

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: ST. JAMES PARISH - 831 NORTH ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD - PC#17-012

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 13th day of December, 2017 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'd like to call this meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission to order. If I could ask you all to please rise and say the pledge of allegiance with us?

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Please be seated. Sam, would you take the roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

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: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Here. We have, first business item, we have minutes from our last meeting on November 8th for the Hey Nonny project. Can I have a motion to approve that?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Does anyone need to abstain that was not here?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, just a note that Commission Dawson arrived. Okay, our first Petitioner, or the only Petitioner this evening, if I could ask whoever is going to give comments to please come forward? Will there be anybody else speaking with you?

MR. HICHENS: No, just the two of us.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Just the two of you, okay. I would like to swear both of you in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, who's going to start?

REVEREND FOLEY: I will start.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If you would please come forward to the microphone, tell us your name and please spell it for the court reporter?

REVEREND FOLEY: Reverend Matt Foley, M-a-t-t F-o-l-e-y, Master at St. James.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Would you tell us about your project?

REVEREND FOLEY: Sir, thank you so much for this time, and thank you to the Village of Arlington Heights. When we chose Newman Architecture for our program, you met with us two and a half years ago. We're very grateful for the guidance for the plan. The project is basically to address two primary issues. One is handicap accessibility to our church, our worship space, and the second is to add additional parking, nearly 50 slots on that parking lot adjacent to our church.

MR. HUBBARD: I'm going to see if I can dim the lights because it's washed out on the screen.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. If you would give us your name and spell it please?

MR. HICHENS: Good evening. My name is Matthew Hichens, H-i-c-h-e-n-s. I am one of the principals of Newman Architecture. I'm a licensed architect in the state of Illinois.

So, I want to go through the project. We're very excited to share the project with you folks tonight. There's a lot of great things happening in this project including, you know, maintaining the stormwater, added parking, a great new addition for St. James Parish. So, excited to share the details with it, and we have a lot of representatives here. We have a representative with the civil engineer, traffic study engineer, my associate architect, the general contractor is also here. So, if there are questions that pertain to any part of the project, we'd be happy to answer them the best that we can. I'll take a few minutes to go through the project, and then certainly we'll hear Staff's comments and welcome the public comments as well.

So, first, starting about the site development, as you know, St. James Parish is kind of bisected in an east and a west campus by Arlington Heights Road. On the west side of the campus, they have the school and the parish center and its associated parking. As part of this project, there is no work happening on that part of the site. On the east side existing, we have the rectory up at the north corner of the existing church and its footprint, the old elementary school which is currently vacant, and then over the years the parish has acquired some additional property to the south which we are utilizing for additional off-street parking and for some of the stormwater detention.

Another little close-up of the site plan, this is more of the architectural site plan. Again, here you can see the outline of the existing church. In the dark gray, you can see the outline of the proposed addition. As Father Matt had said, the key reason for the project, the reason the project started was for accessibility to this older structure. It's a half level above grade, it's the main level of the nave, the basement level is half below grade, there is no elevator and there's a number of stairs. So, the real crux of the project and the reason it started was providing handicap accessibility to the building which are going to be an elevator and a new entry foyer. We're also providing a handicap accessible toilet room. So, it's a real great upgrade for the building, a great upgrade for the parish and the community.

As we talk about to the south side of the site, this is the approximate location of the existing elementary school that is being demolished. Again, right now it's a vacant building, so it's a very nice site improvement to have that leaving or being taken away from the site. Some of this is the property that's been acquired to the south which allows us to

add 50 additional off-street parking spots as a part of this addition, which again is a great benefit and a great add to the parish and the community.

Also along this southern perimeter here, we have a landscape plan if anybody is interested, we're putting a six-foot high board-on-batten fence with a large amount of landscaping. We want to be sensitive to the neighbors to our south and provide additional screening between their residences and the site.

As I think was in the report, we did have a neighborhood meeting a number of weeks ago, presented the project to the same radius of people that were invited tonight and tried to, you know, hear their comments and incorporate as many of those comments as we could. We think it was a very positive meeting.

Quick description of the floor plans. In here you can see the existing outline and size of the existing church and nave. Just kind of flowing in there is the, in the black walls is the additional spaces that are being added to the south and to the east side of the existing church. This is going to become the new main entry which faces the additional parking onto the south. The lobby level is at grade, and at that level we have an elevator that connects all of the levels of the building for handicap accessibility. There's stairs up to a new gathering area which has the new handicap toilets here. You can get into the original narthex from this location. There is also going to be a new door here, and a nice new access to see the new font and then the main access headed towards the sanctuary to the east. There are some additional seating, we have new pews in these areas. So, round numbers again, that existing building kind of ends here, and then this is a part of the addition to the east.

This is the lower level. Sorry, I thought I had made some, let me go back one. All right. So, the lower level, and again just to kind of get us acclimated, this is the perimeter right here of the existing church. Again, we're building the same footprint that we saw above to the south and the east. Here we're adding some meeting spaces, some additional storage spaces, additional mechanical and electrical spaces.

One of the things that we're most excited about on this level again is we have the elevator accessibility from the grade level above. Their lower level right now doesn't have the best egress, and so we now have a kind of perimeter corridor with multiple egress points. So, we're making it a much safer environment on the lower level.

From an elevation and 3D perspective, as an architect, our main goal on this job is to make it look like it was this way from day one. It's a great colonial looking red brick building. Obviously, the size and the scale changes a bit. We want to get a great brick match, we want to match the stone quoins that are present on the corners so we have some of that detailing. These windows are the same size and shape as the stained glass windows which are immediately to the north of these. You can see here a skylight for natural light for the new gathering area, again the main entrance that faces south and the additional parking, an overhang for people to kind of spill and gather before and after mass so that we enter at grade level here, and then the additional spaces into the back on the east side.

One of the keys again from the roofline is we're just continuing the roofline as it is. We're not making anything higher. We're going to match the shingles. As a matter of fact, I think we're going to do an entire new shingle tear-off so we have an all new roof. Again, the sensitivity here is just to match the stone quoins, the brick. We had a very positive meeting and discussion with the Design Committee, and they have approved us to move forward with some minor conditions which we're taking care of. So, again, certainly not trying to make an

edifice to myself. We want to make sure that it's something that fits really well with the campus and the community.

Here's another view looking to the northwest. This rose window is kind of an interesting point, the rose window that exists here is being taken out and moved to the back. The Design Committee asked for a couple of additional columns and quoins here to kind of support that back nave look which we're incorporating into the design already. Again, you can see the overhang in the main entry down at the grade level.

Then finally, a kind of straight view, perspective view. We do have a main kind of north-south sidewalk that gets people from that larger south parking area to the main entrance. So, there's kind of one controlled crossing point to the main entrance.

Just a couple of items I have before I turn it over. Here's a quick glance at the landscape plan. This is where we're including that six-foot tall board-on-batten fence with a number of trees and landscaping materials here to provide a real nice block and concealment to our neighbors to the south. Again, you can see the small detention basin we have off to the south, and then new off-street extended parking spaces.

The utility plan, if we have to get to it, there are some questions that talk about some of the underground storage utility that we have.

The next couple of exhibits I just want to spend a couple of minutes on. There is one item in the Staff comments that we have been working diligently with Staff that we feel is a bit of a challenge for us. The question was can we use the existing traffic signal that's there to ingress and egress on to the new east part of our site? As you can see here, this is kind of the extent of the northbound and southbound curb cuts on the west side of the property. If we extend that light and that ingress/egress out, right in here we create quite a pinch point. So, the northern edge of that extended driveway is only about nine feet away from where the proposed addition is, and it eliminates the overhang and eliminates the large spill area for people coming in and leaving mass.

So, for us, this exhibits is challenging, plus it adds traffic on that northern driveway, so most of the people that are trying to get to church now are having to cross a fairly extensive driveway to get into church. It also eliminates the handicap parking spots that we had in this area, so now all the handicap parking spots have to be south of that driveway. So, again working together with our civil engineer and our traffic engineer, we felt this was a bit of a challenge, and we'd ask for Plan Commission to approve as drawn with the right-in and right-out that happens more at the south side of the site.

One last exhibit that goes with that is we did look at, I call them offset driveways. So, the curb cuts still aligned with the north and south curb cuts on the west side of the property, but here you can see the attempt was to try to get back to a point where that driveway was in this position so that we can maintain a nicer spill space and the overhang for the church on rough weather days. So, again this area is really just not efficient, not effective. It's, quite frankly, it's just not very good design.

So, again, we would ask the Plan Commission to approve the plan as submitted even though I think Staff is recommending a continuance on this issue. We feel like we have done some due diligence in terms of it just not being feasible, not to mention some of the other disadvantages. The additional costs are very significant for the parish to include that into the project.

The last bit, there was another item that was discussed. Staff had

asked if the parish could take over ownership and maintenance of the traffic signal itself. That traffic signal was moved I believe back in 2006. There was a letter from IDOT that had the Village of Arlington Heights responsible for the ownership and maintenance of that signal. That came up in some of the Staff discussion which the parish said they would consider.

Pastor Matt and Dev, the parish manager, did some due diligence with the archdiocese of Chicago. They talked to their real estate department, their legal department, and that's not something that those departments of the archdiocese who are the owners of the buildings and the property here are pretty much comfortable with. It's not something they've done in the past and it would be a very big precedent for them.

So, I would ask that Plan Commission approve our plans tonight with the exceptions of item one and item 11 that are on page 11 of 14 on the Staff document. Again, we feel we've done some due diligence on these items, and hopefully you agree. At the end of the day, the most important part is that this is a really wonderful project in terms of added off-street parking, in terms of additional landscape. The ingress and the right-in/right-out, it reduces the amount of traffic that goes into the neighborhood streets. The storm collection underground and the storm detention above grade, there are some very, very significant improvements on this property and we're excited to be a part of it. So, again, thank you for your attention. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Hichens. Can I ask Reverend Foley to just come up? I have one quick question. When I opened, I should have asked you if you're familiar with the four conditions that are laid out regarding this application, and the fact that that has been amended. Sam, do we have a copy of the amended list of changes? I saw this online but I don't see that we have a copy. There's like 12 or 14 changes, and I think that's what, 15? There are 15.

MR. HUBBARD: There were 15 conditions of approval that Staff recommended if this application were to move forward this evening. I can certainly provide those in the motion sheet for the Plan Commission.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If you could for the Commissioners. Do any of, do you not have a copy of it? So, are you aware of the two different lists of conditions?

REVEREND FOLEY: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you, that's all. It appears we have a number of people from the audience. Can I see a show of hands and approximately how many of you intend to come forward to speak after we get the hearing started? So, a number, okay.

Then, let me explain just where we're going from here. We're going to ask Staff to provide us with their report, and I'm going to ask, Sam, if you could provide Staff's basis for recommending the conditions involved in the detail of the alignment of the streets from the Staff's point of view so we have kind of an understanding on that. Once that is done, the Commissioners will have an opportunity to ask questions of both the Petitioner and Staff. Then we will have a period of time for members of the audience to come forward and make comments. Once all of those comments have been made, the public portion of the meeting will be closed, and it will come back to the Commissioners to make their final determination.

So, Sam, if I can ask you, were all the public notices made for the hearing?

MR. HUBBARD: They were, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Would you please provide us with your report?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Ennes, and good evening to the Plan Commission.

As you've heard, the Petitioner is proposing the demolition of the existing school building, some improvements to the parking lot and underground utility infrastructure, as well as some addition to the existing church building located on the east campus. The changes are meant to provide additional parking options for parishioners, to expand the seating size of the church to accommodate for the masses that currently take place on the western campus at 10:00 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., and also make the church more accessible for individuals with disabilities.

The subject property includes both the east and west campuses and is subject to an existing special use permit that was approved in 1963. That special use permit was amended several times over the years, most recently in 2007, to allow the addition to the west campus and large scale improvements there that allowed the subject property to consolidate all school activities into the western campus.

So, one of the actions that the Plan Commission will be deliberating on this evening would be an amendment to the existing special use permit, and that's going to allow the site modifications that are proposed this evening to the east campus.

The second action would be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. This is due to the fact that the church has picked up two additional properties on the southern end, specifically 811 North Arlington Heights Road, and 810 North Pine Avenue. Those properties are currently designated as Single Family Detached, and because they're going to be incorporated into the church site and part of the detention area, the Comprehensive Plan designation needs to be amended from Residential to Institutional.

The third action requested is a planned unit development. Because the east and west campuses exist all as kind of one unified site despite being bisected by Arlington Heights Road in the center, a planned unit development is required. They do share parking between the two sites, and there are multiple buildings on the entire zoning lot which is considered both east and west campus which kicks in the PUD requirement.

Finally, as part of this process, a plat of subdivision to consolidate the east campus is required. I think the east campus consists of multiple lots of record, maybe upwards of 16 lots. So, the Petitioner is required to consolidate those lots into one to accommodate for the overall development.

Additionally, a number of variations are required, and I'll go into detail throughout this presentation. But the one I want to highlight is just fairly simple, it's the last variation there, to allow for the double frontage lot. I'll just kind of expand on that a little bit.

As the Petitioner is required to consolidate everything shown here into one lot, it creates one large lot that is defined by our code as a double frontage lot, meaning it has frontage on two streets that are not intersecting, that being Arlington Heights Road and Pine Avenue. Our subdivision code requires that any double frontage lot be restricted from access onto a major arterial. The Petitioner has proposed a right-in/right-out access onto Arlington Heights Road which is classified as a major arterial. So, technically, that access is not allowed by the subdivision code, so a variation is needed.

Staff is supportive of that variation. We believe that access onto Arlington Heights Road will actually be a benefit for this development. This restriction generally is more applicable to just like a single family residential lot that would have a frontage on a

neighborhood street on the front side and frontage on a majority arterial on the back side, and on a situation like that, this regulation makes complete sense because you wouldn't want multiple single family lots having access on a major arterial. But in this case, we don't believe it's practical and we're in support of that variation.

So, here you can see the aerial. Both portions of the subject property are outlined in red. On the right-hand side is the east campus consisting of the church, and on the west side which is the left side of the screen is the west campus which is composed of the school.

So, there have been several actions to date which have let us to this point this evening. On August 23rd, the Petitioner appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee to present the concept. I think it was favorably reviewed by the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. Concerns at that time centered around possible parking constraint, some of the landscaping improvements that were needed, and the Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged a neighborhood meeting which the Petitioner did host on September 24th. A summary of that meeting as prepared by the Petitioner was provided to the Plan Commission. It's part of the public record on our website.

Finally, on October 24th, the Petitioner appeared before the Design Commission that did end in a favorable motion for approval contingent on several conditions. The first element this evening most notably I think was, you know, one of the conditions that would require a small bump-out and architectural detailing on the east rear of the building, or some small architectural changes requested on the southwest corner of the building as well. As the Petitioner has stated, they thought it was a favorable meeting, they are amenable to these conditions. If and when this application is ultimately to move forward to the Village Board, compliance with these Design Commission conditions would be required.

So, I'd just like to go through some of the particular variations that are requested. First of all, there was a variation requested to reduce the drive aisle width from 24 feet required to 22 feet. Specifically, the drive aisle width in question is shown here in red, it's originally proposed at 22 feet. Based on discussions with the Petitioner, the Petitioner has agreed to shorten, I'm sorry, to increase in width the segment on the north side here and the segment on the south side here to 24 feet. So, they have reduced the extent of the variation requested. I think on the north side they are able to do that because there's additional room here and here. So, we've kind of pushed these islands over to create that 24-foot width.

On the south side, they are able to accomplish this by possibly reducing the depth of the spaces from 19 feet to 16.5 and possible reduction there as well. Or alternatively, they can reduce in width the pedestrian connection here. But ultimately, they have agreed to do this where it is feasible. However, there is a small section here in the center that cannot be reduced in width and a variation is needed.

Staff is supportive of that variation for several reasons, one of which is if they were to increase the width of the drive aisle on the west side, they would be decreasing the green space which is proposed for some plantings along the church. Furthermore, the Design Commission does require a small bump-out in this area here, so it will make any decrease in green space very tight for landscaping. If they were to increase the width on this side, it would impact some of the preliminary planting for the parking lot that they are proposing along the eastern edge of the site. So, we feel that it's a sensible variation. We verified that emergency access won't be affected and we are supportive of the reduction in drive aisle width.

Another of the variations requested is relative to one landscape island. All parking rows are required to terminate with a landscape island and a single width to support a shade tree. So, at the very north of the site, you can see here there's really not enough room for that landscaping island to support a shade tree, and so a variation would be needed for that. In conversations with the Petitioner, they propose an alternative which would be to take this median landscape island and bump it up to the north which would eliminate that last parking space which is probably not a desirable space due to potential conflicts with inbound and outbound traffic, take that space and make it a landscape island.

But of course that is going to result in this parking row which I believe has 29 spaces without having a median aisle. So, our code requires that any stretch of 20 or more spaces have a median landscape aisle in the center. As that island would be pushed to the end, it requires a variation. Again, Staff is also supportive of this variation.

I do want to talk about some of the landscape improvements that are proposed by the church. This is the existing site, and you can see on the parking lot, there is no perimeter landscaping, a lot of parking lot on the north and east sides, and the south really, the parking lot doesn't have any landscape islands either. There's very little perimeter landscaping down here. Most of these large trees are actually located on the properties here which are also owned by the church. But there is not much perimeter landscaping for the existing church site.

So, here is the landscaping plan that they have proposed. Again, this is with the north, following that red arrow to the left of the screen would be north. You can see here, they are incorporating the code-required landscape islands. In addition, they incorporated the code-required perimeter landscaping along the edge of the site to the east and to the north.

As mentioned by the Petitioner and as requested by Staff, they have added extensive landscaping to the south of the site, on the southern side of the proposed detention basin. This is above and beyond code requirements. We only require a screen and that screen could be through landscaping or through a fence or a berm. They have not only provided a six-foot tall wooden fence, but they have also provided extensive landscaping on the southern side of the detention basin. Again, if this petition is to move forward, if and when it does, Staff has recommended a small change, and that would be to swap out these three trees which are proposed as crabapple trees and be substituted with evergreen trees which would provide a better, year-round screen.

I also want to talk about detention a little bit. Currently, the site basically just sheet drains to the southeast. So, all rainfall kind of follows this path. Some of it will end up in the small green space area that's currently located here, but most of it is just going to sheet drain off of Pine Avenue and flow down the street or be collected in the existing storm sewer that runs along the west side of that street. The Petitioner has proposed a detention basin which is shown here in red. The detention, this is an underground detention vault, and it would ultimately connect it to the Village storm sewer here and drain down Pine Avenue.

Additionally, there is the aboveground detention area here which would connect to the detention vault and then ultimately drain out into the Village storm sewers. There are some historical flooding issues along Pine Avenue, mostly to the south. As I mentioned, a lot of the existing runoff just drains right onto Pine Avenue and can go south. Some ponding can occur. The proposed improvements including the underground stormwater vault and the aboveground detention area should have a positive impact on this flooding, as

most of the runoff would be captured now on site and slowly released into the Village system as opposed to just sheet draining straight off the site and collecting and exacerbating the existing problems there. So, we view that as a positive improvement.

One of the last things I want to touch on is the parking variation. When you look at it on a typical basis, we have to consider both the east and west campus including in the overall parking count, required parking count. So, the variation request is to allow a reduction in the minimum number of required parking stalls from 974 to 337. This, you know, from a strictly number standpoint, it look like a pretty excessive variation, but when we look at it from a practical standpoint, we're including the west campus in that calculation. You can see on the table here, the west campus is responsible for 673 spaces of that 974 space requirement. So, the vast majority of that variation is generated by the west campus. That was already deliberated and approved when the west campus went through the approval process in 2007. But because we're making changes to the east campus, we have to factor in the overall variation.. So, again, it's from 974 spaces to 337.

When you consider just what's on the east campus requirement, it's 301 spaces and they would provide 188 spaces on site. So, in order to determine if that was sufficient, the Petitioner provided a parking and traffic study that surveyed parking at the church on Sundays to determine what that peak parking demand would be . Based on these surveys which included all of the parishioners parking on the east lot, all of the parishioners parking on the west lot, the parishioners parking on Arlington Heights Road, Pine Avenue, Frederick Street, Marshall Street, and Evergreen, they determined that the maximum parking demand was 359 spaces. That occurs as a result of the 10:00 a.m. mass that happens on the west campus.

Based on the improvements and the addition to the parking, there would be 334 total spaces. So, if we were willing to accept the typical Sunday parking demand, it would be 359 spaces, the 334 spaces provided leaves us with a 25-space deficit. So, if and when this project moves forward, we are recommending that the current parking allowance for parking along Arlington Heights Road, both east and west side, be eliminated because we feel that it's no longer necessary to accommodate for the peak parking demand. Furthermore, we've seen, based on simple research with the Police Department, that parking along Arlington Heights Road is somewhat of a hazard. There have been a record of accidents over the past several years that can be attributed to this parking. So, based on the demand and the fact that it's hazardous, we think it should be eliminated, that parking allowance on Arlington Heights Road.

Furthermore, if we're looking at this 25-space parking deficit that's going to overflow, we would want to know especially given the elimination of parking along Arlington Heights Road where that overflow would occur. So, if you take into consideration the stretch of Pine Avenue which could accommodate 40 cars, and the stretch of Frederick Street which could accommodate at least five cars, we believe there is enough space to accommodate for this overflow in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, we can see the parishioners parking here, possibly parking on the north side of Frederick here, and then maybe along Marshall there.

This, you know, in order for the parking overflow to be limited, all of the church parking spaces and school's parking spaces need to be utilized prior to parishioners seeking parking on the residential streets. So, we communicated this to the Petitioner, and they have said that they would adopt kind of a policy where they would make it known through their weekly bulletins, through their Facebook social media, and through announcements during service that parishioners are strongly encouraged to park in these existing facilities rather than

seeking parking on surface streets.

So, that being said, we know that sometimes people will just park where it's convenient. So, if parking becomes a problem, we would strongly recommend the condition that requires the church to provide additional either onsite or off-site parking spaces to help ameliorate the overflow that's becoming a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood. One of those areas could be, or one of these options could be if the church was to upsize the underground detention vault that they're putting in here, that would mean that the parking area could be expanded to the south here and where they're proposing the aboveground detention area. So, that's one of the options, something to consider.

This kind of brings me to my closing tonight. We also looked at traffic that would be generated as a result of the consolidation of services on the east campus. Currently, if you want access to the east campus, you're going to have to drive on Frederick, come down on Pine and enter the site here, or come up from Pine Avenue if you're coming from the east. This right-in/right-out, you know, would allow this northbound ingress to the site. But egress from the site after the services let out, the only option would be northbound on Arlington Heights Road from the site. Otherwise, you're going to have to come on the residential streets, come up Pine, on to Frederick, take a turn to head southbound. Or alternatively, if you head out of the site, if you want to reach a signal, you can go southbound and eventually reach Euclid and make that southbound movement through the traffic signal on Arlington Heights and Euclid.

We asked the church to consider, as you've heard, the ingress/egress point here that would align with the signal. That would provide for signalized access and southbound egress from the site, potentially even southbound ingress to the site from Arlington Heights Road. We know that the church has come up with some rationale as to why they think that's not feasible, but we didn't receive detailed information on this until this week. So, Staff just doesn't feel like we've had the opportunity to vet whether or not this is a viable alternative.

It may be that ultimately we agree with the Petitioner and think that it's not something that would make sense for their site. But you know, we understand that there is going to be a, you know, potential parking overflow and we'd like to vet every possibility that we can to minimize any traffic overflow onto the neighboring residential areas. One way to do that would be if, you know, if alignment is allowed and whether or not, you know, that can provide southbound egress from the site. That will certainly help alleviate some of the traffic that would come out on Pine and then head to Frederick or come down Pine.

So, ultimately, you know, we'd like to have the opportunity to discuss this further with the Petitioner. We'd also like to meet with IDOT to discuss it to see what their approach is. But to date, we really feel like we haven't had the opportunity to fully vet if that's a viable alternative. As such, we would like to, we are recommending continuance of this application until the January 24th meeting in order to give the Petitioner and Staff and IDOT the opportunity to fully review that aligned access point.

So, that concludes my presentation and I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, thank you for your report. Can we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make the motion to accept the report.
COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Commissioner Cherwin, do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I think, you know, I looked at this plan quite a bit in the, I keep forgetting the name, yes, the Conceptual, sorry, Committee level, and so you know, I took a look at really most of the details then. I think the newest issue is the one that was brought up on the light and I think, you know, notwithstanding the Staff's report in terms of their concerns, I think the Petitioner raised a few valid points about the challenges that accommodating the connection of the light would pose to their plan. I think that's probably the issue that I'm looking at right now. It's sort of a new issue that I don't have all the information on, but I'd like to hear the public I think before I ask further questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I was also at the Conceptual Plan Review, and so I do understand the project. I do understand Staff's desire to align drives with that light. At this point in time, I'd like to hear comments from the audience and further discuss this driveway alignment.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Could you speak to the light issue, Sam, about hearing from the Petitioner that they cannot get approval from the archdiocese which is something the Village is insisting on?

MR. HUBBARD: It is one of our recommended conditions of approval. It's not a common situation. You know, the way that the Engineering Department has analyzed the signal, it's really a private benefit signal. It doesn't really serve anyone beyond the church and school, and it is really only there because of the church and school. So, there are a few other instances where we require that. Again, it's not a common thing but it's something that, when we have a private benefit signal like this, that's something that we feel is fair for the church to pay because they're the only one that really benefits from it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, we have other areas in Arlington Heights where there's a private benefit signal and we're requiring the owners to pay for the signal?

MR. HUBBARD: And we bill those maintenance and electric costs to those parties that benefit from them.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do you have any estimates for what that generally costs, what that is?

MR. HUBBARD: I don't. Unfortunately, the Engineering Department is still gathering that information.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. These other locations, was it since we put this light in place? You know, like this is a, we put this light in place and the Village agreed to pay for the maintenance. The others, was this after we did this for St. James? Do you have any idea?

MR. HUBBARD: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: In Petitioner's comment, he stated that IDOT is the one that required the Village to maintain responsibility for this. Could you speak to that?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. So, when the signal study was done back in 2007 to kind of reorient the site and signal system there, IDOT specifically required the Village to maintain the signal which is not unique. I mean I think the Village almost always does, and that's kind of a standard thing that IDOT is going to require. I don't think IDOT ever really puts that maintenance cost on, you know, an individual property owner. Why it wasn't required back then, we don't know, that is, why the maintenance responsibilities weren't pushed to the church back then, we don't know.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can I ask the Petitioner a question? Sir?

MR. HICHENS: Me?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, no, the church.

MR. HICHENS: Okay, it's all right.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Reverend Foley?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Reverend Foley, sorry. I apologize. If we were to insist that this condition stay in, would that prevent the entire project from going forward?

REVEREND FOLEY: At this time, I'm unable to respond to that because I'd have to talk to the people that own the property which is necessary, the archdiocese of Chicago. I can't speak on their behalf. I'm there as their servant and their pastor, but I'm not available to give that answer at this point.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I understand. But you stated that you had already spoken to the legal department and the real estate department, and they had stated that it's not something the church is willing to do. So, I know you certainly can come back to them and talk to them, I'm not asking, but at this moment in time it appears to me that you do not have authority to proceed with this project if this condition remains, is that correct?

REVEREND FOLEY: That's correct, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, to the light issue, I feel like I need more information about the cost. You know, I certainly agree with the Village's position on that but, I mean it's always been that way. We had an opportunity when it was put in to put the cost on to them. They're improving the property. I don't know, but I would want to know the cost.

On the continuance issue, you are recommending continuance, but then we also have a potential motion to allow this to go forward in the prior to Village Board consideration that some of these issues addressed. Could you speak to, Sam, if we were to not continue this, what is the Board missing out on in the decision making? You know, what is it that, on this, you know, the egress situation, I generally rely on people here that have more construction and engineering and traffic experience than I do anyway for those kind of comments. So, if I were to want to speak to this or hear more, what would I be missing?

MR. HUBBARD: You mean why couldn't a decision be resolved prior to appearing at the Village Board with a motion for approval this evening?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. I mean, I guess what I'm asking is I am not going to, it's just a matter of whether or not there is going to be a light and how that's going to impact, I mean it sounds like it makes a lot of sense to me, but I don't know anything about traffic patterns other than from my experience up here. What would you be asking the Commission to be speaking to that Staff and Village Board couldn't do? Because Petitioner wants this to move forward, I'm trying to weigh whether or not I should put the burden on the Petitioner to wait until January 24th which is a significant delay of the project, versus allowing it to go forward and having the Village make this decision.

MR. HUBBARD: I mean we think it could have a substantial impact on the site. It could have a substantial impact on the traffic generation, a positive impact on the traffic generation we believe. So, we're just not able to support this until we know what the actual effect is going to be. We feel that's important not only for Staff to understand but for the Plan Commission as well.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure. All right, I understand where you're coming from. No further questions. I'm interested to hear what the audience has to say.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Do we have to add, if we go forward, if the Petitioner wants to go forward and not go with a continuance, is there a way that we can draft an additional condition to address the issues of the Village with respect to what you have researched before you are more definitive in the direction of this project?

MR. HUBBARD: If you were to make a motion for approval this night?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, if there is, so that the Petitioner can go forward and the Village can do its job in vetting the project, do we add another recommendation?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It's here, referenced in number one.

MR. HUBBARD: I believe condition number one addresses that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It's right here. That's what they're anticipating.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I believe condition number one addresses that. So, Petitioner would provide a written narrative of the various design options which were considered relative to the alignment of the ingress and egress, and then, you know, additional details, and then would have a meeting with Staff and IDOT prior to appearing before the Village Board.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, well, that's what I wanted to ask, if that was satisfactory for going forward if there is not a continuance, that they can get a date with the Village Trustees, and then you'll have enough time to do it and that covers it, or is there some, because you've asked or we, the Village, is recommending that there is a continuance.

MR. HUBBARD: We believe that the issue is significant enough to warrant a continuance so that the entire Plan Commission can deliberate on what that would mean to acquire that access alignment with the traffic signal. If the Plan Commission feels that, you know, that's not something they're interested in and they would kick that to the Village Board to consider, that's --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, well, that's the point. I mean, so it's clear enough at least, or covered in number one that that satisfies the Village in having enough time for the recommendation, in that recommendation to go forward before the Village Trustees, that basically we don't have to worry about a continuance because number one or some clarification of number one allows for Staff to do some more due diligence and vetting. Is that fair?

MR. HUBBARD: Right. I mean ultimately if you're satisfied, then you're putting it on Staff to figure out the issue.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Correct, exactly. That's the point. So, one works against the other. We can go and approve it subject to one which says figure it out by the time you get to the Board is basically the summary of that point. Would that be correct?

MR. HUBBARD: That's correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Can I just clarify? I think the Petitioner also requested though, as far as the conditions go, approval without one, 11 and 14, were those the

numbers?

COMMISSIONER DROST: That's correct, and the point would be whether the Petitioner would reconsider the objections to one, 11 and 14. Just getting through that procedural hurdle is basically --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I think Mr. Hichens --

MR. HICHENS: The Petitioner requests that the Plan Commission make a motion to approve without a continuance with the exceptions of only items number one and 11. I referenced that it's on page 11 of 14.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I apologize.

MR. HICHENS: So, it's just items one and 11.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Thank you for the clarification. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Before I go down to Commissioner Jensen, Sam, just a point of clarification. It's my understanding that the Petitioner has provided you with a written narrative addressing the alignment of the ingress and egress to the light on the eastern parcel, you just have not had time to review that yet?

MR. HUBBARD: Right, correct. Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I was in the CPR as well and am generally positively disposed to the project. It seems to me the Village is, too, the Village Staff is generally positive on this project overall. It's a large project, a lot of aspects to it. As I read your Staff recommendation, you generally support it. But you have these two or three issues that need to be resolved. I'm kind of where I think Commissioner Dawson was. I'm not sure what the Plan Commission will add beyond what you, IDOT, and the Petitioner will work out between now and the Village Board. So, I'm really having trouble seeing the value of continuing, but I will wait until I hear from the audience and others before coming to a final decision on that.

I do have a couple of questions for Mr. Hichens though. Do we have a cost associated with doing what they want to do in terms of aligning the signal and the egress and ingress?

MR. HICHENS: Yes. I believe with the traffic study and the civil engineer that we have here, and gentlemen, if I speak with an incorrect number, let me know. Early on in the process, just 60 seconds of history, we did look at trying to utilize that intersection. The civil engineer of record, Kimley-Horn, not only did we have problems with the alignment and how it impacted the proposed addition, the drop-off, where the handicap stops were, some of the things that I referenced, their recent experience with upgrading traffic signals to take that fourth leg is in the area of \$200,000-\$250,000, just to redo the traffic lights. There's old poles, there's old street lights, there's electric wires, overhead wires. It's a very significant cost for a parish which is a not for project.

So, earlier in the design phase, that's when we started to look at the right-in/right-out towards the south to help save and make good economic decisions for the parish. We liked, you know, we like getting some of that; right now there is not an ingress or an egress onto Arlington Heights, so we felt that the right-in/right-out was a nice improvement. It saved them significant money, and it also kept the bulk of the traffic to the south side of the site

in lieu of adding more cars to where the entrance of the church was.

So, just the lights alone we were informed was over \$200,000, and I would estimate we're talking over \$250,000 to make that happen. Again, we're not convinced that the geometries even work.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You did have a design issue, too, you might need to refresh my memory, there was something you said. If you did align it, it would create some problems for the main entrance. Is that correct? You wouldn't be able to have the overhang or you'll have a design issue?

MR. HICHENS: So, the design issue is where, you know, we have our proposed addition to the south and to the east. Then from where the new main entrance is, there's roughly a 15 by 15 or 20 by 20 overhang which is a nice spill area for the people that come out of the church. So, if you can imagine 700-750 people coming out of the church, that's a place where they can gather, kind of collect themselves before they cross that driveway to get to their car. If there is a perfect alignment that goes right from where the curb cut is on the west side of the campus straight through, which is the right thing for a traffic signal, right? You don't want to have an offset traffic signal, that can be a safety issue. If you keep it going straight through, the overhang goes away, the spill area and the sidewalk for the main entrances goes away, and that north edge of the driveway would be 9.5 feet away from where the doors are.

So, if you can imagine 700-800 people coming out into a nine-foot sidewalk in the north side of the driveway, again respectfully, we don't even think it should be on the table.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Last question, do you have any idea what the cost would be if the ownership of the traffic light were shifted back to you and away from the Village? Do you have any estimates on that?

MR. HICHENS: Javier, do you have a number on that?

MR. MILLAN: No, I unfortunately don't. So, I really couldn't speculate on that one.

MR. HICHENS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, if you don't have a number, that's fine. I would ask Staff on that issue, did I understand you correctly that in the earlier negotiations, IDOT assigned that in essence to the Village, to take over the maintenance and the cost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Which I think is typical, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, why do we think it would turn out any differently when you have your negotiation with IDOT this next time?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, I think they'll still assign it to the Village, we'll just bill the church for that cost.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay. I should ask you this other question, Mr. Hichens. It seems to me one of the issues that was just raised by Mr. Hubbard was something about traffic generation. It seems to me like your traffic engineers could model what the traffic generation would be under both conditions, with the configuration that the Village wants as well as what you want. They didn't do that as I didn't see it in the report or did I miss it?

MR. HICHENS: There was, the generation was, I would say the generation is the same regardless of either option. The number of cars are the same.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Right.

MR. HICHENS: So, I guess the answer is no, there wasn't a different

generation with using the traffic signal versus using the right-in/right-out. But I'm not sure how those variables in number of cars changes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I guess that would be kind of my guess, too, just that there really wouldn't be much change anyway.

MR. HICHENS: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think that's all I have at this point.

MR. HICHENS: Commissioner, if I could just add, one of the other detriments or disadvantages that we saw, we're trying to connect from Pine all the way to the traffic signal. Obviously, I mentioned the number of issues and concerns that we have, but it does also become a potential cut-through for people coming from Arlington Heights, people coming from the neighborhood. With the right-in/right-out at the south side, it's a lot less desirable for people to cut through the parking.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I certainly understand the concerns on both sides. I mean I want to acknowledge that there could be residents here who live on Pine and Frederick and other streets that having that, you know, egress right on Arlington Heights Road would alleviate that, and I live on a road that is accessed by a church, so I understand the additional traffic that that creates. So, I do want to point out that there is give and take on both sides there.

It's not going to surprise anybody, I'm going to ask about water. I very much appreciate the above and below ground capture of the water and slow release. I think it's definitely going to be better than what they have now. My only question, it was very much pointed out in the Staff report that there are no native plantings in the detention area. Can I ask if that was a consideration? And if so, why it was decided against native plantings?

MR. HICHENS: So, the short answer is yes, it was considered. There were a couple of, probably two reasons why we kept it a dry detention with a turf basin. Number one is the idea of potentially having that, you know, a usable space in terms of if there's, it's just another green space, another grass area that could be utilized by the parish or the church. The other is just the native plantings are great but there is a maintenance issue associated, I'm sure you understand, with those types of plantings. If not well maintained, they can quickly look terrible. So, we were, you know, again as a parish, they don't have full-time maintenance people and they don't have people that are going to, you know, they're not arborists, they're not taking care of these things like you might on other sites.

So, it was kind of keeping it simple and stupid was the answer to go to turf versus native plantings. Certainly we're very pro native plantings. But for this particular site, it didn't feel like the right choice.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Well, I'm glad it was considered. I'm sorry to hear it's not become part of the plan but I'm glad it was considered. I will wait to hear from the public before I ask any additional questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mary Jo. Commissioner Lorenzini?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Sam, the plantings in the southwest corner, the landscaping, that's not going to block the view of people exiting the parking lot, will it?

MR. HUBBARD: No. They are kept outside of the sight triangle.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, you mentioned about possibly using some of the detention area for parking if additional parking is needed. But practically, how would

that work? You would do that at day one or after a year or two you'd be reevaluating and then they would be asked to fill that in? Or what were you suggesting here?

MR. HUBBARD: The approach that Staff is taking was to recommend it as a condition of approval that at any point after this project has been completed it's determined that there is significant overflow onto the residential streets, that the Village could require the church to find some means to provide alternative parking. That could either be off-site at some satellite location where people are trucked in or I believe the church may own additional lots in the neighborhood, possibly directly to south of this, or through the expansion of the underground vault which would allow the aboveground detention area to be turned into paving. Alternatively, if the Plan Commission felt that it would be a significant parking nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood, they could require it at this juncture. So, Staff's recommendation was to, you know, have it as a future monitoring kind of situation.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: But to me it seemed like the most practical solution would be to start using some of the school parking lot.

MR. HUBBARD: Well, they will be. I mean that's --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, sorry. All right. Then going back to item number one about the traffic study or the in and out being aligned with the light, whatever it is or not, if we were to approve this tonight with that caveat that you have to approve it, so let's say we do approve it tonight and they do satisfy number one and then everybody is happy and we're all done, but what happens if we approve it tonight and you don't like number one? Do we start this process all over again?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, if you approve it under that condition and Staff evaluates what the church provides and Staff's ultimate recommendation is that that alignment be created, then ultimately I think that would go on to the Village Board for their determination and consideration.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: If we were to continue it tonight, this would be a question for the parish, if we were to continue it tonight to sometime in January, what does that do to your plans?

MR. HICHENS: It would be a significant event. So, the goal is to try to get the demo going as soon as possible here in say February or March of the vacant school, followed by the submission of drawings and building permit. The hope was to break ground in the spring when weather is favorable. Obviously, that would push back our timeline with Village Board approval. I believe there's a second return when we get the signed IDOT agreement.

Again, selfishly speaking for my client, you know, as these things push back weeks and weeks which becomes maybe months, the construction would be impacted by winter conditions which would be an additional cost to the parish. So, it would be a significant crunch on the deadline.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Have you gotten any feedback from the residents with what may happen with the additional, there probably will be obviously additional traffic on the east side of Arlington Heights Road, has there been any feedback from anybody on those impacts?

MR. HICHENS: If you could ask that again, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, so with all the parking on the east side now, with the expansion of parking on the east side, you're going to have a lot more traffic up and down some of the side streets. Have you gotten any feedback from the neighbors on

that?

MR. HICHENS: So, when we first met and we had the neighborhood meeting, there was representation from Pine and Frederick at the neighborhood meeting, and there were discussions and some concerns about, what we heard at the neighborhood meeting is that there was some parking that was happening on both sides of the street which was Pine particularly which was difficult because now two cars, you know, two-way traffic with two cars on each side. I believe parking is really only allowed on one side of the street based on the signage. What we see is a reduction in the traffic into the neighborhood because we have 50 additional off-street parking spots, and we're providing a right-in/right-out onto Arlington Heights.

So, the right-in/right-out doesn't exist today, so there will be more traffic that can evacuate the site via Arlington Heights, and there is more off-street parking. There's really not more cars, or not more people that are going to church, it's just we're managing the cars better for that site.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Sam, one last question. Getting the meeting with IDOT, especially at time of the year, how long do you think that would take?

MR. HUBBARD: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Getting the meeting with IDOT at this time of the year, how long do you think that would take? Is this January realistic?

MR. HUBBARD: We felt that we would be able to coordinate that meeting and discuss this with them prior to the January 24th Plan Commission meeting.

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

CHAIRMAN ENNES: To follow up on that question, whether we continue or approve it tonight, for this drive to go out onto Arlington Heights Road which currently does not exist, IDOT has got to approve that, right?

MR. HUBBARD: They will have to review and approve the access, the proposed right-in/right-out.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The alignment of the traffic light with the parking lot is a very interesting concept. I think it becomes a safety issue. I see the problem that the architect has with how the alignment works. I have sort of a question for anybody who can answer it.

Do these alignments have to be straight east-west onto each other? Or can they be offset? To whoever can answer that, please come forward, because I don't deal with, as an architect myself, I just don't deal with a lot of alignment of streets.

MR. MILLAN: Good evening. My name is Javier Millan, I'm a senior consultant of KLOA, Incorporated.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Would you spell your name please?

MR. MILLAN: Yes, sorry. J-a-v-i-e-r, last name M-i-l-l-a-n. To answer your question, yes, good planning practice and whenever possible, you should try to avoid having those offset intersections. I believe it was alluded, I don't know if it was Sam or the architect. Any time you have offset intersections, you start creating some overlapping movements which can cause some serious issues with accidents. So, whenever possible, you want it to be lined up. However, that presents some problems that were mentioned.

I'm not trying to rehash everything, but if you certainly take away that, I'm going to call it the landing area, the area that people when they exit --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, no, I agree, when it lines up it becomes problematic with the design. I understand all that. I was just asking --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Since you didn't come up to be sworn in originally, would you swear to tell the truth about everything you're going, all the information you're going to provide to this Commission?

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, not a problem. The only reason I asked the question was if you offset these intersections, and since these are just turning functions and there is no through traffic, you know, you don't have through problem going on, is it simpler to make it happen, that's all, was my question.

MR. MILLAN: Let me explain it. Let's say that they're offset a little bit to the south so it doesn't affect that area, now you basically have overlapping northbound and southbound left turn lanes that would actually be head on because of the offset. Do you understand what I'm trying to say? Like if you're going southbound, excuse me, on Arlington Heights Road and you're trying to get to the church, you in essence have to almost pass the west lane so that you can do that.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I was just wondering if there could be a secret alley such that this stoppage that you have X number of feet is not straight.

MR. MILLAN: I'll say this, it could be. The state tries to avoid that. It's difficult and, you know, for the most part the state wants to keep the flow of traffic north-south. Yes, it could be done but it's very difficult and the state typically shies away from that because of exactly what he mentioned.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That's what I needed as an answer. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sam, could you put that screen up so that we can see what they're talking about?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: It would be like a three-step sequence almost.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: What, the aerial, Sue?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The proposed, yes, that's right, I couldn't see it.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: In other words, if it lines up, I understand what it does to the building, I get that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, you can't really see it.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's just that you can, I know where it is just because I know where it is, and it hits right up at the corner of the building. So, it's a tough --

MR. MILLAN: Yes, some of the other issues, I know they were alluded to. You can see how they have their entrance on the south side on the handicap parking spaces. If it's lined up, the handicap spaces would have to be moved to the south. Now, you have the majority of the people crossing, I don't really know, I'm just saying.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'd have to offset it enough to get around.

MR. MILLAN: Yes. Then the other issue, I think this would be very attractive to the residents right now trying to get to Arlington Heights Road. So, you're certainly going to increase in my opinion traffic on Frederick trying to, you know, go down south on Pine

and then just use the signal which makes it attractive. Right now, they have to go probably down south so they can get to the signal on Euclid. Yes, am I right, Euclid?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. MILLAN: In trying to make a right and then just go to the signal. So, there's pros and cons to everything, but I think there's a little bit more of an impact to the church as well as to the residents because we're going to see increased traffic on Frederick as well as Pine.

MR. HICHENS: Mr. Commissioner, if I could add, IDOT did review the preliminary site plan for this project and there were multiple conversations with them. They approved the right-in/right-out concept with no exceptions.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank you.

MR. MILLAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I think that, you know, we're talking about how number one is incorporated into this, and I think what I just heard, that whether this discussion is with us with a continuance or the discussion is with the Village Board with just this kind of information, the information would get passed along and I think it's, in my estimation, it's problematic to do what they want to do, not only the cost consideration that goes along with that. So, I'd like to hear what other people in the audience have to say.

The other issue is the cost and maintenance of the traffic light. I tend to agree with the Staff here. I think if it's just one user who benefits, I think that you should pay. That's all I have for now, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: On that same line of questioning in regard to the cost of the light, Sam, are you aware of how that light functions at present?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: What triggers it to go on and off?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I believe it's cars that are exiting from the west campus or people who are pressing the buttons to cross the street.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, it is just people pushing buttons. If there isn't anyone, a pedestrian isn't there to cross the street or there isn't a car leaving the western lot and coming up to a sensor or something on the sidewalk, the light does not stop traffic?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe that to be the case.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, that's why it's being classified as a convenience for the property owner, okay. Mr. Millan, you are the traffic engineer for the project?

MR. MILLAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I have a question for you. Can we put up an aerial of the current site? My concern also is in regard to item number one. Can we zoom in on that? It would be nice if we have both the east and the west campus. Yes, can you zoom in?

Okay, the way I understand the west lot is that parking lot which is used, when you have services, people park there across the street and go to the church. The exits for that lot on Evergreen, those are closed, aren't they? Those are gated off? Because don't we have traffic leave on the Arlington Heights Road or am I wrong? That is what it is, okay.

Whether or not there is parking on the east campus during the week for the school or not isn't my concern, but the way the lot is presently, there is no exit onto Arlington Heights Road. So, all of the traffic is leaving on the street that's on the north lot, Frederick, and the street that runs to the east, that's correct?

MR. MILLAN: Are you saying that, because right now --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm asking the question, yes, currently.

MR. MILLAN: Right now, they park in both lots. Whether east or, sorry, the east campus or the west campus, they do.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But on days when you have services and there is heavy use of the lot around the church, the only ingress and egress is on the side streets?

MR. MILLAN: Correct. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, on those days, Saturdays, Sundays, whenever you have these services, do you have a police officer or someone who controls traffic onto Arlington Heights Road? Or is that just kind of a free-for-all?

MR. MILLAN: To the best of my knowledge, there is no police officer.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. Now that you're going to have it, right now the proposal is that the two drives are not going to align?

MR. MILLAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If we have traffic coming out onto Arlington Heights Road on either Saturday service or on Sunday services, will you be having some kind of traffic control there, a police officer or whatever?

MR. MILLAN: We don't expect that. Again, there's a right-in/right-out that will take away some of the weight or load from the residential streets to the east. If they do park also on the west campus and they exit, that will trigger the signal, I think it was mentioned. It's on, actually it was for sensors.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, but that's people coming out of the west lot. I'm talking about when, if you make this improvement and the traffic coming out onto Arlington Heights Road under your proposal, it's going to --

MR. MILLAN: Just the right-in/right-out, am I correct?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Correct, correct. But that's going to be uncontrolled, people are just going to come and go. They're going to all be turning right to get out of there going north.

MR. MILLAN: Correct. It would be like any typical right-in/right-out that you see in which the outbound movement is under stop sign control.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All those people that come from the south side are going to go turn on the side streets and come back around.

MR. MILLAN: All the people that are coming from the south?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: They'll leave the church, they're going to turn right, they're going to go north.

MR. MILLAN: Those are, yes, those are probably --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: They want to go south, they want to go Downtown Arlington Heights or south of there.

MR. MILLAN: Those people --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are going to flip around the blocks, so it's not going to be less on Frederick and the street on the east.

MR. MILLAN: It's going to be less by half. If you think about it, you have four movements. Well, you have four movements, you basically have left in, right in, left out, right out. So, we're able to capture the right-in/right-out, two of the four movements which is the right in and the right out.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. That's all.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Terry, I think I just had a, you know, there would be some benefit to having the light to the south for interrupting on a northbound red, that would give cushion to the northbound out of the right-in. So, it wouldn't just be cars jetting out from the northbound right-out because you have a sequence where the northbound light would be red and it would allow egress from that side.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The light to the north of the proposed --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right, I understand, but that's --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I know. I think there are some, the traffic flows somewhat to allow some access is my thought.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Millan. I would like to open the public portion of the meeting. Sorry, it's taken long, but this is an important issue to us. Can I see again a show of hands of people who would like to come forward? Would you, let's start with the gentleman in the back, come forward. Please state your name and spell it for the court reporter.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MR. DILIBERTO: Hi, my name is Tony Diliberto, last name D-i-l-i-b-e-r-t-o. I live at 819 Pine, so my driveway faces the south driveway of that east lot. So, the driveway all the way on the east lot. My neighbors right next door, we have driveways that are together.

When there is church and people park on Pine, that's not, I mean that's really a one-way street now. We actually have to pull our car into driveways or like halfway in driveways to be able to let traffic come back and forth. So, really, I was suggesting when we met with them, Pine should be a one-way street at that point. I mean, because if there's people parked on Pine, we can't get through anyways. Okay, especially when you get farther south on the street and people park on both sides of the street, now you only can let one car through on the street because on this southern part of Pine, they can park on both sides of the street.

Also, when there's school, people park on the street and don't let us get through. Even when they let out of school, they actually stop traffic and we can't get into our driveway at all which is a problem.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, Tom, really the question, services --

MR. DILIBERTO: Tony.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm sorry. So, services are Saturday afternoon and --

MR. DILIBERTO: Well, Saturday, 5:00 o'clock mass on Saturday is not that bad. But Sunday masses in the morning, there are people parking all the time.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you're saying you want that street to be one way seven days a week, 365 days --

MR. DILIBERTO: It wouldn't bother me. I grew up in the city, I couldn't care less if it's one-way or not because that's what I grew up in. But it would be safer for traffic, especially when people are parking on Pine because that street is not a two-way street at that point. It can hold two cars, 2.5 cars really, so that's about it. Also, our street --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: People are parking on both sides of the street?

MR. DILIBERTO: Even on one side, when you park on one side of the

street, because across the street there's no parking in front of the house, someone parks right on my street, it's hard to get two cars passed it.

Then also, our street because of all the traffic, there's probably in front of my house a six-inch divot about 12 feet long across the street, along the street. Our street is just getting pounded by all the traffic. There's way too much traffic, the street is not getting worked on, and it just doesn't look right. So, you know, I mean, and also another thing I had was how much landscaping are you going to put up? Because now we're looking at, our property values are going down because I'm looking at Arlington Heights Road. Are they putting more landscaping up along Pine so I don't have to see a road that I didn't see before?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You saw the drawings, right?

MR. DILIBERTO: What's that? Saw the drawing? Yes, but there's not as much landscaping that's going on Pine as they're putting up on the south side of their property. So, that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Next person please.

MR. SLOWINSKE: Hello, my name is Mike Slowinske, S-l-o-w-i-n-s-k-e. I live at 815 North Pine, so again I'm facing the parking lot, I'm at the southern driveway adjoining the lot.

First of all, I just want to echo what my neighbor said. Traffic is very difficult, especially because the street is narrow where we are. Sunday morning traffic is heavy, it's hard to get in and out.

I also have another new concern. There wasn't much in the plan detailing the demolition, so I'm not sure if this was in another report. But it's an old building, I was worried about asbestos dust and if there has already been asbestos remediation or if that is part of it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. The next person please?

MRS. SLOWINSKE: Hi, my name is Amy Slowinske, S-l-o-w-i-n-s-k-e. I also live at 815 North Pine Avenue. So, my driveway faces the southern entrance/exit to the parking lot.

I just want to reiterate what my neighbor was saying, Tony, about pickup in the afternoon, it's really, really difficult when everybody is parked going southbound on Pine and I'm trying to go north. Two cars cannot, there can't be two-way traffic and cars parked there. When the initial construction happened with the school across the street, we were all told that there will be no parent drop-off/pickup on Pine, that would only be school buses. That really hasn't happened, it's loaded with cars.

I get it, people live on that side of Arlington Heights Road. They want the kids to walk over and take them home, I understand that. But it makes it really difficult for the people who live on the street, when I'm trying to get home in time and they're letting everybody out of the parking lot. There is somebody who physically stops traffic on the street. After the buses go, I get that, they need to be at a place to pick up other students in different schools. But to let parents go, you know, I don't understand.

I pick up my kids from Olive, I go through the parking lot. I have to yield to all the traffic on Olive. I pick up my kids at Thomas. If I'm in the parking lot, I have to yield to all the traffic on Thomas. I don't know why traffic is being stopped and I can't get to my house. This is a through street.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You're saying people stop in the middle of the street

to pick up their child?

MRS. SLOWINSKE: There's a staff member from the school who gets in the middle of the street and stops traffic on Pine if you're going southbound. So, everybody out of the parking lot, and then everybody is parked along the street to go through, but for the people who are already continuing to go through go through.

MR. SLOWINSKE: It takes 10 minutes. I have a video of it if you want to see it.

MRS. SLOWINSKE: It can be very frustrating at times.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MRS. SLOWINSKE: So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there anyone else? Please come forward.

MR. BALIS: Hi, my name is Ron Balis. I actually live on 813 North Pine. I'm also a parishioner. You know, this project, we're totally in favor of it. You know, Father Matt has done a wonderful job, I think, doing this vision. The church, you know, has I think been a pretty good neighbor. But I feel, living on Pine since 2004 that, you know, the Pine neighbors have been equally good if not more understanding everything that, you know, the church has undertaken, the school, different ministries and all that.

I know when we built the west side school, the church bent over backwards for the residents on Evergreen. Literally, Evergreen and Pine are the same, it's a very narrow street, too. So, I understood some of the concerns, and I attended most of those meetings. It was ridiculous, some of the requests that were given and that the church actually had to act on, designing like a, you know, something that no one has ever even heard of just to acquiesce to every single need. I mean you had neighbors coming in and demanding what type and color fences needed to be put in and where they needed to put their trash.

None of the Pine neighbors, again, ever stood in the way. We actually had to go to battle to get them to actually put in the appropriate amount of landscaping or easement between the parking lot and the street. This was after five years, you know, the previous pastor had promised us and he was going to renege on that promise. So, we actually had to come here and get, you know, the parish to do what they promised that they were going to do five years afterwards.

There is a lot of traffic on Pine, and for everything that these neighbors have had to put up with for a lot of years. I've only been a part of that community since 2004. I would just hate for, you know, I understand, I don't want necessarily the project to be deterred.

You know, the continuance is an interesting issue. They've known about, I'm curious why they didn't submit, you know, the plans to the Village sooner so they can have more time to review it. Perhaps there's reasons for it, but I would hate for, again, for you guys to make a decision about all these important issues especially to the residents on Pine without having all the information, you know, to make a fully informed decision. Again, the parking and the traffic is just something that really needs to be considered and addressed in this project, and I encourage all of you guys to really weigh all those decisions and do right by the residents of Pine who again have been good neighbors, and I think Father Bill would agree. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. SAELENS: My name is Frank Saelens, S-a-e-l-e-n-s. I live at 807

North Arlington Heights Road. It's the second oldest house in Arlington Heights.

I am here to ask that you keep it a neighborhood, that you do not allow those two houses to be destroyed next to me. At this point, I am trying to sell my house. The realtors have come to me and said if there is a parking lot or a ditch next to my house, it will cause my house to sell, it would devalue between seven and 11 percent. That's a lot of money for me.

In the past, the church has come to me and asked me to sell my property to them. I have offered my property to them, they have declined to accept. At one time, that property was going to be a parking lot, a continued parking lot along with the house behind me. I'm not sure if they still own that property or not, but it would be a very difficult situation for me if you do allow that to happen.

Also, my understanding is they will put construction trailers next to my property. During the construction, they'll be staging most of it right next to my property, which again the realtors will carry through at least 12 to 18 months before I'll be able to sell my house. It's just too much of a burden on me to allow this happen at this point.

They have also said that because of the ditch or the retaining basin, it might actually come over and flood into my yard, so that there would have to be some kind of understanding of engineering to understand your study to make sure that my house does not flood because of that situation there.

So, I'm asking you guys to not allow those houses to be destroyed. We need low income homes in Arlington Heights. Those are good homes for people to come into starter homes. I've offered the church to buy those homes, I would rehab them and sell them to keep the value of my property up and to keep the neighborhood in tact. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Frank. Next please. Is there anybody else? Okay, we're going to close the public portion of this hearing and I'm going to go back to the Commissioners for final deliberation. Do you want to start?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Sure. Just to follow on Mr. Saelens' point on the stormwater, Sam, Staff reviewed engineering and stormwater pertaining to the release and all that stuff. Are you satisfied with the engineering plans?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, they've provided preliminary detention calculations, and we're confident that it's going to comply with all of the stormwater regulations.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, and you know, I appreciate the comments, you know, from the neighbors. Has there been any discussion about the landscaping along the southern part of the property to give some additional screening to the west from the homes facing what are now currently houses but will be torn down and part of this? Has there been any discussion about maybe just some modest additional screening?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. I believe we did ask for the additional plantings along the entire detention basin. Our focus was mostly to the south, but we do see that, you know, they've provided a substantial screen to the west as well. So, there are plantings there.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Then, additionally, there was some talk about the current circulation, sort of the school day circulation along Pine. Now, I understand given the operations, that's going to go away, correct? Because that school, that's not going to be the same operation at this point.

MR. HUBBARD: My understanding is the existing school buildings to be demolished is not used for school. If the church wants to correct me, they can. My guess is that

it's just in relation to what's going on on the west campus.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: On the west campus.

MR. HUBBARD: It's the same --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay. So, you know, as I consider the light issue, too, you know, as I look at the totality here and a few of the items, I think that the Petitioner, there's a handful of very important, as you look at the cost benefit analysis here of moving that light, I think it is nice to have on that light lining up for a number of reasons. However, I think, currently, they do not have any access to Arlington Heights, so the right-in/right-out would be a bit of an enhancement. I think if we were to ask them to move it, and I don't know whether you'd have a cost burden, but I do believe there are safety issues with the circulation of the parking lot as was demonstrated. I think you have issues with the proximity of the structure and also movement of the handicap spaces, and the pedestrians traversing the parking lot. In my opinion, I have enough information, you know, I feel like if IDOT is good with the right-in/right-out, I have enough information here that I'm comfortable with them keeping the plan the way it is and not aligning the light. That's the one issue.

I guess the other issue I have is, if you can clarify for me, and I know Commissioner Dawson brought this up and I apologize if I didn't catch all of it as I was making notes, but on number 11, the condition that we talked about, the costs, are you saying that, so when we have developments like, you say it's North Point or, you know, Lowe's or somewhere like this where we have lights feeding in, that those are taken on by those parties, those are not managed by the Village?

MR. HUBBARD: Generally speaking, yes, there are some instances where private benefit signals haven't been assigned to the parties. But where we have been able to get that, yes, on North Point, South Point.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: But it's not universal, this is not the sole outlier that we're talking about?

MR. HUBBARD: Right, this wouldn't be. Right, there are some others.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, in my opinion, you know, that's kind of water under the bridge at this point. I think that's an issue that's already been addressed by IDOT. I personally would not put that burden on St. James Parish at this time and essentially give them another bunny ear.

I guess the third issue I have is, you know, number nine. I don't know that it's practical to require them to potentially seek alternative off-site locations. I think, you know, the parking we have here as I look at it, we are adding additional spaces. I do think it should be looked at on Pine in terms of, if there's a temporary, you know, one-way, I mean I'm looking at peak load here of several hours a week. To make drastic changes that we think based on the peak load of several hours a week, you know, I see this more that we're going to use force around certain parts, you know, on Saturday morning, very congested along different churches that are in residential neighborhoods, very congested during those peak load times.

You know, I appreciate that, but I don't know that I want to see more asphalt than we're already adding to this site and potentially taking away some of this green space to the south. You know, I feel like there is a, I guess you could say a cost benefit again here on the street parking. If there's a way to mitigate that on Pine, I think we should take those actions. But I wouldn't necessarily put that requirement in.

So, in my opinion, you know, I think conditions one, 11, and also nine

would be conditions that I wouldn't require to approve this.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, just to clarify a point. Petitioner's architect indicated that they have preliminary approval from IDOT. They do not have approval from IDOT for the final draft of this plan, right, other than the right-in/right-out?

MR. HUBBARD: Correct. The concept of --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, IDOT has not approved this location of the drive aisle the way it is.

MR. HUBBARD: Right. Correct.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'm sorry, my understanding is IDOT is on board with the right-in/right-out, is that right?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Not the location though.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No. I think the location is, as it is in this plan --

MR. HUBBARD: On a conceptual basis, the right-in/right-out as shown in the plan has been presented to IDOT and they are amenable to that. The Village has not been a part of those conversations, so we don't know to what extent, you know, this alignment option was presented to IDOT.

CCC. Mr. Hichens, could you come up and qualify what your statement was regarding IDOT's tentative approval?

MR. HICHENS: Yes, sir. So, the plan that you see or an earlier version, but it had the right-in/right-out at the same location, was delivered and presented to IDOT. The folks there did a preliminary review of that plan and they authored a letter that was sent out having no exceptions to the right-in and right-out as in its current location. Now, that's just part of their preliminary review process.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, but that isn't the final though, right?

MR. HUBBARD: Correct. They still need actual, apply for a permit to IDOT to do that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, I don't know if that changed, Jay, anything?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: It does not.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any other Commissioners have comments?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think we need to get a little clarification from the church because, since it's the archdiocese that owns the property, and we don't know whether they're willing to accept the ownership and the cost related to the light, there is almost a suggestion that this project might not go forward if that cost were shifted to the church. I'd really like to have somebody explain or restate that so I understand either the process you have to go through to get a determination of that or where it leads the project. Does it actually cause the project to be delayed or not done at all?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If you would please give us your name and spell it? And I would like to swear you in.

MS. COATH: Sure.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. The name and please spell it.

MS. COATH: Celine, C-e-l-i-n-e, last name is Coath, C-o-a-t-h. I'm the construction manager with the facilities and construction department of the archdiocese of Chicago.

In regards to the light, again we had some preliminary conversation with the legal department, so I'm not a lawyer, I'm an architect. In the 352 parishes that we own, we have never owned a traffic light. This would be a problem.

As far as potentially sharing cost and maintenance, we haven't had those conversations and could certainly have those conversations. But I believe that the light would be a liability to the archdiocese.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I don't think the Village is asking you to own it but rather to pay for the operation and maintenance of it.

MS. COATH: That would need to be, a letter would need to be drafted, we'd have to work out the agreement. We haven't had time to even discuss that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'm asking Sam now, is there any situation where the Village pays for a traffic light that is really for private benefit only? So, is this the only situation that exists in Arlington Heights where that's the case?

MR. HUBBARD: No, I believe there are other cases where the Village does pay for what we consider private benefit signals. I think negotiations happened on those and ultimately the Village wanted it but it wasn't established.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That certainly complicates things a bit.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Could I just follow up with that real quick? When we talk about private, you know, I mean this is, there is a benefit to the public in this, right? Because you're controlling traffic, you know, for instance, if there were no signal, you'd have cars coming out northbound, southbound or whatever. I mean does the Village really consider this exclusive private? I mean there is a true public benefit to having this there whether you're going to church or not. I mean how do we, I guess how do we analyze this as private as opposed to public? What's the tipping point on that?

MR. HUBBARD: I think the Village views this as a signal that would not be necessary if it wasn't for the church there.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Correct. Okay, so, and I guess going back to Lynn's point, it seems to me that there are, if this isn't a sole outlier and we have a mix of those and this has been in existence, I just think it's hard to now in retrospect go back, and the church has been there for a very long time before the signal was there. You know, it's not a new development coming in to where it would generate a new need. So, I guess that's how I'm looking at it. I understand your point there, I guess I'm just thinking in terms of sequencing, you know, a new traffic demand for new construction.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have a question along the lines of the light. There was a mention that new lights, if we were to align, if we were to go with the Village's recommendation of moving the in and out on Arlington Heights Road, that that light would have to be replaced? Did I hear that correctly, and that it would cost \$250,000? What is the current condition of these lights? Are they older? There was also mention of electrical wires or something that made me wonder, oh, are these old lights that have to be replaced anyway?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe they were installed in 2007 when the project was originally approved. I don't know that they meet current IDOT standards but, you know, they're functional. Their lifespan I couldn't comment on.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I mean I guess I don't know how frequently lights need to be replaced in the Village of Arlington Heights. I guess where I'm going along those lines is when I was asking my first line of questioning, I was thinking what could possibly

the electrical cost be and why are we arguing over this. But mention was made of \$250,000 to replace those lights. I'm a taxpayer in this Village and I don't use those lights to my benefit at all, and I said to myself, wait a second, I'm going to pay \$250,000 if those lights have to be replaced? I have to believe that there would be other taxpayers in this Village that would have that, it's a significant cost all of a sudden. I understand that you are not for profit, but boy, it never occurred to me as a citizen of this Village that I was going to have to pay \$250,000 for lights that, I disagree, I don't think they have any benefit.

So, I don't know that I can make a decision on the light point. I feel like I can make more of a decision of a continuance on the in and out. But I don't think I can make a recommendation to the Board either way if I don't know what we're talking about here. I don't know what dollars we're talking about, I don't know what the arrangement is.

So, I'm not saying I would make the parish pay for the whole thing. I'm not saying that I would make the Village pay for the whole thing. What I'm saying is I don't have enough information right now to make any type of recommendation to the Board as to whether or not the Village maintain that cost or we should be talking to the parish about picking up the cost because we don't have any of that information. So, that was a big number to me, that was kind of a shocker.

So, I'd want to know what the current condition of the lights is and what is the charge, what is the cost, and what kind of relationship would we be talking about with some sort of shared scenario for those costs before I could make any decision on number 11. I think if the lights have a 30-year lifespan, I'm going to be less concerned, and we're only talking about electrical. But if you're telling me that the lights are going to be replaced in the next five years, we're on a budget crunch right now, that's a concern to the Village I think.

That's it for me on the lights. I have other questions. Anyone else wants to jump on the lights or can I ask other questions?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Just a quick comment on the lights. The \$200,000 cost, I think that includes relocating them with new cable and just to replace it where it's at, I don't think it's going to be --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But that's what I don't know, right. So, it's hard for me.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I just don't know where you're drawing the line. I mean there's so many lights in the Village. You could allocate, you know, what's really a benefit to the public, what's the benefit to the private? You know, I feel like then you're going to be opening the door to almost, you know, many of the light systems out there in terms of who allocates the cost, who uses and who doesn't. I would say that I use that light even though I'm never going to St. James because, you know, I'm able to, you know, essentially drive safer through that intersection. I think the same could be said through just about any other light system, and I think it's hard to, I think once we open that door to that, we've got to go back to just about everybody in the Village to evaluate the lights.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, since the decision had been made in 1990, the Village's decision to go ahead and pick up the cost of the maintenance, you know, I could understand that. But you made it in 2007 which I have no understanding exactly why, there's a bit of time here in the decision, well, maybe we ought to shift that cost back. Why wasn't that a consideration in 2007? This is more rhetorical, I don't think you can answer that, Sam, but this seems like it's quite current. I don't know if that's going to be a new policy that's

going to be going forward that you're going to use to assess the lights that are primarily for the benefit of one group.

MR. HUBBARD: I can partially answer that. From what I've been told, the Village was not included as part of the conversations with IDOT in 2007 when the original permit was applied for for this. So, when IDOT received that permit, reviewed it and gave their ruling which required the Village to maintain it, I don't know if we were really involved in that process. So, that may be why it was never fully addressed in 2007.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, we never had the opportunity potentially to have this negotiation, okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That makes sense. Now, from the archdiocese's point of view, you said no other parish has this problem. You've got 352 or whatever, why is it a problem? I mean this is Arlington Heights. If Arlington Heights, you know, I'm not sure why that's, you know, why does that pose a problem for the archdiocese? A business decision has to be made by the Village and a decision has to be made by the parish as to whether to go ahead with this project. So, why do you see that as a problem?

MS. COATH: I'm really not in a position to answer that. Like I said, I'm an architect. I work for the facilities and construction, I'm not a lawyer. What I understand is that, what I mentioned earlier is the light fixture, we would not want to own it, you know. It's not on our property, we wouldn't want to have the liability of a light fixture.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, if the Village took the light down, you wouldn't care actually?

MS. COATH: I did not say that. I don't think I said that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'm trying to understand whether you're interested in this.

MS. COATH: Like I said, that's not my decision to make. That is something that the parish would have to enter into conversations with the legal department. But their initial response was that we do not want to own it. We could potentially have conversations on maintenance, but that has not happened at this point.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, thank you. Well, I was originally leaning against a continuance, but there has been so much discussion here even in just the last half hour. I don't see how we could actually go ahead and make some of the decisions about these things tonight. There's too many loose ends that need to be answered in conversations between the parish and archdiocese and the Village and others. So, I'm more in favor of a continuance than I was when we started here.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: To that end, and not to constantly sound like I'm going back and forth, but I wonder if this is really an appropriate decision for this Commission to make in the first place, and whether or not, I don't know that I need to continue it. I just feel that I can't make that recommendation, and that this is something, whether or not this is a cost for the Village is a Village Board determination. It doesn't fall within our purview here. So, I would rather remove this condition and let Staff introduce that condition at the Village Board hearing because I just can't make a decision on that. So, I just want to clarify kind of my pennies on that issue.

But if we can move off the lights, I do have --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, I want to stay on the lights for just a minute. My feeling on this is the logic behind a single user and who is going to maintain that

light, I don't agree with you, Sue, this is a decision we could make. If the Board does not agree with it, they could pull it out and they can change it. So, just based on what's here and the logic behind it, I can leave number 11 in there. If the Board doesn't agree with that, they can take it out because that's what they do. So, that's my feeling on lights.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, can I ask about the Pine? I have to say I'm probably more concerned about what I'm hearing from the residents of Pine than the light issue. I used to live in this area but not this close, I lived on Haddow, the 900 block of Haddow which is blocks away, and we had parking all the way up to Haddow. So, I'm familiar though I did not feel the pain that you feel with the parking overflow in the area. But I also, going through the whole Windsor, not to bring that up, parking situation, we have that problem at Windsor School with the drop-off on Windsor Avenue and how that's created a burden on the residents. Not as tight, it doesn't appear to be as tight a street, but we did try to do a temporary one-way and it's a disaster because no one reads the sign. It's more of a hazard and it's been corrected now with the addition, but it was more of a hazard when we put that in place than without it.

To that though, to ask you, Sam, is this street narrower than most streets in Arlington Heights?

MR. HUBBARD: I think it's a typical street width for this, you know, area. It's about 24 feet in width approximately, so when there's a car parked on one side which is approximately about seven feet in width, you're left with about 17 feet for a two-way traffic which is suitable but it's tight. So, if cars aren't parked real close to the curb and drivers aren't comfortable driving close to the car that's parked on the side of the street, then there could be challenges driving by it. But it is viable, but the Village would not permit parking on the street if it rendered it impassable.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Is there parking allowed only on one side of the street? Because I heard discussion --

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But it didn't say that it continues.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, but they're saying people coming to mass are parking on both sides of the street, one side illegally?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: If you're south on Marshall, you can park on both sides of the street. If you're north on Marshall, you can park on one side.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But it seems like it needs, the one side of the street parking needs to continue down because, you know, I live in the old area of town, we have narrow streets where I'm at. I'm thinking, you know, we're in Frontier Days land, so when there's parking on both sides of the street, you couldn't exist with a two-way street, you just couldn't. But during Frontier Days we change that direction, we change it to only one-way to accommodate parking. But on regular days, there's parking on only one side of the street, and yet when I pass it's tight, especially if you're driving big SUVs and such but it's doable.

It sounds to me like the real problem is the one-way doesn't continue far enough down and it needs to continue down farther. Then there needs to be some policing both by the church in reminding their parishioners but also the Police Department in making sure that there is no two-sided parking. That's not a condition, that's more of a condition that I would be concerned about seeing here and feel that that's much more of our purview than the light issue. So, has Staff talked about that at all, continuing down the one side of the street parking?

MR. HUBBARD: I'm not sure that I follow your thinking that it should be continued down.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, they said that south of Marshall you can park on both sides.

MR. HUBBARD: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: What they're saying, and I hear them because you said there's 40 spots right here, so it seems like the Village is assuming that parishioners are going to park south of Marshall. What they're saying is, and I agree with them, if the size of their street is the same size as my street which it sounds like it is, you can't have parking on both sides and get through. So, I think the Village should consider making it, and it's very common all over Arlington Heights, that you can only park on one side of the street.

To continue that below Marshall I think would alleviate a lot of the problem, not all of it but a lot of that problem. I would ask the Village, I would make that as part of, conditional kind of on my vote, I would like to see that happen.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I see what you're saying, the point that you're making. Yes, the Village has talked that, you know, we'll have to evaluate if additional parking restrictions are needed as a result of this project. For example, parking is allowed on both sides of Frederick Street up here. Now, Frederick Street is about 27 feet wide, so if you have cars parked on both sides of Frederick Street and then you have people, you know, coming in from Arlington Heights Road, it's going to be problematic. So, yes, we have discussed that during this process, there likely will need to be additional restrictions on parking.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Commissioner Dawson, I agree with you wholeheartedly. I wasn't as specific as Commissioner Dawson was, but kind of when I was talking about item nine, that's kind of what I had in mind. I wasn't thinking that something like that is a viable, I don't know how viable requiring off-site parking would be quite frankly, so I wouldn't make that a condition. But I think what Commissioner Dawson is saying is exactly what the Staff and the parish should consider when we think about item nine. I think that's the most, you know, practical type of approach.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I promise I'll stop talking, I only have one other comment which was on the school pickup. Mention was made that in the meeting, the original meeting, that it was promised, and I was at that Board meeting, when you said that, it occurred to me it was promised at that meeting that there would not be school pickup on that street, I believe. Does anyone else recall that? There would not be school pickup on that street?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I seem to recall that as well, that there was not going to be any student parking on the --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, that was a concern that we had at that time.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I actually remember that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, that's incredibly disturbing to me to hear that that's going on. If that was, I remember having a significant conversation about that now that that's been brought up. So, I think that the parish needs to address that. We need to go back perhaps in the minutes, perhaps I'm recalling incorrectly, luckily we have someone recording every word that is being said. But if that was a significant part of the Plan Commission meeting and part of our recommendation to go forward, then I have to say this needs to be

changed and addressed. Certainly no one in that school should be standing and blocking traffic to that road. That's not within your right to do so, as a private citizen, to stand in the road and block traffic.

MR. HUBBARD: If I could jump in here, I'm looking at the ordinance from 2007. There was a condition of approval that says all parent pickup and drop-off operations shall occur on site and on the west side of campus.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Great.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We'll have no clapping here.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. So, that needs to come to an end. But to that point, residents, you didn't call the Village, did you? Don't answer because you can't answer but, you know, residents need to be --

MR. HUBBARD: It sounds like an enforcement issue.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It sounds like an enforcement issue, but if the residents aren't communicating to the Village that these things are going on, the Village can't do anything about it. So, you know, just be reminded that it's also your obligation to call and tell people what's going on. That's it, I'll stop talking.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I've got a question for Mr. Millan please. Could you put the site plan back up, Sam? Okay, so looking at this exhibit, so right now, everybody that parks in the parking lot has no access to Arlington Heights Road directly, correct?

MR. MILLAN: Under existing conditions, correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Now, under this plan, the new plan, you will have an exit onto Arlington Heights Road but you will also have more parking. So, my question is on this new plan and with this new exit, are you going to have more, less, or equal traffic on Pine Street?

MR. MILLAN: Excuse me. Taking into account that, yes, I mean there's going to be additional parking, 49 or 50 additional parking spaces, you would immediately think there's going to be more because now I have more parking spaces. But by the same token, you're providing an additional access that they don't have today. So, in the end, it becomes "a wash." Is it going to be five or 10 more? It could be. Is it going to be five or 10 less? Yes. So, that's what I'm saying that it's going to be more of a wash.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, as a traffic engineer, your professional opinion is this is going to be a wash.

MR. MILLAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I heard that a lot of the residents are saying on Pine Street that you have a traffic problem, I'm not arguing with that. But with this project, we're here to discuss this project and it doesn't seem like this project is going to make a difference to the traffic on Pine Street, although we do recognize there are problems there. That's all I have.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: It could have alleviated a traffic problem though. If the light worked out, then you would have people making southbound exit off of the property onto Arlington Heights Road, so it could have alleviated some of the traffic situation on there.

MR. MILLAN: Some, some, because of what I said. But I think it's going to attract then some of the people to actually use Pine Street, Frederick and Pine just to use the

signal. So, it's a balanced act. You're right, it would alleviate some, but it would increase traffic in some areas.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: One other question I had regarding the gentleman's concern about living next to the detention pond. I ask this question probably for one of our lawyers, we've got three on the board, distinguished ones I might add. Is there any way to determine or is there any liability to the church if this detention pond does cause flooding in the gentleman's basement? Is there any way that could be answered?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: How would that be proved, that the detention pond would be causing flooding? How could we prove --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's what his concern was.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: That it didn't handle the water from the property itself, but that's difficult to determine because the water could be coming from off of --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. I don't know how.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right now, didn't we hear earlier that the water is sheeting off of the parking area there now onto --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right, but now this could cause a potential concentration of water right next to the property as opposed --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Because there's additional, we're losing green space is what you're saying, correct, is what you're referencing?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, we're not really losing green space.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: It's just concentrating that water risk on one or two property owners as opposed to everybody on the block because it's going out onto the street.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Joe, I would say, I mean regardless of a legal opinion on that, I don't know that it's, I mean the only thing we have to look at, at this point, is are they looking for a variance from the ordinance and, you know, that was my question to Sam was that the engineering is there and that they're following the standards for stormwater retention and release. You know, I don't know personally that we can look much past that issue in terms of potential future liability. I just, I don't think that's within our scope.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: The other concern, about the asbestos removal. I don't know if asbestos has been removed or not from that school but I'm pretty positive that if there is asbestos, it has to be removed. It would depend on the required, you know, EPA and OSHA requirements, so you shouldn't have to worry about that. That's all I have.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, the other point --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The only thing I was going to add -- go ahead, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: On Mr. Saelens, is that if there is any way to mitigate some of the nakedness of that property, the experiences we have had here, there's a good example with Lutheran Life communities where they created a parking lot and they were able to satisfy the adjoining residences with berming and with some heavier screening. I don't know if you've had any fallout from that at all as far as any complaints after that parking lot was put in. So, I'm sympathetic both with the detention and with the, you know, the openness of that site for the neighbor that would probably suffer some damage, financial damage because of the demolition of the two homes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The only comment I was going to make regarding the existing school, the demolition, I heard that if this was continued, I'm not suggesting that it be continued, but I heard it will have a detrimental effect to your overall schedule by pushing this to a January meeting. Given the age of that school, I'm assuming there's a lot of asbestos in that building. Has that been tested? Has there been an asbestos report?

MS. COATH: Again, you know, because I'm in the facilities and construction, we take that very, you know, seriously. We do, we will have the school tested and abated properly per the regulations.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: You haven't done that yet?

MS. COATH: We have a report. We have some asbestos. It will be abated but we don't have a, you know, a contract yet to do that. But we're in the process of determining that, the extent of it.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I can just tell you as a general contractor, that takes some time to do that as far as getting permits from the Cook County for the abatement --

MS. COATH: Yes, and --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: -- and then getting your clearance test afterwards and so on. So, the idea that you may be wanting to demo this building in January or February I think I heard, I don't think it's realistic.

MS. COATH: I think if we had our bids out, I mean we deal with an asbestos contractor on a regular basis, I can turn around a project within four weeks, get three contractors, three bids, and get all, you know, we have to do the 10-day notification, and we do all that per the regulations. It has not been a problem. I do most of the parishes in the archdiocese, so we do have a pretty efficient process in how to do that, and I don't think that would affect the schedule.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, I just wanted to bring it up. So, you are certainly aware of it then.

MS. COATH: Yes. You know, I was a school architect, so I've removed lots of asbestos. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. So, we have three issues, whether we're going to continue it.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'd like to just pop in here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Sort of my initial opening comment was that whether or not within, if we approve this particular set of conditions, that we can pass that on to the Trustees and not have to go through a redundancy here of trying to manage things that maybe we don't know enough about and really belong to the Village Board rather than to the Plan Commission. I think maybe there will be enough time between now and January to resolve many of these questions so that we don't have to go through sort of a circular process here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: It sounds like we don't have any problem with the variances, but we have our issues with the considerations, with the conditions that Staff has put on this. Commissioner Dawson, I agree with you. I don't know that those are necessarily points that we need to address as opposed to putting those on the Board as Commissioner Drost says.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Hopefully, the Trustees will read the minutes

carefully to lessen the concerns about parking and the one-way and the asbestos remediation, any of the screening that might go on the bordering properties. So, those are multiple number of issues and I think they have been identified and they can be addressed at the Village Board of Trustees meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just to clarify because, and I don't think it was intended, Sam, but there was a comment that you made about us kicking it to the Village Board, and I don't think, and I want to make sure that it's clear on the record, I don't feel anyone here is kicking this decision to the Village Board. I think that what we're saying is that we can understand the pros and cons but we rely very heavily on Staff in making these decisions anyway. So, most of my emphasis, at least for myself, would be listening to you and then listening to other people on the board that have this specific experience. I don't know that I would be able to be in a position to analyze that any better than Staff would, and the Village Board, I would feel comfortable with whatever your recommendation is being presented to the Village Board.

I think we've said many times in here we're very much in favor of moving these processes along and not cause a delay. This is a six-week delay for them, and that's significant in the construction schedule. So, if I felt that it wasn't going to, I would certainly want to revisit this myself at this level, but I want to make sure that this project proceeds forward for them. If I don't feel that I can specifically give important input on that point, I don't feel there is any need to delay them further.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, and the project itself, there is no objection to improving that site.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It's a great project.

COMMISSIONER DROST: The net benefit to the community is that it's going to be a better site, it's going to be a safer site, and it will assist and be of benefit to many Arlington Heights residents that are parishioners at St. James.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Not only St. James because they added parking.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Sam, I don't really have any problems with the conditions. Just on condition number one, since this was written, they've given you something. Does that satisfy what you're looking for in number one or are you looking for more from them?

MR. HUBBARD: No, number one involves also a meeting with IDOT. They have provided a written narrative of the various design options. Whether or not that narrative answers all the questions we have, I don't know because we haven't had a full chance to review it. They have provided a geometric layout of those options, and based on that geometric layout, they said that, you know, they don't think it's viable. We haven't had a chance to review those geometric layouts. Maybe there are alternatives that wouldn't have the same impacts to the site that they feel are detrimental that we could suggest, but we haven't had the full chance to review that. Traffic operations, they have not provided those to us.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: But if we approve this tonight and left this condition in there, they could always work with you between now and the Village Board meeting to work this out, right? And if you're not satisfied with it, you could always report it back to the Board.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, based on what --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: The thing about the traffic light cost, I'm still on the fence about that one. But other than that, I really have no problems with the way it's written.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: By then you should have, by the Village Board meeting, you should be able to provide the cost to maintain this light so at least people know that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do you feel like there's any concern from Staff that if we don't continue this at this point, that there won't be an opportunity for you to communicate with IDOT and get the concerns of the Village prior to the Board meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, I don't think we would schedule that meeting at the Village Board until that's --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I wanted to make sure I asked that question because I don't want our --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, they can continue it there, too.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, I understand. But I don't want it to, I wanted to make sure that I fully felt vetted that a continuance is not, or that we really don't need to continue.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right, that's correct. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I can make a motion. I'm going to make a motion, my motion is going to exclude number 11 just so you know. Everyone can vote the way that they want to vote.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 17-012, Amendment to Special Use Ordinances #63-078, #97-058, and #07-012 to allow an addition to the church building and modifications to the east campus parking lot; Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the land use classification from Single Family Detached to Institutional for the properties located at 811 N. Arlington Heights Road and 810 N. Pine Avenue; Planned Unit Development encompassing both the east and west campuses to allow multiple buildings on one zoning lot; Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to consolidate all of the east campus into one lot, and the following variations:

1. A variation from Chapter 29, Section 29-307(F), to allow a double frontage lot with vehicular access from an abutting arterial street.
2. 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 974 to 337.
3. A variation from Chapter 28, Section, 11.2-8, to allow a reduction in the required width of a parking row from 24 feet to 22 feet.
4. A variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2(B) to waive the requirement for one landscape island with a shade tree at the end of a row of 20 parking stalls.

This approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

Prior to Village Board Consideration

1. The Petitioner shall provide a written narrative of the various design options that were considered relative to aligning the ingress/egress to and from the site with the existing traffic signal on Arlington Heights Road, and the reasons for not pursuing those options. This narrative must include details on the geometric, traffic operation, and traffic signal considerations relative to this alignment. Upon receipt of this information, the Village, the Petitioner, and IDOT shall meet to discuss the proposed access on Arlington Heights Road.
2. The Petitioner shall revise the site plan to relocate the middle parking lot landscape island in the northeast parking row to the northeast terminus of that parking row in the northeast most corner of the site.
3. The Petitioner shall revise the site plan to change the two 22-foot wide drive aisles to 24-foot wide drive aisles as indicated in Exhibit 11.
4. The Petitioner shall substitute the three crabapple trees in the southwest portion of the detention area with evergreen trees for review and approval by the Village.
5. The Petitioner shall provide a new fire truck turning radius exhibit for review and approval by the Village.

General Conditions

6. Final Plat of Subdivision approval shall be required.
7. The allowance for Sunday parking along both the east and west sides of Arlington Heights Road adjacent to St. James Parish shall be eliminated.
8. The Parish will continually encourage parishioners to utilize both the east and west parking lots prior to parking along the street for typical Sunday and Saturday services.
9. The Village and St. James Parish shall continue to monitor parking to determine if parking overflow onto neighboring residential streets is problematic. If parking overflow is determined to be problematic, the Parish shall develop and implement a plan, for Village review and approval, that would provide additional parking either on the subject property or at alternative off-site location(s).
10. If parishioner parking during the course of construction overflows and becomes a problem in the surrounding residential neighborhood, St. James Parish shall provide, to the satisfaction of the Village, a plan for satellite parking at other agreeable locations.
11. IDOT review and approval of the proposed curb cut onto Arlington Heights Road and the Final Plat of Subdivision shall be required.
12. Compliance with the Design Commission motion from October 24, 2017 shall be required.
13. The Parish shall install timers on all site lighting within the east campus so that they automatically turn off no later than 12:00 a.m., with the exception of Christmas Eve and Christmas services.

14. The Petitioner shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, would you take a roll call vote?

MR. HUBBARD: Is there a second?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. On 11, do we modify 11 to --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I removed 11.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I know. But as it can stand there, instead of removing it, to put a condition in there to let the, again, the Village Board of Trustees, let there be a negotiation between the Petitioner and the Village to come to some resolution with number 11 based on data or facts that are submitted at the hearing in January.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My only concern is that we don't make a recommendation one way or another. We can do so in comments.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and we're leaving it open.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, that's what I'm saying. We can do so in comments, but you know --

COMMISSIONER DROST: But taking it out, you know, there's been some work done on that, but basically just keeping it as an open item and let the facts kind of control --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I think with Commissioner Dawson's motion, it being out, doesn't that leave open, I mean it's still in there, it's still on the record.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The Village could always put it back in.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The motion could be denied because you took it out.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It certainly could be, absolutely. Let's see. I'm just trying to decide how we would modify this so that it addresses my concern. I think you would have to say that, I think it would have to be moved up. That's what, we need to move 11 up to Village Board consideration.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Number six.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Have it become number six in Prior to Village Board Consideration, and instead of the recommendation that it all be borne by St. James, that we are recommending further discussions between Staff and the church regarding the issue of the expenses being borne with respect to the lighting. Does that sound appropriate?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do you understand what I'm saying, Sam?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I think that's fine.

MR. HUBBARD: So, are you amending your motion?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: **So, I would amend my motion**, I'm in agreement with Commissioner Drost, and I would amend it because that modifies my concern, that I'm not making that recommendation at this time. **So, we would make that number six under Prior to Village Board Consideration and have it simply be that there be further discussions regarding who shall bear the cost and whether or not there should be a cost**

share arrangement prior to Village Board consideration. Okay?

COMMISSIONER DROST: That's a very good, I think that works better.

MR. HUBBARD: Is there a second on the amended motion?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll make the second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have a second on the amended motion.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, roll call vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes. Oh, with comment, sorry.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Let's start with Mr. Sigalos this time.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Cherwin.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: It's all right. I appreciate the motion, I want to see the project move forward. My only comment would be I would have removed item one and I would have removed item 11 because I feel like the project is, you know, I think the Petitioner explained the benefit. You know, there could be an ideal state for the Village's perspective as to that alignment of the traffic light, but I think we've seen, in my opinion, there are enough cons to that where I would not make it a requirement of them. As to 11, I would say that if the Village is going to put that burden on this particular church, that it should be prepared to review most or all of the lights existing to determine who is bearing the cost burden of those lights so that it's not singling out St. James Parish for its particular use.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would agree with that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Thank you, Bruce.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My comment was just to reemphasize my hope that the Village will consider creating one-way parking patterns throughout that community to alleviate the parking burdens on the residents. But other than that, I think, I really think it's a great project and I'm happy to see, I know it doesn't come across always because we're looking at the minutia, but it really is a great project and I am really glad that the church is coming

forward with increasing parking on site. I think it's going to be a beautiful building.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I just have a final comment. I, too, am supportive and I feel the same way Commissioner Dawson does, that I really want to emphasize that the parking situation on Pine should be studied very deliberately so that these residents do not continue to endure what they have been for so many years.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. You have a unanimous approval from the Plan Commission based on the aforementioned conditions. Sam, the next Board meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: It's not clear if there's going to be yet a Board meeting on the first of January which should be the next targeted meeting. So, tentatively, I would say this would be on the second meeting in January which would be January 15th I believe. But that all depends on the Petitioner providing the additional items as required.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Good luck.

MR. HICHENS: Thank you.

MS. COATH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have nothing else on our agenda. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do we have a meeting on the 27th?

MR. HUBBARD: We do not.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We don't, that's canceled, okay.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

(Whereupon the above-mentioned petition was concluded at 9:57 p.m.)