

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: GREENBRIER SCHOOL BUILDING EXPANSION - 2330 NORTH VERDE DRIVE -
PC #22-020
AMENDMENT TO SUP ORDINANCE #17-035 FOR BUILDING ADDITION,
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 22nd day of February, 2023 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

for the Pledge.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, let's call the meeting to order and stand

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, roll call.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Present.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

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, first order of business, approval of minutes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Second?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Abstain.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Abstain.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, so then we have another school.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: A couple of schools.

MR. SCHULZ: Five or six, here it is.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Welcome back.

MR. SCHULZ: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, who else is, who am I swearing in

today?

MR. SCHULZ: Oh, yes, I'll have to bring everybody up to give it.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Come on up.

MR. HUBBARD: I don't have it, but I can go through the slides if you just tell

me next one.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: What are we looking for?

MR. HUBBARD: The advancer for the slide show, but we don't have it this

evening.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Terrific, all right. Go ahead with your presentation.

MR. SCHULZ: Thank you very much. Again, I'm Ryan Schulz, Director of Facilities Management for District 25, along with some of the staff for Arlington Heights School District 25. I'm going to have Sam click through tonight since we don't have the clicker.

So, Sam, we can go ahead.

Again, these are just our guiding principles that we talked about before on how we got here with our full-day Kindergarten program. Again, the expansion at Greenbrier is primarily guided by the full-day Kindergarten program and the need to provide additional space to the building and give them additional needs into the future for programs and enrollment needs.

Again, why is the addition needed? Again, it's primarily focused on the full-day Kindergarten portion, and we do see a slight uptick of enrollment at this school. Again, it's primarily the portion that is, the enrollment increase is primarily driven by the increase in Kindergarten students that we anticipate coming to the school as a result of the full-day program coming into effect.

Ownership and notification. Again, we did the title search. We verified the ownership of the properties. The neighborhood meeting was held on November 1st and no neighbors attended that meeting. The Conceptual Design Review had the unanimous support. Design Commission meeting again is scheduled for next week, February 28th. Just a timing issue didn't allow us to have it before this meeting, so it will be happening next week on the 28th.

The Plan Commission hearing tonight, all our notifications were posted. Our mailings were also sent out. The affidavit was sent over to the Village for review. Then the Village Trustee approval will be coming up in the future once we get through the items tonight in this review.

The construction is anticipated a little bit later on this project since it is only two classrooms. Right now we're slating either the winter of '23 or possibly even waiting until the spring of '24, just depending on scheduling. So, that's our preliminary schedule. We may decide to move that up at some point, but right now we're kind of slating it since it is only two classrooms that it would be later in the project since we do have six schools that we'll be getting started to give us some time to get those projects bid and get these started as well.

This is a summary again of the variation requests that we're looking for tonight, again, two variation requests in addition to the special use permit for the site. So, again, the amendment would be for parking that we'll go through in a little bit, and another portion is a small eave that is over, extending the setback limit on one side of the building which I'll point out once we get into those slides.

Going over the footprint and floor plan kind of area of the site, the addition primarily is going to sit on the south end of the building, kind of the southwest corner in that red box. We designed the addition in 2017-2018 to accept an addition in that location in the future should it ever be needed, so we're looking to put two classrooms in this location on the first floor along with some storage and corridor space. So, we'll create a new courtyard space, actually it will help us in that regard because the courtyard right now is open and it's very difficult to maintain for people going in there. So, we put a fence up initially and people were using the

fence to get on the roof, so we had to end up taking out the fence and we have cameras back there.

So, this addition will actually help us in that regard for reviewing people and not allowing them to get into the building area a little bit more and jumping on the roof. So, again, the addition is set up to also accept a second story in the future if we need to since we are starting to run out of land space at this site to accept other places to build. So, this addition will be constructed to be able to accept a second story to connect to the two-story wing that was built several years ago in this location.

I also want to point out the parking requirement. Again, we are short at this facility. One of the reasons that we are going forward and requesting the variation and not looking at additional parking on site here is this building has highly traveling staff at this facility. So, again, we have an EC program here at this facility, the Early Childhood program that is a half-day program in the morning and a half-day program in the afternoon. So, the overall building enrollment at the school is relatively smaller just based on the K-5 population that is pretty small compared with our other schools.

So, we have staff that travel from other buildings in the district and service this school throughout the day. So, they may come in the morning for half a day and then they flow out. So, the staff count is really variable, it's not that they're there at all times. So, the number that you see for our staffing is the full amount of people that are assigned to that building at some point throughout the day, but that may again mean that they're there for half the morning and then they leave and go out and somebody may not be back to the building. So, that doesn't mean they're all going to be at the site at one time. So, that's why we're requesting the variation on parking.

The other portion of variation that we're requesting is the eave along the southwest corner. It's a little hard to see but it's a yellow kind of dash line. That is the section there where the eave oversteps the setback limit by approximately a foot and a half I believe or half a foot. I think it's only half a foot in that location.

One last thing, I just want to point out we are looking to add some permeable pavers in the east parking lot on the top right side of this picture. Then on the bottom left, we do already have some existing permeable pavers for stormwater. Again, I'll talk about the stormwater portion a little bit later on in the later slides.

Just an overview of the floor plan of the addition. Again, the two classrooms will go to connect to an existing building on both ends. One is a part of more of the original building done in the 1960's and the other portion where it's connecting to was done in 2017-2018. So, again, we're looking to add that section there to loop the building off. It will provide some flow then into the building as well, because right now the existing addition that was recently done kind of sticks out, it's just kind of a one-way corridor. So, it will provide some flow and some continuity on that end of the building, and again, we will be creating the small courtyard that can be used by the building throughout the year for various services that they would want while maintaining light and air into those existing classrooms as well.

A rendering of the addition. So, again, this addition really works very well and works very nicely with the existing footprint and layout of the building. So, the facade really carries through to the new addition. It's very similar and symmetrical, so we're looking to carry through that existing 1960's look from the one portion on the southern end and bringing it over to the new addition, again, tying into the two-story addition behind it that was recently done several years ago.

Here's showing the elevations again in 2D format, again, just showing how it connects to the two-story addition, the top one, and then again on the bottom elevation is the south, southwest elevation, showing how it connects to the existing building from the 1960's.

Going through enrollment and staffing, again, we do see the uptick in enrollment at this school that we project to see from the full-day Kindergarten program and a small amount from the actual neighborhood that we anticipate overall enrollment growth, again going from 386 to 406. For staffing, we're only anticipating at this point to go up two staff just to support the full-day Kindergarten program, because again, we just don't have enough Kindergarten teachers right now in the current half-day program to support that going over to the full day. So, we're looking to have the two additional full-time Kindergarten teachers.

Classroom counts, so I'll just go through that real quick. 24 classrooms currently going up to 26, and then you can see our projected sections going forward is 23, pretty flat across the years coming out. So, we will have a number of classrooms that can be used for support services and breakout services at the facility for that going forward.

Traffic and parking -- Sam, you can go ahead.

Going through the parking lots, again, we are short here slightly at the site. We have currently 75 parking spaces on site, we are projected to need 86 by the Village current code. As I discussed earlier, we feel that the site has sufficient parking to support our staff based on the amount of people that are flowing in and out throughout the day, and again, not always utilizing those spaces at all times. So, we feel that this is a reasonable request to have this variation request.

In addition, I just wanted to go through a little bit with taxis. We're heavily on taxis at this school due to the program, the EC program that is at this site. So, we have a large number of taxis that service our students compared with other schools, just because kids may be coming from different locations within Arlington Heights that they would need those transport services to the school. So, we have six taxis in the a.m., 11 mid-day, and six taxis in the p.m. hour, and then we do have one bus at this location.

I just want to point out, this was from the drone footage at like 3:30 in September. I just want to show that there are open parking spaces up on the east lot which is on the top far area under the Greenbrier, and then also below in the main lot to the main parking lot in the back. So, just trying to show general things, this is again 3:30 in the afternoon when we would normally still have all the staff there at the building that were occupying the site, just showing that there are a number of open spaces. Again, parents are already queued up because their students are going to be getting out, and there may be a few parents parked in that lot as well waiting to get their students even though they're technically not supposed to be parked in the parking lot.

Just one more reference, this again, was just a satellite picture from May 13th of 2021 showing a large portion of parking spots open in that west lot. The east lot does have a number open, again, it looks like there's more than there actually are. For some reason, the satellite image just kind of ghosted I guess, it's kind of like see-through, so it's not, all those spots aren't open on that east lot. I would say they're probably about half to 70 percent full on that east smaller lot, but again, it's fairly clear to see on that west lot that there are a large number of spaces open during a normal school day.

Can you just try clicking maybe one, Sam, to get it to start? There we go.

So, this is the arrival video just showing the flow through the back

main parking lot, how traffic enters through one entrance and exits through the same entrance. Again, that lot is technically supposed to be a right-in/right-out only. So, you'll see in the morning that a large number of these cars are following the right-out, but we do see occasionally that a car will snake to the left and start going over to the other intersection. Again, this was intended from our last project, we felt that this was the most reasonable to try to get traffic away from the intersection that's near the school and where there's a large amount of pedestrians. So, we do have good adoption of it but it's perfect, right, so we do have people breaking out, especially towards the end now, you'll see a large number of them start going left which is to the east instead of following the sign and breaking out towards the frontage road. I hope Mr. Green is not one of them that breaks that rule. So, we can go to the next one.

This is again just traffic departure on the stacking, kind of where cars at the end of the day will be stacking primarily in the western parking lot on the side nearest the school. So, again, there are some cars on Roanoke that queue up there, get closer to the intersection of Roanoke and Verde, and then also in the yellow line along Roanoke, we do see some cars there. It's not a primary area where cars are stacking up, but we do see that occasionally where people are queuing up in that location and picking up their students.

Also on Verde is also a section that I have kind of hashed there. We see sporadic, like sometimes it does have a lot of cars there and other times there are not. So, that's why I put it in dash, it's kind of a sporadic zone of cars when they park there. We do see a number of cars near the parking lot on that east side, and then also a little bit farther to the north along the streets near the baseball field.

Going through departure, again, this is at approximately 3:30, you can see cars starting to queue up in the parking lot. You'll notice that a number of cars are sticking out into the streets, but once it gets flowing at approximately 3:35, it moves fairly quickly and it clears that little hiccup in that location fairly quickly in that location. So, you can see traffic now, students are out and starting to flow, and once we get going here, it starts pulling them in fairly quickly off the street. So, again, that was right around 3:30 and the video I think stops around 3:42 or so. You can see that it's a fairly short window that there is an impact on that street.

Again, on the south side of the street, we do see some cars parked, but primarily we believe those are residents parked in that location. Occasionally, there may be a parent that would park there, but primarily there is some residential parking on the street there on the south side of the street.

Just showing vehicle stacking that is uphill on the site, again, both on site and nearby. We did show some of the street because there's no houses on that side of the street. It's primarily the School District's and Park District's property, so we showed that on the map as well that it's not impacting neighbors, that it's a fairly open area. There is a large quantity of street stacking available at this location, especially on the southwest side of the site. Again, we can fit 15 cars in that west lot and 10 vehicles, excuse me, in the east parking lot as well to stack, and you can also see the total stacking that is available on the street.

Stormwater and sustainability. So, stormwater primarily will be serviced by the existing detention basin that is in the northwest portion of the site. It is owned by the Park District, the land, but we do have a license agreement to store our water there. It was permitted with enough volume control that we can have additional water go to that site, so again, that's been reviewed by Village Engineering in preliminary stages. We'll have additional calculations brought forward to them for final approval, and then will be brought to MWRD for

their final sign off on the concept as well, but we do have permitted volume left in that area, it is up near the park area. There's a pathway that goes through that area, but again, we do have permitted licensed volume control available in that location as well.

For sustainability, similar to other sites, there will be LED lighting, high efficiency HVAC, low flow plumbing fixtures. We do have green space still available, adequate bike storage and ridership, and then future exploration again at this facility of solar and PV panels being put on the roof of this facility.

With that, I will be open to any questions that you may have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, great.

Sam, before you start the Staff report, have all public notices been given? I forgot to ask that earlier.

MR. HUBBARD: They have, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, terrific. All right, so Staff report, please.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you, Chair Dawson.

Okay, so Greenbrier School is located in an R-3 Zoning District. As part of the addition that occurred in 2017, they received a special use permit to allow for that building addition. All schools within the R-3 district are required to develop with a special use permit, and the four-classroom addition in 2017 triggered the need for the school to obtain a special use permit. Similarly, the proposed addition triggers a need to amend that special use permit. So, the reason the Petitioner is before you this evening is for an amendment to the 2017 special use permit to allow the building addition.

Additionally, there was a variation granted as part of that approval back in 2017 to allow a parking deficit, 75 stalls, where 84 would be required by current code requirements. The addition of classrooms and staff increases the intensity of this variation to require now 86 stalls instead of 84, and they are not proposing to add any additional parking stalls. So, an amendment to that variation is also required.

Finally, there is a variation required for the projection of the eaves at the southwest corner of the building addition where they project three feet out into the front yard setback where code limits this projection to 2.5 feet. So, there's a half a foot encroachment into the required setback.

On the Comprehensive Plan, the site is designated as schools, so the existing and future uses are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan.

As you've heard, the Petitioner held a neighborhood meeting in November of last year. No one from the public attended. They did send out invitations to all of the residents within 250 feet, and in some instances went a little bit beyond that, but nobody ended up attending the meeting.

In December of last year, they appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. There was limited discussion on this project, mostly related to the drop-off/pickup operations, but there were no major concerns identified and the Conceptual Plan Review Committee members in attendance encouraged the School District to move forward.

The Petitioner will appear before the Design Commission on the 28th of this month, and the School District must abide by any requirements stipulated by the Design Commission as they move forward to final design and permitting for this project.

Here's an aerial of the site. You can see the neighborhood is primarily single-family residential. To the north and northwest there is Greenbrier Park. Then to

the east, south and west are single-family homes. The addition is shown by that red box and it will be built flush with the current portion of the building here, so it just extends straight along that edge.

The current building in this location is built right up to that minimum allowed front yard setback. The proposed addition will maintain that and does not require any variation, but again, as you've heard, the eaves will project out into that required setback by approximately three feet, requiring the need for a variation, and I'll get into that a little bit more later.

Here's a zoomed out neighborhood aerial showing more of the neighborhood, and then again, the site plan with the building addition shown in color with the remaining portions of the existing building shown in gray.

There's very limited site work proposed as part of this project. Some of the other school addition projects that the Plan Commission has recently discussed over the last several weeks have involved more site work in comparison to this project. The only real above ground change, other than the building addition, is that the School District is proposing to reconstruct the east parking lot. Thankfully, the parking lot complies to code as it exists today, and so there's no variations triggered by this reconstruction. It complies with code both relative to the size and orientation of the parking stalls, the drive aisle widths, the curb cuts, as well as the landscaping.

So, here you see the elevations of the building up top, and then on the bottom is the existing building. Again, this projection of the eaves is circled in red here, and they are just maintaining the existing eave that's on the current building. But again, it does require that variation for that half a foot projection beyond the maximum allowed 2.5-foot projection into the required front yard setback.

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation. To deviate the projection of the eaves would have a slightly awkward appearance. It's an existing condition on the building that they're just matching, and it's going to be set back at least 23 feet from the right-of-way, and then there's a street in between that and any neighboring single-family homes. So, we are supportive of that variation.

They will be installing some landscaping in the form of some foundation plantings and two trees. There is no strict code requirement for landscaping in this instance, so this is just to enhance the appearance of the site.

This brings me to traffic, parking and drop-off/pickup operations. So, again in 2017, this site was approved for a variation to allow the 75 parking stalls that exist on the site today. They are increasing the extent of the variation by two stalls, and so the variation needs to be amended.

In relation to whether or not there is adequate supply to accommodate demand for this site, the traffic and parking study surveyed the parking area after the morning arrival period and found that the parking lots were about 75 to 85 percent at capacity. So, that translates to vacancies for about 10 vehicles. Additionally, the Village surveyed the parking area twice over the last two years and found vacancies in the parking lot around nine to 13 vehicles. Given the estimated two-employee increase, the traffic study found that demand for parking would increase by up to around eight vehicles. So, given the surplus that we've observed, plus has been observed in the study, finding anywhere between nine to 13 vacancies within the parking lot, we believe that the parking area does have capacity to accommodate for the increased demand associated with the building addition.

We are aware of some congestion that occurs in and around the Verde and Roanoke intersection during peak times, most notably during afternoon pickup. Again, the Staff report outlined a situation where cars park on the north side of Roanoke and wait while the early childhood pickup occurs, and that creates a situation where there's double-stacked cars. So, we've asked the School District to look into solutions to this, and they are recommending additional communications to families and additional staff outside to address this issue. Should these means prove ineffective, then they have some kind of contingencies. They could put out some traffic cones, we can work with them to maybe install some additional striping, and we can potentially install some No Parking signs in that area where people stop and double-stack. So, we do find these solutions to be adequate, but we are recommending a condition of approval that if there are continued issues with drop-off and pickup, that the Petitioner will work with us to address those.

Relative to the overall drop-off and pickup operations, the traffic and parking study was predicated on the 2026-2027 enrollment which is expected to be 406 students with a capacity of around 23 classrooms. But the addition is being built out to provide capacity for 15 percent above those projections, so there is some potential for unanticipated traffic or parking impacts should enrollment increase to that maximum 15 percent capacity above the 2026-2027 numbers. So, just to be proactive in that situation, we are recommending a condition of approval that if enrollment does exceed the 406 capacity, that they work with the Village to address any drop-off or pickup problems, and if they can't come to an agreement with us on what's needed to mitigate any problems, then they would be required to come back before the Plan Commission and Village Board for an amendment to the special use permit.

That being said, we are supportive of this project and we are recommending approval subject to the five conditions shown here.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, great.

Do I have a motion to enter the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed or abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No, okay, great.

All right, so do we have any questions before public commentary? I'll start down here. No?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I just have a question. When you were showing the video of cars leaving and they were all supposed to go in the entry and aprons there, it was a right-in/right-out, and every once in a while you can see a car, you know, turn to the left and would create a problem. Did you ever consider putting in like a curbed island there, kind of like a pork chop shape to force them to turn right so they're not turning left into oncoming traffic?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes, we haven't considered that yet. I mean, we've had that at other schools. We've just seen that people will still violate that, even though it is trying to, you know, prod them more to the right, that people will still, if it's advantageous to them and there's a not a lot of traffic, they'll still turn left out of there, but it could be something we'd explore. We tried it at other schools and seen kind of mixed use with that as well.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I just wondered if you're aware of that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: To kind of follow-up on that concept, have you had any incidents at all with somebody making a left turn causing any kind of collision there?

MR. SCHULZ: Sorry, was that for Olive?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Oh, I'm sorry. Have you had any incidents at all where somebody has made a left-hand turn and has caused an accident?

MR. SCHULZ: Not that I'm aware of, no. None here.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I guess my last question, and it's not that I'm looking for you to spend more money, but I heard you say that these two classrooms are being designed for a future second-story addition. I didn't see a second floor plan in the presentation. But if you're '25 or '26, 2026 projections require a need for two additional classrooms, I'm just curious, it'd be a lot cheaper to build them now than later being that's already designed. I mean your footings, your foundations, your second floor slab doesn't change, so you're just adding, even the perimeter outside walls, you don't have to do anything inside to finish it. I'm just bringing it up, it might be, if you're only that far away, four years away from building or requiring a couple more classrooms, you might consider building them now, just a shell, and it would be cheaper.

MR. SCHULZ: We're not anticipating the need for more classrooms beyond five years right now. We're accommodating that with these two. So, we're projecting that these two additional classrooms will serve us well into the future, but --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: All right.

MR. SCHULZ: -- again, if way further down the road enrollment would increase --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I thought I saw the table where there may be two more classrooms added in --

MR. SCHULZ: No intention of that right now, no.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: All right, that's all I have.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, a question regarding the current enrollment. You have currently 40 Kindergarten students I believe?

MR. SCHULZ: I trust that you have that correct number.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: About how many teachers does it take to teach them half day? And how many more does it take for full day?

MR. SCHULZ: So, again, typically what will happen, again, if you have four sections of Kindergarten right now, you have two teachers because they can serve two classes in the morning, in the a.m., and then they can service two classrooms in the afternoon. So, essentially, it's not a perfect match but it's essentially doubling the amount of Kindergarten teachers that you need. It depends on the section need a little bit, you get a little bit more efficient this way, so it might not always be doubling. But essentially, as a rough estimate, it's usually adding twice as many Kindergarten teachers.

But I think right now, I think we have two-and-a-half. I think there's a section, I believe it's, is it one? I can't remember the exact quantity. Stacey Mallek does.

MS. MALLEK: So, our enrollment goal at the Kindergarten grade level is 20 students per teacher. So, we don't automatically add a teacher if we hit 21 or 22. Actually, I believe at Greenbrier this year we have slightly larger class sizes, but we added a teacher assistant to assist in that classroom rather than adding a whole another section which would then decrease or split those numbers in half and you'd have 12 kids or 11 kids in a class.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, we're talking about, with the increase, about four more parking spaces are needed, two to four?

MS. MALLEK: Well, based, it's throughout the five years, just two more. Two more additional staff over the total number that we currently have.

MR. SCHULZ: I think the portion that Sam was getting into is taking into account the additional classrooms, there's a requirement for every five classrooms you're going to have a certain amount of parking spaces. So, that's included I believe in the number that Sam was referencing as well. But the spaces are solely based on the number of staff that you have and the number of classrooms. Those are the two metrics that are currently in the code for that. There's no student population metric portion in that right now, especially for elementary schools since we don't have students driving.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, right. Hopefully not at that age. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I get over to this school a lot, and I can tell you that yesterday I was there for three of these pickups and deliveries. A lot of grandkids. As in both the front lot, the east and the west lot as you call them, there were open spots. Every time I'm there, there's parking spots that you can easily take. So, I would go along with your finding, and what the Village found is that there are open parking spots all the hours of the day, because like I say I'm there a lot during the week.

But my only comment would be that the drop-off and pickup works very well. I mean I think it really does. My only problem are the parents and their driving abilities, and I'm being nice when I say that, but that's really where the problem is, it's not in the plan, it's with the parents. So, I've seen the double stacking and everything that happens there. In that case, the right-out is a good idea when you have a double stack because otherwise I'm driving on the right-of-way to get over to where I have to go. I'm only kidding of course.

But like I say, it works very well and it's only a few minutes and it's over with for the day. So, anyway, that was just my comment, that it's a good plan.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, looking at this chart, it says 81 employees, but the zoning is 75 spots. So, how does that, do they ride together or just, you have visitors, too, once in a while I think.

MS. MALLEK: So, of those employees, two of them are night custodians, so they show up at 3:00 in the afternoon. Some of them, I think we have 20 part-time staff at that building that none of those staff work on Fridays. There was one of the slides in Ryan's presentation, I think nine of the 20 work half days. Three of the staff work only during the lunch hour because they're our lunch service staff.

So, they're there at different times of the day. They're not all there at the same time, which is why we always have open spots. In addition, some of our related service providers like speech and language or psychologists, social workers, they may only need to be at the school two hours twice a week. It just depends on when we schedule them because it depends on the needs of the kids, and then those staff will travel to other schools to assist in those buildings. So, we just don't have all of those 86 staff on site at the same time.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Before you sit down, could you just state your name for the record just so we have that?

MS. MALLEK: Stacey Mallek.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Spell the last name.

MS. MALLEK: M-a-l-l-e-k.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, thanks. I know we all have seen you so many times, but we just have to make sure it's on the record.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Just one quick question out of curiosity, and I believe this was the same with the Westgate School that you now have this courtyard in between the classrooms. What do you do with that courtyard? Is it turf grass? How do you maintain that? Would you, you know, would you think about making that maybe some perennial native plants that would not require so much maintenance?

MR. SCHULZ: So, actually it's synthetic turf we're looking to put in this location so it's nice and flat and we can use it. Some of them will probably get a little bit more use than some of the others because there's only classrooms on one side, so if they're vacated there might be more use of that courtyard space. The size of this one gives a little bit more space, too, to set something up in that location.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, first of all, I'd like to just commend the quality of the reports from both the Petitioner and the Village Staff. It really makes understanding these issues much easier.

I do have just one question which is I didn't see any signage that said Right Only in the place where you've got a few people who go to the left. Is there signage there and I just missed it?

MR. SCHULZ: In my understanding, there still is. So, we'll verify that that's still there. I haven't looked at it with my own eyes, but there was initially when we did the addition in 2018 right under the stop sign on that parking lot, it says either No Left Turn or Right Turn Only, one of the two. It does have a sign --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, yes. You should validate that. It didn't look like there was one.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: There's a sign there, Lynn.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Is there? Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I've never seen it, but I know it's there.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, good. Yes, no, thank you, that's the only thing I needed to clarify.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, we're about to open up to public comment, but I did also skip over one other question which was have you read the Staff report and do you agree to the conditions of approval?

MR. SCHULZ: We do.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Terrific. All right, let's move to public commentary. So, we're opening up for public commentary.

Anyone on this side want to speak?

PUBLIC COMMENTARY FOR PC #22-020

MS. CAYER: Melissa Cayer speaking, C-a-y-e-r. Open Rand School, avoid building additions, redistrict and implement school choice. Arlington Heights has dense housing units which causes water management issues.

The referendum, School District 25 issue bonds, shall the Board of Education of Arlington Heights School District No. 25, Cook County, Illinois improve the sites up, build and equip additions to, and alter, repair and equip existing buildings including without

limitation building classrooms for full-day Kindergarten and replacing windows, flooring, roofing, plumbing, electrical equipment and HVAC systems, and issue bonds of said School District to the amount of \$75 million for the purpose of paying the cost thereof.

It doesn't say that you can't implement opening Rand School in other words. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Anyone else in this side of the room? No?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Anyone on this side of the room for public commentary? No?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, then we'll go ahead and close public commentary.

Any additional questions? Anyone have a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I've got one more question. I was wondering if anybody from the public was going to say anything about drainage.

Sam, is there any drainage issues in the area with the public?

MR. HUBBARD: No, the Village did some extensive drainage improvements in this neighborhood a couple of years ago. So, no, I mean, the jury is still out on whether that has completely solved some of the problems. We believe it has, but no, there's no significant stormwater drainage that we're concerned about relative to this building addition.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, but any drainage, any retention that's needed is going to be in the area owned by the park?

MR. HUBBARD: Right. The existing detention is within the park.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: How do you know there's adequate capacity there to take --

MR. HUBBARD: Well, on a preliminary basis, I think we're still kind of working that out with this particular school, but if there does need to be additional capacity, it can probably be solved without any changes to that detention basin. It could be solved through permeable pavers potentially. It could be upsizing some of the pipes there. So, there's a variety of different ways that they could tackle that if additional detention is required without any costly underground stormwater vaults.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other questions? Anyone have a motion?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'd like to make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #22-020, an Amendment to SUP Ordinance #17-035 to allow a building addition, and the following variations:

- 1. An amendment to the variation granted in Ordinance #17-035 that allowed 75 parking spaces where 84 spaces are required by code to now allow 75 spaces where 86 spaces are required by code.**
- 2. A variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.6-5.1 to allow eaves projecting three feet into a front yard setback where code restricts this distance to 2.5 feet.**

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. If enrollment at Greenbrier Elementary School exceeds or is projected to exceed 406 students within the proposed building, the School District shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of 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. Compliance with the 2/28/23 Design Commission motion shall be required.**
- 5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, did you have any discussion? You had your hand up, Jay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Oh, I was just going to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, roll call?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

All right, so we have unanimous approval on Greenbrier.

(Whereupon, at 8:10 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)