless we do something to --

MR. HUBBARD: You're talking about medical, you're talking about office

properties that are leasing to medical tenants and the medical tenants are taking up all of the parking?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: With the change in the medical industry, we have a lot more medical uses going to buildings within town that are not zoned medical, and they're putting a stress on the parking in those buildings. Whether it's realtors, brokers who are leasing these properties, or the property owners, they would rather get a tenant in there, spend his money, and let them come to us and work out a solution than to address the problem beforehand.

MR. HUBBARD: Fair enough. I think one of the main problems is that medical tenants aren't required by the state to get business licenses. So, they move into these spaces, they sign a lease, and then --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: But there is, from my understanding, there is no statute in the Village that prohibits us as a Village from requiring medical practices, businesses that are licensed by the state, we could still have them get business licenses here and make sure that the zoning is done.

MR. HUBBARD: I'm not sure about that, but we would certainly have to look into it.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It's a topic that's come up within the legal and real estate community, individuals that I deal with, and they seem to think that we could still require it. There's other municipalities in the area that require state licensed businesses to get business licenses.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, point well taken.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, any other comments or do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, we're getting in right under the wire though. Look at us.

(Whereupon, at 10:28 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)