

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF  
**THE PLAT & SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE**  
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION  
HELD AT VILLAGE HALL ON:

November 18, 2015

**Project Title:** St. Edna's Catholic Church  
**Address:** 2525 N. Arlington Heights Road.  
**Petitioner:** Susan Maish  
Jaeger, Nickola and Associates  
350 South Northwest Highway, Suite 106  
Park Ridge, Illinois 60068

**Requested Action:**

- Amendment to PUD Ordinance 02-005 and Ordinance 13-072 to allow the construction of a parish center, rectory, chapel and other interior and site improvements.

**Variations Required:**

- A variation from Chapter 28, Section 11.4, Schedule of Required Parking, to allow a reduction to the minimum number of required parking stalls from 642 to 376 spaces.

**Attendees:** Susan Maish – Petitioner, Jaeger, Nickola and Associates  
Michael F., Parishioner of St. Edna  
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner  
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner  
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner  
Bill Enright, Deputy Director of Planning & Community Development

---

**Project Summary:**

The subject site is 8.03 acres (349,787 square feet) and includes the 995-seat sanctuary, and the Doherty Center and Hurley Center totaling 50,209 square feet of building area. In 2013, the PUD was amended to allow for a new 10,800 sf Parish Center and remodeling of the Hurley and the Doherty Centers, a revised northeast detention area and new southwest detention area, and 25 new parking spaces to replace 17 existing spaces (net gain of 8). A variation of 228 spaces for parking to permit 362 spaces where 590 is required was approved. Since 2013, the former rectory building has been demolished to prepare for the new Parish Center, however the project did not move forward at that time due to funding.

St. Edna's is looking to move forward with modifications to the 2013 approvals, including a larger Parish Life Center, which would was approved for 10,800sf in 2013 with the new proposal at 12,795sf in the same location just north of the Hurley Center. The plans also call for a new 2,240sf, 104-seat chapel at the west end of the church, and a new 4,540 rectory at the northeast portion of the site. Modifications to the northeast detention will be required and the addition of a new southwest detention area. Additional parking for 46 cars is proposed to the north of the new Parish Life Center. Total required parking will be 642 spaces with 376 provided a variation of 266.

The petitioner has provided a narrative of existing conditions, the 2013 approval and the new proposal, which is attached as part of the packet.

Operationally, St. Edna's has a congregation size of 2,928 families (8,994 persons) and an employment base of 17 employees (full and part time) and 2 priests. Although the facility does not have a private school, religious education for adults and children are held throughout the week. In addition, St. Edna's has several leadership programs (i.e. Ministries, Separation/Divorce, bereavement, family life, etc.) that are held once or twice a month during the weekday evenings. Religious services are held Monday through Friday at 6:45 AM and 8:00 AM, Saturday at 5:00 PM, and Sunday at 7:30 AM, 9:30 AM, 11:30 AM, and 5:30 PM with a combined Saturday and Sunday average total attendance of 2,400 people.

**Meeting Discussion:**

**Ms. Maish** introduced herself and began by explaining the existing site plan and neighborhood surrounding St. Edna's. The existing site has 363 parking spaces, a single building housing the church, a multi-purpose space, administrative space, and other ancillary meeting spaces. She noted that a rectory had previously been on the site as well, but was taken down as part of a previous PUD amendment, which included the addition of a parish center, reconfigured parking with 8 additional spaces, and the addition of one and modification of an existing detention area. Due to funding, only the removal of the rectory was completed. The reason for requesting another PUD amendment is to have updated plans approved with pieces that can be completed as funds become available. The parish life center would remain in its original position, with an updated larger size of 12,795 square feet, and would host large-scale events such as plays or dinners. The parking area would also be expanded under the new proposal, and a chapel would be added as well for small weddings or funerals. Lastly, the updated plan would re-incorporate a rectory on the site. The only requested variation would be for parking, all heights, setbacks, and other regulations would be observed by the proposal. Additional actions under the new proposal would include remodeling of existing spaces, increasing the height of the proposed structure from 25' 8" to 30' 8". The petitioner then explained the overall building design and grading of the site, showing renderings to the committee.

**Mr. Enright** stated that in general Staff is supportive of the request, stating that the primary issues with the proposal would be: 1) Inclusion of water detention facilities, stating that this would be accomplished through enlarging the existing detention basin in the northeast portion of the site, and adding a second detention basin in the south portion of the site, and therefore the petitioner should submit detailed plans of these basins at the time of application. 2) The parking variation. He noted that while the variation in this proposal is larger, it is due to the larger overall square footage rather than an increase in the capacity of the congregation spaces. Additionally, the size of the congregation has dropped from the size it was at the time of previous approval. It is typical for churches and park district facilities to have large variations for parking. Due to changes in the proposal; however, the petitioner would have to submit an update memo from a parking consultant, the one they had used for the previous PUD amendment or another, that would address any impacts resulting from the change in plans. He explained that this project would also require a Design Commission application, and recommended that a community meeting be held.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked why there was an upscaling of facilities being proposed when the congregation was shrinking in size.

**Ms. Maish** stated that the proposed additions would be to better accommodate the church's current functions. Before the prior PUD amendment, the church was hoping to have a larger facility, however had to scale down plans due to limited funds. Instead of aiming to implement a scaled down building, the church is now looking to do a full-sized but phased addition.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if the rectory was smaller in the previous PUD proposal.

**Ms. Maish** stated that there was no rectory in the previous proposal.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked how the proposed additions would be phased.

**Ms. Maish** stated that the goal was to begin construction of the rectory in spring or summer of 2016, though funding has not yet been secured. The parish center would be the next phase to take place, followed by the remodeling portion of the project.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if there was a time limitation for the petitioner to implement their projects after PUD approval.

**Mr. Enright** stated that there was only a time limitation pertaining to the beginning of construction, which is 12 months. As long as they begin any part of the project within that 12-month period, they can take as long as they need to accomplish each phase.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if the detention basin to the east was being moved.

**Ms. Maish** stated that the outlet for the basin would not move that only the grading and shape of the basin would change.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked how detention capacity would be increased, whether that is through deepening the existing basin or through expanding it.

**Ms. Maish** stated that going deeper was not an option, as they were limited by the location of the restrictor. Any addition to capacity would be done through expanding the size of the basin and flattening it out.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked if the layout as proposed would be able to accommodate the necessary increase in capacity.

**Ms. Maish** stated that she was unsure, that calculations would need to be done by their civil engineer in order to determine the requirements under new MWRD regulations.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked if there had been significant drainage issues on the property previously.

**Michael F.** No, there had not been any drainage issues previously.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked **Mr. Enright** if there were any issues with landscaping that might be raised at a public hearing.

**Mr. Enright** stated that the petitioner would be required to add substantial landscaping to the parking area in front of the rectory, which was part of the prior PUD approval and the petitioner was planning to do. He noted that residents in prior meetings had asked that perimeter landscaping be used instead of fencing along the edges of the property.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked if the added parking in the northeast portion of the property was to accommodate individuals visiting the rectory.

**Ms. Maish** stated that it would be for those visiting the rectory or parish center.

**Commissioner Cherwin** reinforced the importance of receiving an update on the parking study, and that the petitioner should comply with the Village requires. He stated that he was supportive of it.

**Commissioner Sigalos** stated that his only two concerns were with the storm water management, that the proposal cuts significantly into the storm water management they have currently and that they are planning to add a large amount of impervious surface coverage. He also asked if the parking addition proposed was larger than the previously approved plan.

**Ms. Maish** confirmed that the lot in the current proposal is larger than the lot approved in the previous PUD amendment, and that this increase in size allows for better access.

**Commissioner Sigalos** agreed that the new parking lot design allows for better flow, and reiterated his concern over adequate water detention.

**Ms. Maish** stated that it was her intention to bring engineers with to the next meeting to discuss requirements and options for water detention.

**Commissioner Sigalos** stated that he recalled water detention and parking being concerns in the past with the church, and asked if the petitioner had a parking agreement with the high school across the street.

**Ms. Maish** stated that they did not have a written agreement, but had gotten permission to use the lot in question.

**Michael F.** stated that the reason they did not have a formal agreement is because School District 25 would not enter a written agreement with a private Catholic church, which is why using the school's lot has always been a handshake agreement

**Commissioner Jensen** asked how many spaces the church has access to via the informal agreement.

**Michael F.** stated that they have access to around 50 spots

**Ms. Maish** stated that the number should be mentioned in the parking study, and that the study found only a few spaces were being utilized in the school lot. Those using the school lot most likely used that lot for convenience, because the church parking lots were not full.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if those school parking spaces were included in the provided parking counts, or if the spaces were counted in any way.

**Mr. Enright** stated that they were not factored into the provided parking counts, but could be used as possible justification for a variation. However, in this case the major justification for the variation is how Village code requires parking to be calculated. Code requires parking be provided for all areas of the building at capacity, which does not happen with churches. He also noted that the parking study from the previous PUD found that the existing parking lots were not fully utilized. The biggest issue with the proposed parking area was that it might have to be reduced in size to allow the detention area to be expanded.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if residents abutting the property in question ever reported flooding

**Mr. Enright** stated that historically there were residents that did.

**Ms. Maish** stated that there was one resident that had reported flooding, but that they were not on the northeast side where the existing detention basin is located.

**Mr. Enright** added that the petitioner would be adding a second detention basin to the south of the site as well.

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked if the parish life center would be used at the same time as church services.

**Michael F.** stated that the two areas would not be used at the same time. Parishioners would migrate from the church to the parish center for post mass functions

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked if, since the proposed parish center would have a basketball court, there would be a situation where a tournament was taking place at the same time as a mass.

**Michael F.** stated that that would not happen.

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked if the parish center would be rented out for wedding receptions at the same time a mass was occurring.

**Michael F.** stated that the center was not intended to be rented out, that it would be for parishioners only. If there were parishioners using the parish center, it would be because they are drawn from other places within the building.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if the rectory accommodated three priests and how many priests the church currently had.

**Ms. Maish** stated that the rectory would house three priests, and that currently the church had two. The rectory had room to grow, as well as house one visiting priest, for a total of four.

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked if the first phase would be to construct the rectory.

**Ms. Maish** stated that the rectory would be build first, which would allow the church to sell an adjacent home that they had

**T. EDNA'S CATHOLIC CHURCH; 2525 N. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD; T1517**

been using as an interim rectory. Funds from this sale could then be used to replenish funds.

**Michael F.** mentioned that then the house would go back on the tax rolls once the rectory was reconstructed on the Church property.

**RECOMMENDATION.**

The Plat & Subdivision Committee was supportive of the proposal and advised that the petitioner should move forward.

**John Sigalos, Chair**  
**PLAT & SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE**  
**Jake Schmidt, Recorder**