

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: ST. EDNA CHURCH - 2525 NORTH ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD - PC#17-010
PUD AMENDMENT

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 October, 2017 at the hour of 7:39 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JOE LORENZINI, Acting Chairman
LYNN JENSEN
SUSAN DAWSON
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

APPROVED

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I would like to call this meeting of the Plan Commission to order. Will you please rise and say the pledge of allegiance with us?

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Sam, roll call please.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Acting Chair Lorenzini.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Here. Okay, the next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes. The first one is CA Ventures/Sigwalt Apartments held on September 27th, 2017, and the second is the Ivy Hotel held on October 11th, 2017. Any comments or motions to approve?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I wasn't here for the CA Ventures.

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

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Your comments, Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I just, I wasn't here for the one with CA Ventures.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right. Okay, the next item on the agenda is the public hearing. There is one tonight, St. Edna Church, PC#17-010. It's a PUD Amendment. Have all the proper notices been given, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: They have, yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Petitioner? Is the Petitioner here? Okay, please stand. Anybody who is going to present, would you all come forward and we'll just swear you all in at once? Would you raise your right hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Who is going to speak first? Could you please state your name, spell it for the court reporter, and give us a brief presentation

APPROVED

on what you're presenting tonight.

MS. MAISH: My name is Susan Maish, M-a-i-s-h. I am the architect from Jaeger Nickola Kuhlman & Associates. As you indicated, we are here today to have an amendment to the PUD, but also to ask for a variance for the parking requirement. The requirement is for 627 spaces, and we are looking to have 377 spaces included on the lot.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, can I, I'm sorry, let me interrupt you for a second.

MS. MAISH: Sure.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Sam, have all the public notices been given?

MR. HUBBARD: They have, yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Sorry. Please proceed.

MS. MAISH: I also have the civil engineer, landscape architect and the traffic engineer here also for questions, but I'll be giving the presentation.

I did want to make a couple of clarifications on the report that Sam put out. On page two, there was an indication about the 17 parking spaces that exist. It indicated that we put them in after the rectory was demolished. It's actually probably been there since the rectory was constructed, because I know in 2001 when we did the original PUD it was already there.

The other correction was for the height of the building. I noticed that in 2013, it said the building was 28 feet two inches, and the new building was 29-foot 10 inches. They're both accurate but they were measured in different ways. So, the newest height at 29-foot 10 is the way your ordinance reads the average to the top of the flat roof. So, if I would go back and translate that to the 2013 building, the height would be 24 feet 11. So, we are raising the overall building by five feet.

Then lastly, on page five under the hardship criteria, it does indicate that we won't run two large-scale programs at the same time. That is accurate, but there are two instances one of which I had indicated on the variance request inadvertently. The pancake breakfast and the craft fairs, they do run both of those while mass is going on. So, you'll go to mass and then you'll go to the pancake breakfast or the craft fair afterwards. So, there is some overlap from the next service coming in two hours later. So, we just wanted to clarify that that does occasionally happen, but they wouldn't schedule a mass with a performance or a presentation or something like that.

So, those were the clarifications we just wanted to make.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Can I just one more question?

MS. MAISH: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Do you agree with the five conditions that are in the Staff report?

MS. MAISH: I just want to --

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Compliance with Design Commission, landscaping, such as that?

MS. MAISH: So, let me just look at them so I know what five you're referring to. I see, oh, yes, yes, okay. Yes, we will comply with the Design Commission requirements. There was some additional landscaping which we have already added on to the site plan you will see today. We have also submitted the detention calculations, so we are on board with that for the Village Board. I talked to Sam for clarification on number four, and I understand that that

APPROVED

means that as things transpire throughout time, that if there is any issue, that he will bring it up and discuss and make modifications as required to the parking. Then we will comply with all codes, yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. You may proceed.

MS. MAISH: So, just a quick history that was in the report. We were here in 2001 and came and got the original PUD. The reason we needed it was, if you can see the current slide, there were two buildings on one zoning lot. So, we got the PUD. In 2013, we came back again with this project for the Parish Center and the parking lot addition. The funding was not there, so the building was not built. So, in that time between 2013 and now, the rectory was taken down. We did some additional work on the plan, so the building is now larger and the parking lot is a little bit larger. We do have the funding in place now and then we're here today to present the current plan to you.

So, with that, this is the current existing plan, site plan. So, to orient you, Arlington Heights Road is to the left, north is at the top. The rectory has been taken down. The existing building is at the south side of the building. There is currently 356 parking spaces including the 17 spaces. Then up at the top which is hard to see on here is the detention area that currently exists.

This is the new plan so you can -- oops, sorry. In the blue, we have the new building. It is 13,490 square feet. It has two entry canopies to lead you to the main entrance as well as the entrance into the new Parish Life Center. The orange on the existing building indicates some remodeling that will happen when the funds are available after the Parish Center is built.

Then we have our new parking area. So, the new parking area is 44 spaces. It also has a turnaround which the existing parking does not. Then also we have the enlarged detention area, and then we have a new detention area in the southwest corner of the property. So, that did not exist previously. So, that's the two areas, how we're taking care of the stormwater management, and we were complying with all the current codes and MWRD changes that have happened since the last time we were here.

Here is just an enlarged site plan. So, you can see that we have all new walks here. In addition to the Parish Life Center, our mechanical units are ground mounted. So, we have one 10-ton unit that is servicing the front portion, the west portion of the building. It is screened the precast wall that is an extension of the new building. Then we also have some fencing on the east. We also have two 25-ton units on the east side of the building that are screened by board-on-board fencing as well as landscaping to comply with your requirements.

In addition to that, I think on this plan what is significant is all the landscaping that we are adding as a part of this plan. We did meet with the neighbors and they had some requests for some landscaping on the east side of the stage access. They actually had just said can we just move so that we wouldn't have to add more, but I know that we need the screening on the west side of the unit. So, we added some additional landscaping to the stage access drive.

Since the round one comments of the Plan Commission, we have added three additional evergreen trees, three additional juniper trees, just to add some additional screening along the east side. When we met with the neighbors, they did request that we remove the 15 north spaces on the north row of the parking area. We did meet, the church and I met as a group yesterday to discuss that as well as the other landscaping, so we added additional landscaping. We do feel that the additional 15 spaces would be a benefit to the church. They

APPROVED

would utilize it on all their high-use activities, like this weekend with the craft fair going on, there's also Easter, Christmas. We also believe it is a benefit from the Parish Life Center because it is close spaces to the Parish Life Center.

I also had a discussion with the landscape architect. Part of the reason that they would like the northern spaces to remain would be there is an existing tree, two existing trees, one that is 40 inches in diameter. So, in order for me to save that tree, I really need 40 feet in radius. So, I can't guarantee even if I take off those north parking spaces that I'm going to save that tree. So, we are presenting the plan as we had submitted it to the Plan Commission.

We're also adding some lighting which complies with your requirements of having zero foot candles at the lot line. We have two poles within the islands.

Just showing you an existing plan. The current main space is both for multipurpose and large-scale activities. All those large-scale activities will be moved to the new building. This just shows some of those activities, dinner events, craft fairs, sports, theater, special events, vacation bible school, puppet ministry. So, we're really not adding ministries, just relocating them.

Then here is an enlarged version of the new Parish Life Center. So, it's a link to the existing building, a 6,500 square-foot Parish Life Center. It has a stage for their theater productions. Currently, that happened once a year for two weekends. It has its own restroom facilities, storage, and a kitchen facility that go along with it.

Then this just shows how the Doherty Center would be remodeled, creating an office, a meeting space with a corridor, so the large-scale activities would no longer occur in there. Then also, we'd be creating a youth room in the lower level. Those two items are both future activities that would occur after the Parish Life Center was built.

These are just some interior views. From an exterior standpoint, we went through the Design Commission and we're approved. We are basically blending with the existing church, continuing the black brick and the large white fascia at the lower portion. Then we are also blending with the 1996 addition that's in the back, and the large parish space kind of mimics that construction.

Some views, different views from the west. Again, it is a precast building incorporating thin brick on the lower base portion. This is a view from the northwest. Then as we move towards the neighbors, we take the larger volume of the Parish Center and then step it down at the stage in order to be able to kind of lower the volume where the neighbors are.

Then this is the east elevation. Again, you can see the stage volume, and then some trees, then the landscaping that we added. I'm hoping that you guys can see better than we can see back over here because it's very dim.

From an elevation standpoint, the top of our parapet is 31 feet. However, the grade is a help to us here and the building actually looks like it's only 27 feet. So, that is kind of consistent in the back part of the building, that whatever the dimension is, if it's 23-foot-four, it actually looks like it's 21-foot-four. The 18-foot volume looks like it's 16 feet. So, the grade is working for us in order to soften the height of that building.

We basically, we feel that this building is very consistent with what we showed in 2013. So, as far as it maintains the same architecture, it's a little bit larger and a little bit taller than it was before, but it's still within the setbacks. It's still within the lot coverage and the height requirements. We do feel that the parking lot that we're showing is a benefit to the church as I indicated, on those high-use activity days, and it's a benefit to the church for the Parish Center, providing them with closer spaces. We also feel that the number of spaces we show is

APPROVED

kind of a great compromise between what the Village is requiring at 627 and what the neighbors would like and what the church deems is necessary. We also feel like we have amply landscaped it to soften some of the trees that we've taken down. I think he noted in his report that we're required to put 24 and then we're nearly doubling that as far as how much we're adding back from what we're taking down.

Then lastly, obviously we don't really want to incorporate, putting in 627 spaces which I know is not what you really want me to do, we couldn't feasibly do that and I don't think that that would be desirable for the community if we did. That's it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Staff report, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Good evening again to the Plan Commission. So, the request before you is for a parish center addition to the existing church, St. Edna's Church at 2525 North Arlington Heights Road. The property is zoned R-1 which is a single-family residential zoning district. In the R-1 District, religious institutions are allowed as a permitted use. So, there is no special approval needed for a church use. However, they did receive a PUD approval in 2002, the Ordinance 02-005, and they are proposing changes to the site from that prior approval which requires an amendment to Ordinance 02-005.

In addition, they are requesting a parking variation. 627 spaces are required by code and 377 spaces are provided on site. This is not atypical for churches. Just for reference, the Orchard Free Church is required to provide 671 spaces, they have 303 spaces on that site. Our Savior's Church is required to provide 214 spaces, they have, you know, 179 spaces. St. James Parish has a parking deficit in the hundreds of spaces similar to St. Edna's Church, so this isn't necessarily a unique situation. On paper it looks bad, but it's pretty common throughout the Village.

There have been several actions that the church has gone through to date to get them to this point. As you've heard, originally they were planning for this addition back in 2012 and 2013. They actually did receive approval for a very similar site plan albeit this one has changed. Things have gone a little bigger this time, but they were approved, essentially approved for this project back in 2013.

That approval expired because they didn't start work within the code required 12-month period. So, they do have to come back through the process again which is why you're seeing them before you this evening. After the approval had expired, in 2015 they came back to the Village with an amended plan that went to the Conceptual Plan Review Committee called the Plat and Subdivision Committee at that time. That plan included a rectory that was going to be built in the northeast corner of the site. That is no longer in the plans today. That northeast corner of the site is to remain vacant. Overall, I think they got a generally favorable review at the Plat and Sub meeting in 2015. I think there were some concerns over the traffic study being up to date and some of the detention requirements. But overall, I think it was a favorable review.

On October 17th of this year, they conducted their neighborhood meeting. A summary of that meeting was included in the packet to the Plan Commission. Then on September 26th, they appeared before the Design Commission. They did have a favorable vote for approval subject to one condition which is screening a mechanical unit on the northwest corner of the building addition. They are agreeable to conforming to that condition of approval.

So, what I'm showing here is what was approved in 2013. You can see there, this is where the addition is going to take place and there is a parking lot addition up here. As I transition the slide, you can see exactly the change to today. So, let me kind of go

APPROVED

back, here is the original approval from 2013 and then here is what they are proposing to change. So, not really too big of a difference. The building has gotten a little bit bigger. It's pushed back a tiny bit farther. They've added this additional area of parking to the north. But overall, it's essentially the same project, and the programming and use of the space would remain the same as originally approved in 2013.

Some of the main differences compared to 2013, it was a 10,800 square-foot addition. Today, it's 13,700, so that's about a 26 percent increase. They increased the parking from 362 spaces to 377. The setbacks to the west remain the same as those approved in 2013. As I mentioned before, there is a slight reduction in the east setback of about 18 feet, and a slight reduction to the north setback. Again, nothing around the south of the site is proposed to be changed.

As you heard, there are two height differentials. Yes, I believe the Petitioner is correct, that this 28 feet two-inch was measured to the peak of the roof. If we were to use the standards that we determined the 29-foot height measurement from today and apply that to 2013, we would come up with roughly around 24-25 feet. So, the height has increased a little bit.

Overall, we've seen that the size of the congregation has decreased slightly since 2013, and the average weekly attendance has gone down a little bit.

So, here is the site as it currently exists today. This is the main church building in the narthex. This is the Doherty Center here, and to the east is the Hurley Center. The addition of course will go right here.

So, when I transition the slide, if you want to pay attention, this is how it sits on the property relative to the adjacent single-family homes. When Staff analyzed this request, again we looked at the setback to the east which decreased slightly but still provided 139 feet to the property line. Then if you measure it to the closest structure, it's about 160 feet away from the closest structure, and we felt that that was a suitable separation and setback for a building of this size. The rear of the building is buffered with some landscaping as you can see here. Then the parking lot to the east and to the north is also buffered with some landscaping.

The detention pond that exists on the northeast of the site will be expanded slightly, and then they will be adding the new detention to the southwestern corner of the site as well. We did incorporate a condition of approval that final detention calculations be provided to the Village Engineer prior to final Village Board consideration of this project. They designed the site in 2013 and then everything was approved. They did make some slight changes to the impervious surface, so we did ask for those updated calculations. I did hear from the Village Engineer today that they did provide some additional information and he was comfortable moving forward relative to stormwater detention. He was confident that it would be able to meet the requirements of the Village and MWRD.

Then again I want to point out, too, that the rear of the building essentially matches what the existing setback of the Hurley Center is. But we did kind of zero in on the back of the building, there was an increase in height, a slight increase in height there. So, we just wanted to make sure that, you know, it was compatible with what was originally approved.

So, here you'll see up top here is the original approval. This is the southern elevation. So, on this side would be, is towards the east and that's where the neighbors are located. On this side would be Arlington Heights Road. Of course this is the building addition that was proposed in 2013. You can see they do feature the stepback of the building, it steps down in height as it extends out towards the east, towards the closest residential properties. Here

APPROVED

you can see the present proposal, the building pushed out a little bit farther when you compare it to the 2013 approval. But again, that distance is buffered by landscaping, both proposed and existing, and is over 160 feet away from the nearest residential structure.

Relative to the landscaping, I believe there might have been an error in the Staff report. I counted a total of 14 trees to be removed, I think the Staff report mentioned seven. Out of these 14 trees that are going to be removed, five are ash trees, and they are adding an additional 46 new trees. By replacement values, they would only be required to add 24, but they are adding 46 replacement trees. A lot of it on there is dense landscaping to buffer the RTU units and the HVAC units that are ground mounted. Staff did request additional landscaping be added in this area just to further screen headlight glare from neighboring properties to the east. The Petitioner has provided an updated landscape plan today that shows these plantings. I think they were placed up in the corner here, and I think Staff was looking for them more down in this area. So, we'll work with the Petitioner when they come in for permit on that, assuming that everything is approved.

Relative to parking, they did provide a traffic and parking study. They provided an update memo just stating that the findings back from 2013 are still applicable today. Staff is supportive of the parking variation for several reason, one of them being that they estimated peak parking demand on a typical day to be 309 parking stalls. They have 377 on site, so they are projecting that they'll be able to meet demand. We have seen also that the size of their congregation and attendance has been decreasing over the years, so we don't anticipate that things are going to change drastically and with great increase and create a parking problem.

Additionally, they have an informal agreement with the school district to park in the Futabakai School across the street. It's an informal agreement but they do utilize some of that parking. There is a traffic signal on Arlington Heights Road that does provide for safe pedestrian access back and forth between the two sites. But we are hoping that by increasing the capacity on their church site, that they hopefully would no longer really need the parking at the Futabakai School. We're guessing that people probably park there maybe just to avoid lines when leaving on mass times. It's not necessarily much closer to the church but, you know, people still do park there.

But the main reason why the parking variation is required is due to the Village requirement for, the collective provision for parking which requires every space in the site be accounted for in the parking requirement. Practically speaking, they are not going to be using the Parish Center at the same time that they're going to be using the church building except for limited instances as you've heard this evening. So, the parking by the Village code is really meant to accommodate a situation where all spaces were used to their maximum capacity. Practically speaking, they're not going to be using the Parish Center at the same time as the church, so in that sense we believe that the variation on parking is justified. Again, having them add 627 parking spaces on site would decrease the green area, require a lot more stormwater detention, and we don't believe that that's the preferable situation.

So, Staff is recommending approval of the application subject to five conditions as highlighted in the Staff report, and I'd be happy to answer any of your questions this evening.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Sam. Do we have a motion to include the Staff report into the public record?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Is there a second?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, that concludes the Staff report portion. Next, we'll go to the questions from the Plan Commission and then go to the public for questions. So, Lynn, would you like to start?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. Actually I've been in a number of meetings where this has gone before us and I'm generally supportive of what you're here to do. Just a couple of verifying questions. With your weekly attendance going down to 25 percent, what's the impetus for, you know, expanding the facilities as much as you are?

MS. MAISH: As far as the building itself?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. MAISH: It was basically for the same reason as 2013. Right now, all the large-scale functions and their other meeting activities occur in that Doherty Center. So, they have 40-year-old movable walls and they would like to be able to have an additional meeting space and then a large-scale function space. So, it's really just to no longer have that combined function within that space. The Doherty Center is basically more architecturally suited for meeting space given that it doesn't have very tall ceilings and it doesn't provide, you know --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, basically you're modernizing it to make it more useful and more flexible?

MS. MAISH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, I'm not sure I followed the whole, it's not specifically important what you're asking us to make a decision on, but you mentioned the 40-inch tree. You said even if you got rid of the 15 spaces, you didn't think you'd be able to accommodate it, I'm not sure --

MS. MAISH: Okay, so unfortunately I didn't put the slide in my presentation. So, I did, can I come up there and show you?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, I guess my question is do you want to take 15 spaces out or not or how do you --

MS. MAISH: We do not want to take the 15 spaces out. So, one of the reasons was to try and save this tree because it's a very large tree. So, if this is the edge of the parking lot, in discussions with the landscape architect, I would need 40 feet in order to save this tree. So, that actually goes beyond taking this out. So, once I get this circle, I really can't guarantee that I'm going to save the tree.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, the spaces are not in jeopardy, it's the tree that's the issue.

MS. MAISH: Yes, right, right. Well, they would like the, and they'll come up and speak for themselves, but they would like this removed from the green space, we'd like to have -- being able to save those trees.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And give up the spaces.

MS. MAISH: And give up the spaces. We would prefer to keep what we have --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, there should be spaces that it could be

APPROVED

reduced, I mean they may be asking you to take those 15 spaces out to make this thing --

MS. MAISH: Right, that was what, the problem was --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, the issue is whether you use the space for the trees or use it for parking.

MS. MAISH: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The only last question I have is that route that is on the east side of the church that exits out, that's only, that's an emergency route, right?

MS. MAISH: That's a fire lane, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, so that's not used by the parishioners.

MS. MAISH: No. It's chained.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I really don't have anything further. I think it's a good project.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Susan?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't have any questions at this time. I'll wait to hear from the audience.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My only couple of questions. What's changed from the 2013 plan, other than the footprint size of the height, what's causing it now to be higher? If it's basically the same function?

MS. MAISH: Well, for two reasons. Proportion and also just to provide a little more space for the athletic portion of the activities. So, we were at 20 feet to the bottom of the structure, and now we're at 24-ish to the bottom of the structure, maybe a little bit more. Then also we made the building bigger, so we made it a little taller at the same time. So, for those two reasons.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I understand you're making a larger square footage, but I'm just curious about the height. I mean, if you were contemplating the same usage in 2013 as you have now --

MS. MAISH: Again, it was, so there has been a lot of evolution in the whole project since we started in 2010. So, it started at a certain size, then it got smaller and smaller and smaller. So, then as we came since many years have passed and more fund raising has taken place, we kind of went back to more of the ideal building that they would like to build to suit really all their functions the best I guess. So, providing a little more height helps the athletics, but also helps just the proportion of the space as you make it bigger, to make it a little bit taller as well. I hope that --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My last questions are really just related to the parking. Again, I was at the Plat and Sub meeting back in 2015. I know you have additional parking with no formal agreement with the Futabakai School. How many parking spaces do they have there that are available to you?

MS. MAISH: Do you know?

MR. HUBBARD: I think it's like 50 I want to say.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: About 50?

MS. MAISH: I do not know, I'm sorry. I know that Steve is looking if it's --

MR. MALONI: I don't know off the top of my head.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: If you're going to speak to all, please come forward.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's okay. I mean, if you don't have that, I

APPROVED

live nearby this so I'm very familiar with the church and the activities that go on.

My last question would be as far as functions in the new Parish Life Center at the same time that you're going to have church services, you said that that won't happen except for craft fair and one other event.

MS. MAISH: The pancake breakfast.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Let me ask you, for instance, you have Saturday evening church services.

MS. MAISH: Right.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Could that, this additional Parish Life Center be utilized in a safe way in a wedding reception so that you conceivably have 300 or 350 people in that building while there's church services?

MS. MAISH: I mean it's my understanding that that will not happen.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But what would happen if it does happen? I can't understand why it would not happen, I mean, that's one of the functions that the Parish Life Center would be able to accommodate would be say a wedding reception.

MR. MALONI: When --

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Could you please give your name and spell it?

MR. MALONI: Sure. Mike Maloni, M-a-l-o-n-i. When we stood before you and Father Jerry was our pastor, he had stated back then and it still exists today that we would not rent out this facility. So, it's not intended to be a place for a wedding reception. It would be separate from the church. So, it could be just like a receiving area, but it would follow a function that took place in the church and then moved to there.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm a little surprised by that. I mean, it seems like an ideal place or setting as the wedding service in the afternoon and then they go to the Parish Life Center for the reception afterwards. It seems logical, but you're saying that's not going to happen?

MR. MALONI: Right. That's not the intended purpose, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Because that would be my only concern with that additional volume of people and the parking, where would they go?

MR. MALONI: Right.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't have any other questions.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Jay?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Could I just clarify? I think what you're saying is that in maybe minimal circumstances you would have a group at the church, that same group might go over to the Parish Center --

MR. MALONI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: -- you wouldn't necessarily be bringing in a new group that would --

MR. MALONI: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay. No, thank you. I really don't, I saw this at the Plat and Sub, so I'm familiar with the project. I don't have any additional questions. I do apologize for being a little bit late to get the meeting started. So, I would like to apologize for that. Otherwise, that's it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Sam, so right now, by calculation they're 250 spots short. What were we, how many spots short were they in 2013 when they came before

APPROVED

us?

MR. HUBBARD: Let's see. It was around the same. I think they were going to provide 362 spaces and I think they were required to provide around a little over 600 spaces. So, it's very similar.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, it sounds like the additional 15 spots they have in this current plan seems to make up for the additional space of the Parish Center being enlarged --

MR. HUBBARD: Right, yes. As they enlarged the Parish Center, they enlarged the parking over as well.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right. Susan, so there's also, besides the two detention ponds, there is underground storage tanks, too, I think I saw it on the plan? The underground detention?

MS. MAISH: No, that's just for volume control. I'll let George speak to the storm sewer.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Would you please state your name and spell it please?

MR. DREGER: My name is George Dreger, D-r-e-g-e-r. I'm with Eriksson Engineering. In 2015, the MWRD ratified a new ordinance, and within that ordinance there's a new component that's called volume control. There's a number of different ways that that can be provided. A very common one is what we're proposing here which is a structure underneath the parking lot. It's for the impervious area.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: What's another method?

MR. DREGER: What's another method?

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. DREGER: Well, in this particular case, that would be difficult because it's basically, the sewers are rather shallow in the existing condition. The only way we could provide for water to get out of there is to drain it through a sewer ultimately. That's why the volume control is perched up higher underneath the parking lot as opposed to down at the bottom of the detention basin.

The other option that I was referring to is basically gouging out the bottom of the basin and allowing that to drain. But you still need some kind of drainage, otherwise you end up with a wetland or swamp and it just won't drain at all which isn't really, it doesn't, it defeats the purpose.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, thank you. All right, that concludes the Commissioners' questions. So, we'll go to the public now for any questions. Why don't we start on this side of the room? Yes, sir, come forward, state your name, spell it for the court reporter.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MR. GROSSICH: My name is Keith Grossich, G-r-o-s-s-i-c-h. I'm a neighbor of St. Edna's.

First, I have three items that I wanted to discuss, but before I do that, I would like to publicly acknowledge Susan Maish. She's really been professional throughout all of this. She's been through this for like three or four years I guess, maybe longer than that, and she's really I think tried her best to kind of manage all the different constituencies involved with

APPROVED

this. I just wanted to take a moment to say that.

But the first, and some of these are interconnected, the first is the stormwater management concern. You've talked about increasing the size a little bit. The building is 26 percent larger than proposed earlier with more parking spots, which really translates to an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces. We have had significant flooding issues over the last several months in that area. In fact, I brought some pictures with me of the area that would be the northeast portion where the current retention pond is.

So, I do have some significant concerns about how the new retention will be engineered in order to handle that. Would the group like to take a look at a couple of these?

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Sure, you can pass them on.

MR. GROSSICH: Sure. The water is flowing actually up into the, almost into the residents' backyards. In the same picture, there's all different --

So, the request I would have associated with the stormwater management concern is sort of tied into the additional parking spots also. The more green space that we have there, hopefully the better that will make that situation. Also, I see on your recommendation that it sounds like your Engineering Department will be passing their recommendation along to the Village Board along with this. I would suggest, because of, I believe, just look around you, storms are just getting more and more severe, I would suggest that maybe you guys take another look at the Engineering Department, what they come back with in the details very closely before you pass this back on to the Village Board and make sure you're all comfortable with the, you know, what's being recommended.

I'm a computer engineer, I'm not a civil engineer. So, I'm sure a number of you have a much better background than I do. But I just, a lot of times you throw it to the next level and I just really feel uncomfortable with what's occurring there, that you folks don't take another closer look at that from the standpoint of what the Engineering Department says. So, that was the first item.

The second item was associated with the loss of the green space and the mature trees. We did ask, and Susan mentioned, that that last row of parking not be included, and obviously it has been. A number of the mature trees will be cut down. I guess the question is really, is that really necessary? Why can't these trees be saved? You're going to put new vegetation in, but again it's not at the maturity level of what's there.

Again, if I could approach you all, I've got a couple of pictures of some of these trees that are coming down and the green space. So, in the scheme of things associated with how many parking spots there are, you know, the building is larger but the functions are going to be relatively the same. You know, it doesn't seem to, you know, I've been looking at that tree for the last 30 years and, those trees, and it just doesn't, you know, pave paradise to put up a parking lot. This doesn't make a whole lot of sense, especially with the issues we have with the flooding.

Then the last item that I have is really a concern about the outside sound spillover from the building events. They have, and I truly believe that this will be a multipurpose facility. I am very skeptical that I think, you mentioned about the fact that there won't be a wedding and an accompanying reception. There is some skepticism I have, too, in that the last plan you saw, you know, there was a big rectory sitting there, now it's no longer there. So, I think it's hard for anybody to say what it's going to be used for, but you can't, I think, rule out, you know, that this is not going to be used for something like that.

APPROVED

Also, from an athletic standpoint, you know, actually the Staff/Design Commission report refers to the multipurpose building as a large gymnasium building. Actually the building and gym and the banquet space is 39 percent larger than an NBA basketball court. I expect that there will be a significant amount of athletic events there, basketball tournaments, volleyball tournaments, and there is a real concern that the neighbors have with regard to, you know, participants loitering after these athletic events out in the parking lot which has just been built up there. I know it will happen because when I was that age I did it. So, there is a concern about what is the church going to do with regard to that versus after the fact and, you know, when people start calling the police with regard to something like that. So, I don't know if they expect to have monitors there or, again cutting down on that size of that parking lot can help prevent a little bit of that.

Then the second issue around the sound spillover has to do with the space between the proposed Parish Life Center and the existing Hurley Center. We were told in the neighborhood meeting that that outside space south of the building might be used as a courtyard. Further investigation in the project narrative, it states that a future exterior patio was planned. A patio use to me is significantly different than courtyard use as far as sound emission is concerned. Going back to, you know, the functions of that multipurpose, if there's a banquet in there, you can see there's two exit doors coming out of that proposed Parish Life Center right into that exterior patio.

I'm not really, I don't think the neighbors would be really pleased with, you know, if somebody sets up the, you know, the drinks and cocktails out there, puts the mariachi band out there, I don't see any noise abatement associated with that on this particular diagram. The reason that didn't come up at the neighborhood meeting is it wasn't raised and, again until we dug into some of these documents a little bit more and saw that, we didn't raise it at that particular point in time. So, the question there is what's going to be done about abating the noise from that particular area when it becomes a patio and an extension of that, an outside extension of the proposed Parish Life Center?

So, thank you. Those are the concerns and questions that we have from some of the neighbors.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else on this side of the room? Anybody on the other side of the room who would like to speak? Okay, seeing there's nobody else, we'll close the public portion of the meeting and go back to the Commissioners for final questions, deliberations, and possible recommendation. Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossich, that was very helpful with some of these issues. So, I would ask on some of these issues, like stormwater management, I'd ask Staff, what is the situation in that part of that town in reference to the sewer system, storm sewer versus regular sewer? Do we have any idea whether the water, the flooding problems that have been referred to are the result of runoff from this piece of property or runoff elsewhere? So, what can you shed as light in that sense?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I think there has been some historical flooding in this area. You know, the design of the detention areas, and the project engineer can fill in on the gaps where my expertise doesn't cover, but I believe this detention area has an outlet that's going to drain down below the parking lot and out to Arlington Heights Road into a storm sewer there. I believe in this detention area, there's the same thing. So, it would drain outward towards the storm sewer in Arlington Heights Road.

So, you know, as I'm sure the Plan Commission is familiar, you know,

APPROVED

the Village has strict stormwater control regulations, MWRD also has their regulations, that do not allow to adversely, you know, affect your neighbor with regards to stormwater runoff. You know, they are not allowed to build this Parish Center and the corresponding parking lot and not accommodate for that additional stormwater that those are going to create on their site. They can't just shove it off onto neighboring property owners.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Right. Well, I'm confident, given the number of cases we've had before, we will make sure they manage the water on their property, but I guess my question goes to is the general flooding that he's had pictures of, is that due to something else outside of their property that is not going to get fixed?

MR. HUBBARD: I don't know the specifics of the neighborhood flooding here and what the underlying cause is.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, we can be fairly confident, and I guess I'd ask the engineers if they need to make statements that they will manage the water runoff from their property as our ordinances have been set up to do that.

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: My second question, this is for Staff, in that choice that was proposed between the 15 parking spaces and more green space, where does the Village come down on this? Their parking level as you indicated, the peak time is what, 309, 303, somewhere around there? So, they're losing 15, but that will still leave them a little bit above what we've seen at the peak. So, if the Village had to make a choice between parking and green space, where does the Village come down?

MR. HUBBARD: I think we're amenable to both approaches. I don't know as if we have a strong opinion one way or the other. I mean I think it's a tradeoff either way. I think it's great that they could have more parking on site to accommodate for those peak events such as Christmas and Easter and when, you know, they have their bake sale and so forth corresponding with the church activities, and they could capture that and provide that parking onsite, but of course it is a tradeoff, so you know, we're supportive of this proposal.

We were supportive of the proposal from 2013 that showed a slightly smaller parking area. You know, yes, the 40-inch diameter tree would be removed under this scenario, but again we believe that they have provided a lot of replacement trees. They met the requirements even though preservation of that tree is not specifically required because it's within the buildable footprint. They've provided the replacement values, replacement trees as would be required if that tree was to be preserved and removed. So, they're going above and beyond what the code would require., you know, I think Staff is supportive of both. I don't know as if we have a strong opinion one way or the other.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Good. Then maybe we can hear from the consultants, landscaping as well as the architect and so forth and give us the sense of the tradeoff and is there a preference in terms of either the church or the consultants in terms of whether they want to use that for parking spaces or green space relative to the water issue?

MS. MAISH: I'm not sure I understand as far as when you say relative to the water. I mean, I should make it clear that it is, the church would desire to keep those 15 spaces. So, when I'm showing the image of the tree and that, you know --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The church would like the spaces?

MS. MAISH: The church would like to keep those spaces, I mean, for the peak times as you indicated, and also providing additional spaces for the Parish Life Center that are closer than parking all the way over to the, you know, near Arlington Heights --

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Let me pose a question that may be for the landscape architect or whoever needs to speak to this. Is preserving that tree and not putting those 15 spaces in going to materially improve the situation relative to water runoff? Is it going to make a difference, I guess? So, if it does make a difference, I'm glad you put in the parking spaces?

MR. DREGER: That's kind of a two-part question. Removing the spaces, irregardless of whether there's a tree there, would reduce the amount of detention that's provided. So, would that cause less drainage out into the grass where the detention is? Yes. Would the detention, therefore, also become smaller? Yes. So, you know, it's kind of a tradeoff as well. Do you see what I mean?

MR. HUBBARD: It's going to have the same effect on drainage essentially.

MS. MAISH: Right.

MR. DREGER: Right, and then that --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, the position is, from what Ms. Maish said is the church would prefer to keep the 15 spaces, and as far as we are concerned, probably keeping those spaces doesn't materially adversely affect the runoff, right?

MS. MAISH: Right, because what he was saying is basically it's just, it affects the size of the detention, it's not going to affect adversely the neighbors one way or the other because we'll just change the size of the detention to accommodate those 15 spaces because it's now pervious.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Who is going to address the sound spillover issue? I mean, is there any abatement plan at all for that?

MS. MAISH: I mean as far as the courtyard? So, I am the one who wrote the word patio. I guess, in my mind I wasn't thinking one way or another that patio or courtyard meant one thing or another. I would agree with the assessment that should there be a courtyard there in the future, that it would be used as a part of the Parish Life Center as spillover. We have not really looked into the design of the courtyard at this time and how landscaping or screening would, you know, how the sound would be taken care of for that issue. Oh, Mike Maloni also wanted to say something.

MR. MALONI: So, as she has stated, you know, we've been through many iterations and that includes a few different pastors, too. That's why some of this has had, where the building got smaller, then it got bigger. So, the intent of that area, and this goes to a Father Rich issue which now Father Rich is no longer our pastor, was his thought in that regard would be that would be a nice place for people to be able to put a stone that says in memory of grandma. It was not a high populated area. It's more of like a memorial type, you know, put a stone out there and then people would be willing to make a donation that would help.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, you didn't see using it as a meeting place?

MR. MALONI: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It wouldn't be designed as a meeting place area?

MR. MALONI: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Susan?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, the tree issue, I understand, just to clarify, so the church wants the parking spaces and not keeping the tree. When you were saying the detention, you were saying that you wouldn't make this large of a detention space if you didn't

APPROVED

have those 15 spaces, is that what you're saying? So, because I was thinking, well, let's go land-banking, right? See if they need it, but then the detention would already be too small and so that won't work. Okay, I just wanted to say that thought process out loud.

It breaks my heart to lose such a beautiful tree. It's gorgeous, but I understand what you're saying and, you know, okay. So, I'll move on from that. I won't discuss that further.

Could we address one issue that hasn't been addressed which was a concern of the neighbors regarding this, and also you had the concern about perhaps a disbelief that the Parish Center won't be used as a rented out space? I know that's the intention, but intentions can always change in the future, and they don't require you to come back to us, correct? If they decided to suddenly start renting out the space for weddings, we would have no control over that, correct?

MR. HUBBARD: Right. Essentially, that's an auxiliary function of the church.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Are they required to get any type of liquor service license? Probably not if you have a caterer with a license, correct?

MR. HUBBARD: Probably not, yes. I don't know the specifics of that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: All right. So, I recognize the concern which is that you can't control what's going to happen in the future. We can't obviously predict for anyone or anything what's going to happen in the future. But I wanted to point out and give Sam an opportunity to talk about condition number four which is added in to the motion which does talk about a mitigation plan should parking become an issue. So, could you speak to that a little bit?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. So, I guess to continue your thought process, if for some reason that the Parish Center was rented out for larger athletic facilities, we do have a recommended condition of approval that would address a situation like that. If it was and if it created a parking problem, then the church is agreeing to look at restrictions on use or programming or timing of things in order to ameliorate any parking issue created by that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. So, the motion itself has anticipated that there could be changes in use that might require additional parking, and the Petitioner has agreed to obligate themselves to work with the Village regarding a mitigation plan. So, I don't think the concern is that people might start renting out the hall for weddings. The concern was that the parking would then require an overflow, and if neighbors are seeing that, neighbors need to call the Village and complain, and the Village will then reach out to the church, pull up this requirement and say we need to sit down and discuss. So, in my mind, that addresses that issue.

The one other issue that was brought up was the concern over youths hanging out in the parking lot which is quite frankly something that happens all over Arlington Heights. So, this isn't a new, we're not necessarily maybe creating a new problem that doesn't exist. So, to that end, I don't mean that it shouldn't be a concern of yours. I'm not trying to dismiss your concern. My point to that is that the Village handles this type of situation. So, what I wanted to speak to you was, again could you speak to that? If neighbors are seeing a congregation of youths, if things are not happening, you would call, you'd report it, the Police would start patrolling. I mean could you speak to how that would be addressed?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. The Police could respond to any complaints and we have community service outreach officers that can work with the church, you know, just to get the message out. I think that the point is also the church is saying they're not going to rent this out to organizations outside of the church. If there are athletic events, it's going to be for the, you know, the church. So, you know, you're not talking about like a sports center that's going to have sports

APPROVED

fans or, you know, hockey practices for anyone. This is the landlord essentially providing services for their tenants.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Would the use change if they did start renting it out consistently significantly?

MR. HUBBARD: I mean it's kind of a gray line. Yes, if it became more of like a rental sports facility or a magnet facility, I mean at a certain point, the Village could step in and say hey, this is no longer the use as a church, this is bordering on a church/banquet hall which requires a different level of approval.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I guess I'm just trying to lay all that out information hopefully so that the neighbors can hear that there are some checks and balances in place. It's not going to be perfect and that change is happening and that is going to cause change in the community to some degree, but I think the church, in my understanding, has been a good neighbor. There have never been complaints, at least that's what I heard previously. The Village will stay on this if necessary. They have agreed to conditions that will allow for adjustments in use if it's needed to be. So, I just wanted to walk through that process so that everyone felt that maybe their concerns were being addressed. I have no specific questions. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The only question I have, did I understand the trees that were going to be removed, a number of those are ash trees?

MR. HUBBARD: Five of the 14 are ash trees.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's in this area of these 15 parking spaces?

MR. HUBBARD: They are scattered throughout the site. Some of them are located here, some of them, yes, are up here and then the detention area as well.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But not necessarily where those 15 spaces are?

MR. HUBBARD: Right. I don't know specifically.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The reason I'm saying that is that ash trees, I mean, they may be gone in the very near future anyhow. Again, I'm not fond of cutting down mature trees and there are some beautiful trees in those pictures, but it's kind of a tradeoff with these parking spaces.

In relationship to that detention area, I understand if you have less impervious surface, you can have less detention area. Why would you not keep it larger even though you, let's say if you were to eliminate those 15 spaces, why wouldn't you keep that detention area at the larger size that it is now to help alleviate some of the other flooding that's occurring in that area as the photos are now showing? Why would you have to reduce the size of it? I mean, I understand the code and MWRD doesn't require you to, but the space is there, why wouldn't you leave that larger detention?

MR. DREGER: Well, the design is based upon what's proposed. You know, obviously it would cost more money. You know, you'd be spending money on something that wouldn't be required.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right, but you have less parking area so you're saving money there.

MR. DREGER: True, but I mean it's just not a requirement. It's not a requirement.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I understand. So, you only design per the

APPROVED

requirement and not maybe to help alleviate some of this flooding that's occurring there regardless of how many parking spaces you have?

MR. DREGER: I didn't see the pictures. Where was that flooding, can I ask?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: It looked like it was in that east area between the homes. Between the parking area and the homes if I was looking at those photos correctly.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do you want to look at the pictures?

MR. DREGER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think one of them shows parking spaces in the photos so it gives you a better perspective.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Take it back to the podium please.

MR. DREGER: This looks like --

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Just while he's looking at the pictures, the public portion, the comments on the part of the public can continue.

MS. MAISH: Is that from the detention, is that looking at the detention?

MR. DREGER: Is this the detention basin itself?

MR. GROSSICH: Yes, the basin, looking right towards the, looking east towards the homes.

MR. DREGER: Right.

MR. GROSSICH: One is --

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Why don't you come back up as far as answering the questions? You'll have to speak on the mic so the court reporter can get all this.

MR. DREGER: To me the detention basin is doing what it's supposed to do basically.

MR. GROSSICH: The water is outside the detention area. I mean, this is not the detention, this is somebody's backyard, the water standing.

MR. DREGER: No, I understand, but that's a low area in that person's backyard. I'm not trying to be facetious but it is.

MR. GROSSICH: Can I just make a couple of comments on the parking?

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: As long as you're up there, sure.

MR. GROSSICH: Okay, thank you so much. First of all, while the church has been a good neighbor, I think the neighbors have been good neighbors to the church. When this thing was first proposed, there was an issue about putting fencing up, and we said no, we don't need fencing. We can live without that. The issue of the parking, so everybody is clear, is at peak times, Christmas, Easter, some of these other big events, these spaces aren't going to accommodate that. The neighborhood is willing to leave with the fact that there's going to be people maybe parking on the street a couple of times a year. We get it.

But why should we, for five or six events out of the year, you know, have the additional parking, have less green space, lose some mature trees, and also not provide ourselves as you mentioned maybe an additional buffer from flooding where, yes, I would not reduce the size of the retention pond. I would leave it the same size and take advantage of the fact that you have less impervious space up there. So, that's why I say some of this is tied together. These extra 15 spots aren't going to really make a difference in the day-to-day use of the facility. They're not going to make a difference at peak times either.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you for that. Anything else, John?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No. My only other concern again is I understand what you're saying today that you're not going to rent out this Parish Life Center to other evening activities. I'm looking at specifically say Saturday night which would conflict with your church services. It's easy to say that today, but I don't see how you can ignore that in the future if that's going to be a revenue producing item. That space would be vacant, and why not bring in the revenue that a wedding reception, I'm using that as an example, would bring you? I mean, it doesn't make sense to me.

MR. MALONI: I hear what you're saying, but our primary function is a church of worship and we're not going to do something that interferes with that. So, mass is of critical importance to us. Our parking, our use of our facilities is centered around mass. That's number one and always will be. So, that's why we wouldn't schedule something that would create an issue for ourselves within, you know, the Parish Center.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I mean, you're building this for other uses, not for mass. You're building it for sports events, for craft fairs, for other functions, you know, which your parishioners would partake in, I understand that.

MR. MALONI: Right.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm just having a hard time with the fact that you're going to ignore that in the next five, 10, 15, 20 years where that could be bringing in some additional revenue to the church and use those for other, that money for other items that the parishioners may need.

MR. MALONI: We've never charged to let somebody use the Doherty Center within the parish for whatever, pancake breakfast or a bake sale or, you know, those are all church functions that we don't charge anybody for. So, the idea is not for this to be a revenue center. I wanted to kind of address that. It's been stated a couple of times here as if, well, the activities we have now and, you're right, our numbers are decreasing. But the idea, you know, it's like if your sales are going down, do you not advertise to try to bring your sales back up? This is something that we see as a lifeblood to our parish to bring those numbers back up. We want to attract the youth. We want to be able to have something on a Saturday morning that the kids want to come to.

Right now, we have no gym facility whatsoever for them. We have no place, you know, for them to, our teen center is, sorry, pitiful, you know. We have a very active minister that's trying to increase the teens that want to come. But it's hard to compete against like the, you know, the Willow Creeks and that, because they have all these great facilities. So, this is something we see as benefiting the kids, as benefiting the seniors, as benefiting the whole parish that would want to bring those numbers back up, you know. So, we don't see it just for today, we see it for the growth of our parish.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I understand. I guess my last conflict is with those parking spaces. If you were to eliminate those 15 spaces and preserved those trees with more greenery and less impervious surface, I know by code and by MWRD requirements you could reduce the size of the detention pond, why would you do that? Why won't you just leave it the way it is? Because right now it's in your budget to build it to that size plus pay for those 15 additional spaces. So, again that would be, if that would help the neighbors and their flooding that I'm seeing in these photos, I don't see why you wouldn't do that.

MR. MALONI: One thing about those --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I know the code doesn't require you to do that, I understand that.

APPROVED

MR. MALONI: The thing with that particular tree, what Susan was trying to say is if you eliminate those 15 spaces, you're still within the area of the tree that might make it, it's going to die anyway because that's --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That it will die because of the root system of that tree.

MR. MALONI: Yes. Yes, that's the concern is that we're still within, just eliminating those. In terms of that other thing about building the basin, I mean we are, you know, we're adding detention to the southwest as it is as part of this to help alleviate the issue. So, we're trying to address both the neighborhood issues, but we also, it's not like we have a bunch of extra money for this. I mean right now, you know, we're struggling to pay for basketball poles or, you know, any of the other functions, tables, chairs, just, you know, we're riding the edge of how much our parish can raise. So, we're trying to both, you know, do the best with the money we have.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I understand that you don't want to spend the money that you don't have to, I guess. I'm saying that will go to the overall benefit. I mean, I don't want to belabor us all. That's all I have.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Jay?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: What is the size of the congregation now, approximately? I saw it, but --

MR. MALONI: 2928.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So I mean, obviously the church has been here for a while and the houses around it. I mean the houses are about 20-25 years old around it.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, I mean if you think, you know, the size of the congregation in the last, you know, if it's gone down from over 3,000 families to what it is now, 150 families, I would imagine that what we had in this property 30 years ago in terms of congregation and how busy the church was and everything was probably pretty substantial, and even more substantial, significantly more substantial than it is now. You know, I was just thinking that. But you know, I think if you look at how the property is burdened with parking, it's probably less burdened now just given the size of the congregation has gone down significantly. So, I think that matters, but other than that, I don't have any other questions.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, just a couple of points. I think maybe after hearing all the discussion around here, they may have made a false tradeoff. You've already said, Sam, that they're going to put in 46 new trees and they're going to give up 14, five of which were added. So, they're already adding some green, a lot of green to this area which should help with the problem of water runoff. The code requires them to take care of their own water, period. There may be a problem that's larger than that that the Village has to deal with that doesn't relate to this property, but we really can't ask them to take care of the Village's water problem if they take care of their own. So, I don't see that there's really a tradeoff here between the parking and green space because you're actually adding a lot of green.

If the plan is successful and, as Mr. Maloni said, and you actually increase the attendance, you probably might want those parking spaces. I did find it somewhat compelling that you might kill that tree anyway. That tree might die anyway no matter what you do. So, trying to save that one tree probably shouldn't be the focus of this activity here.

So, on the other issue, just to, I don't know how other churches do this, but a lot of churches obviously require people to be members of the church or they can't use

APPROVED

the facility for weddings and things like that. If they are members of the church, I think you would have people moving from, you know, the church ceremony to the reception. So, I'm not sure that that is really add, and they clearly don't want to rent it out which a lot of churches don't. I'm not sure I would be too concerned about it.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I was only referring to Saturday evenings when you would have a different group of parishioners in the church as opposed to people who attend a wedding service in the afternoon and now congregating into this activity center.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I think Susan has shown us there is a clause here. One of the conditions would allow the Village to go back and say, hey, you're creating a bunch of issues for the neighborhood, parking being one of them, and so we need a remediation plan. That would have to be one of the provisions that would be included in that -- to pass and go forward. I don't have anything else.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Question. Is the project funded for the Parish Center?

MS. MAISH: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I'm seeing a bunch of nods, I guess it's a yes. Is there a teen basketball program right now?

MR. MALONI: No, because we don't have a gym. We don't have a basketball court.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No program because of no gym, all right. Okay, that's all I have. Any other questions, comments, recommendations?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I would like to make a motion.

MR. GROSSICH: Could I make one other comment please? Just one other comment.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sorry.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: The public, sorry, it's closed.

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

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#17-010, Amendment to PUD Ordinance #02-005, and the following variation:

- 1. Chapter 28, Section 11.4, Schedule of Required Parking, to allow 377 parking spaces where code requires 627 parking spaces.**

This approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Compliance with all Design Commission requirements as identified during the September 26, 2017 Design Commission meeting.**
- 2. Provide additional landscaping adjacent to the proposed parking lot on the east side, including three or four additional upright junipers at the end of the drive aisle between the hick yews.**
- 3. Prior to consideration by the Village Board, the Petitioner shall provide the Engineering Department with the detention calculations for the property, for the review and approval by the Engineering Department.**
- 4. If parking beyond what is provided for the church and its ancillary functions is insufficient as determined by the Village, then the Petitioner shall work with the**

APPROVED

- Village to develop and implement a parking mitigation plan that may include, but shall not be limited to, operational restrictions and/or the installation of additional parking or other parking accommodations located elsewhere on site.**
5. **The Applicant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Roll call vote please.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Lorenzini.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes. Okay, you received a unanimous approval from the board up here, but this is only a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. They have the final say-so on this. Is there a date this is going to go to the Trustees, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: We have a tentative date for November 20th, but that's subject to availability, so we'll stay in communication as we provide the update this week.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. All right, we'll close this business. Any other business, Sam? Anything else?

MR. HUBBARD: Next month, or next meeting, we have Hanome which went to Conceptual Plan Review. It's a music venue restaurant in downtown. Then as the Plan Commission may know, we switched our second meeting in November from the day before Thanksgiving to the following week, and we have one project for that meeting as well.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Is that the Plan Commission that you're looking at for the new date or is that all the whole thing?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe we'll Conceptual Plan on the 29th of November as well.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: As well, okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Anything else?

MR. HUBBARD: That's it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Motion to adjourn.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Who seconded? John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I seconded.

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

APPROVED

for attending. ACTING CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: The meeting is adjourned. Thank you

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned petition was adjourned
at 8:59 p.m.)