

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 1108 SOUTH SALEM LANE - ZBA #24-001

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 12th day of February, 2024 at the hour of
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

PETER SIAVELIS, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE
JOSEPH SELBKA

ALSO PRESENT:

DEREK MACH, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All right, we'll call this meeting to order. Welcome, everybody, to tonight's meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals for the Village of Arlington Heights. Tonight is February 12th, 2024, 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Welcome, as I said. Let's do roll call, Derek, please.

MR. MACH: Chairman Siavelis.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Here.

MR. MACH: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Here.

MR. MACH: Mr. Jaffe.

(No response.)

MR. MACH: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Here.

MR. MACH: Mr. O'Connor.

(No response.)

MR. MACH: Mr. Selbka.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Here.

MR. MACH: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Great, thank you.

Pledge of allegiance, flag is right back there.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, let's now move to the approval of the minutes from the January meeting. Has everybody had a chance to review those minutes? If yes, are there any corrections, revisions or adders to those minutes?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hearing none, is there a motion to approve the minutes in their current form?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: So moved.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: We need a voice?

MR. MACH: Voice.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hearing none, motion granted.

Okay, so folks, we're going to talk a little bit about the hearing procedures, which have changed. Looking at all the audience, I don't see any real familiar faces from architects who have been here in front of this Board a number of times, but if there was, I would advise that our procedures have changed, at least temporarily. Those changes were handed down from above; they are not our changes. It makes the meeting potentially a little bit difficult, but we'll work through it together.

So, again, there are certain procedures and rules that apply to this meeting and let's start with those. I'll call those out and explain those.

So, first off, if there are less than six members present, which there

APPROVED

are today, the petitioner has an option to continue to a later meeting, next month's meeting for example, because it takes four affirmative votes to approve a variance sought regardless of the number of Board members in attendance. So, you need to go four in one in favor of your variance, okay, for it to pass. If you are denied, a petitioner cannot reapply for that same variance for an entire year, so there is a preclusive effect. So, think carefully, choose wisely.

There will also be a Staff presentation which essentially entails a project overview and description of the variance that will be provided by Derek.

There are four elements necessary to establish in order for the Board to be able to grant a variance:

1. That the proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with the existing uses and zoning of nearby property;
2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned;
3. That the proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of Chapter 28 of the Village's Code; and
4. That the variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

A variation shall be permitted only if the evidence in the judgment of this Board of Appeals sustains each of the four conditions enumerated. Again, these are elements that you as petitioner must establish. It is not the responsibility of this Board to pull those elements out of you. You should be prepared to talk and speak and address each of those four. We have denied variances in the past when those four elements are not established, okay, and those are the elements that were in the packets that the petitioners submitted.

So, with that in mind, there are a couple of other aspects. Derek, I notice that a couple of folks ambled in after we got started, right? So, your question regarding establish as an objector, do you want to reiterate that now?

MR. MACH: Sure. Again, is there anyone that wanted to testify and object to any of the petitions this evening? If so, we would ask you to sign in.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, so what Derek says, this is the new aspect of the procedures that are being imposed essentially on us. An objector is somebody who actually has an objection to a variance or variances being sought, okay, so the procedure has gotten a little bit more rigorous for an objector, okay. The procedure continues on as it was for a resident who just wants to make public comment at the hearing but not object. So, that's how these procedures are dividing comments from a non-petitioner, okay.

We apologize if that's a bit confusing, and we're still working our way through that. Those are the regulations that have been provided to us, at least at present.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to open the public hearing for 1108 South Salem Lane, ZBA Case #24-001.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: And we've got Staff presentation.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is there a second?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Oh, I'm sorry, that's right. Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Second.

MR. MACH: Voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All in favor?

APPROVED

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hearing none, motion granted.

Staff?

MR. MACH: Thank you. The Petitioner is proposing to construct an addition to the existing split-level home in order to create a third car garage bay. The proposed expansion is encroaching 4.2 feet into the required side yard.

Therefore, they're requesting a 4.2-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3b to allow an addition with a side yard setback of 3.9 feet instead of the required 8.1 feet and an additional one-foot for the eave. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Great, thank you very much.

All right, so who is speaking on behalf? Come on up, sir. Okay, have you signed in?

MR. VENAMORE: I have.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: You've printed your name, signed in?

MR. VENAMORE: And address.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Provided --

MR. VENAMORE: I did.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, I think you have to spell your name now on the record as well.

MR. VENAMORE: Yes, I can do that. My name is Andrew Venamore, V-e-n-a-m-o-r-e, 602 Academy Drive, Northbrook, Illinois.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, you have the floor. Please proceed.

MR. VENAMORE: Thank you kindly, Chair. So, the case before you this evening is, as Derek mentioned, is an attached one-car garage bay to allow the owners to enclose all their vehicles and ensuring the streetscape remains as pleasant and open. With a third vehicle in the household, the project seeks to provide undercover parking for that vehicle through a design that attempts to reflect the architecture of the home with masonry finish and a reverse gable roof to match how the existing garage lays out.

As 13-year residents of the home, and in fact John, the husband in this group, grew up in the Village. His mom was also a part of the Public Works Department many moons ago as well. They certainly want the addition to match the exterior of the home.

Initially, consideration was given to a one-car detached garage on the home. The problem arose when we, from a design phase as we were running a driveway from the front section of the house up down, or rather down the south side of the lot and into the backyard where a single car could exist. We ended up being awfully close to the amount of impervious surfaces permitted, 50 percent on a lot of this size. It dramatically reduced the layout in the backyard, it really compressed it.

These lots are more wide than they are deep, and so there's not a heck of a lot of room behind the existing house as it stands at the moment. Then subsequently to that location, there's a pretty decent mature tree that's in the backyard, and that would have been detrimentally impacted by a detached garage. So, as the design process was getting underway, it was considered that the attached garage would be the better solution in this situation.

So, the variation before you this evening, as Derek mentioned, is

APPROVED

reducing the required side yard from essentially eight-foot down to four-foot. It's a 4.2-foot reduction to accommodate this rather basically sized one-car garage. We have an eight-foot overhead door, we have two-foot returns on either side, that's how we end up with a 12-foot wide structure. So, certainly nothing dramatically sized, but enough to get a one-car vehicle in there.

The garage, the proposed addition has been designed to appear to be somewhat subservient to the house but compatible with the overall design. The front face is moved back a foot off the existing front facade of the garage, the idea being to try and cumulatively make the garage seem like it was there the whole time but not overwhelming on that front facade. So, while the garage does encroach into the south side yard, care and review was given to how that drainage would appear down that side in between the two homes. The swale that is there now, again, while the area is being compressed to around about four feet, the Engineering Department has given its tentative okay for that design as long as we maintain that swale and shorter water lines towards the front.

As part of the design process and the variation piece, the homeowners were kind enough to go around to all of the neighbors and review with them the overall design and sort of further explain beyond the notice that I sent to them and get them, you know, a little bit more of an idea so the neighbors knew what was going on. I'm just going to present to either Derek or the Chair at this point review sheets from 1104 South Salem, 1105 South Salem, 1109 South Salem, 1112 South Salem, 1119 South Salem, 1120 South Salem, 1133 South Salem, 1211 South Salem, and then 1030 South Fernandez. These drawings have been presented to those neighbors, they've reviewed them and have signed off that they're comfortable with what's happened.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any neighbors voicing any form of opposition?

MR. VENAMORE: There have not been any, no. As part of that, probably the most important one is the neighbor to the south obviously, he's part of that signature process. Excuse me.

So, the hardship. For this project, the hardship is tied to the location of the existing home. As I've mentioned a little bit before, the lots are wider than they are deep. Hence, the reason for us to sort of move from a detached garage up to this attached design. Based on the width of the lot and the requirement that the side yards need to be 10 percent of that, we are at a requirement for eight feet. We are now down to a fraction less than four-foot.

Part of the existing condition that's driving the requested variation is that location. The house isn't quite centered on the lot. There's certainly enough room, even with this 12-foot wide addition, if the house had been located farther to the north as there's still enough overall side yards on both sides for it to be compliant. Unfortunately, obviously the house is, you know, located a little bit too close to the south property line to make that work, but the hardship is somewhat tied to the existing nature of the location of the house.

The attached garage, sorry, the detached garage option as I mentioned we feel would be a really negative impact on both the rear yard for this property and it's compressing its usefulness essentially, as well as creating, I think with the amount of additional impervious on that south side, creating the potential for some drainage issues for the neighbor to the south. He is, the neighbor to the south is well aware, obviously he's the biggest concern here as it relates to, you know, the impact to the project. As I

APPROVED

mentioned before, he has signed off on the signature sheets.

So, the owners and I would be happy to answer any questions that the Board would have.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I had a couple of questions.

MR. VENAMORE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: How many residents are in the house right now?

MR. VENAMORE: Four.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And how many drivers?

MR. VENAMORE: Two.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Two, and three expected in the next coming years?

MR. VENAMORE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, we've gotten the consent from the south neighbor?

MR. VENAMORE: Yes, that will be in the ones coming your way in a minute.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes. 1112?

MR. VENAMORE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: You're aware of the Staff comments? You spoke a little bit about the engineering and the grading plan, as well as the building and life safety. Have the fire --

MR. VENAMORE: So, I don't know the extent of the knowledge of those requirements. Obviously, they are aware of the relationship as it exists between the two properties right now and the understanding of how much closer it's going to get. If you go out there, you can see there is a, from the top of foundation on the neighbor's garage down to the swale and then back up again, there's a natural U-shape there already. We just have to sort of compress that U-shape and keep it on the subject property.

One of the ways we're going to deal with that is, as you can see by the drawings, we have a reverse gable. So, the gutters are going to come to the south and downspouts are going to drop down. We're going to put those underground and run those out to a pop-up that comes up to the front yard on the subject property. So, all that drainage from the addition will be taken care of.

Obviously, that drainage pattern from west to east would be disrupted by the addition, so that's then where the key part of the swale comes in, which is why, and this hasn't happened, I've done a lot of garages in the Village before, Engineering is now asking for cross sections, right, so they really want to make sure that drainage doesn't make an issue for the neighbor. So, I don't know that he's aware of the specifics of that, and the building code piece of it tied to the one-hour fire rate wall, obviously we're going to have to do that as part of the plan review process anyway. So, I think the issues that he may have had a concern about again will be dealt with as a result of that engineering plan.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, great. I don't have any more questions.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I commend on an excellent presentation. Well-prepared.

APPROVED

MR. VENAMORE: Thank you, sir. Much appreciated.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Well, with that, I move that we close the public hearing --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hold on a second before I call a vote. Do we ask, the procedure is a little confusing on this point now there's no objector. Do we ask if there is a resident --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Comments before we close?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Do we open it up to public comments?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, well, it was never closed and we never voted on the motion.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right, and we didn't have a second.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, yes, hold on a second there.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so this is the time where if there's any resident, and that's one of the key criteria as well, you have to be a resident of the Village, to provide comments on this particular petition and the variance sought but you're not an objector, right, because the objector status was something that Derek asked for before. If there are none, we will then close this part of the proceeding and move to deliberations and then a potential vote.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, hearing and seeing nobody?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Now, I'll go ahead and move. I move that we close the public hearing for 1108 South Salem Lane, ZBA Case #24-001.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hearing none, motion granted. Now, we move to deliberations.

Okay, Frank, if you could start?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes. The presentation was on point, hit all four elements very clearly. No neighbor opposition seemingly at all. The most affected neighbor at the south signed off on the forms and the notice. Yes, I think it's a pretty reasonable ask and the Petitioner has made a good case, so I would be in favor.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I would say I kind of hate, you know, variances that are half of the required setback is never a comfortable variance to grant, but in this case, I think they've done a great job. They reached out to the neighbors, making sure they're all on board. Engineering seems on board. So, I could support this one.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I concur with those comments. In addition, I think another point, Derek, on the variance to the side yard setback, right, and all that is affected, this house is not centered on the lot, right? On the west side, that distance is not dimensioned necessarily but, yes, it's pretty substantial. It looks like it's about maybe 12, 14, maybe even 15 feet. So, I'm in favor of the variance sought.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I'm in favor as well. Well done on the presentation.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: And I'm in favor as well.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, do we have a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: **I move to approve this petition as presented.**

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

MR. MACH: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Selbka.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Yes.

MR. MACH: Chairman Siavelis.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes.

Congratulations, variance granted.

MR. VENAMORE: Thanks very much for your time, folks. It's really appreciated.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:19 p.m.)

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 1120 NORTH ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD - ZBA #24-002

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 12th day of February, 2024 at the hour of
7:19 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

PETER SIAVELIS, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE
JOSEPH SELBKA

ALSO PRESENT:

DEREK MACH, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so next up --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Derek, do we need to move to open the public hearing for the next one?

MR. MACH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: We do.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Where does it say that on the guidance from the lawyer?

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: It says here each agenda item we're going to visit.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Here's one of the ambiguities that I've flagged before. You look at it and then --

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Did you ever get this?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes. Like that's not what's right here.

Derek, what's your preference?

MR. MACH: It's not necessary. We're trying to streamline.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes. Thank you, that's what I thought. There we go, all right.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Even better then.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes.

Next up is ZBA Petition No. 24-002, 1120 North Arlington Heights Road.

Derek?

MR. MACH: Thank you, Chairman.

The subject property is zoned B-1 and consists of an area of approximately 39,000 square feet. The existing two-story building is 17,400 square feet. The Petitioner has indicated that their anticipated peak parking demand is 50 spaces; however, the parking ratios set forth in the Zoning Code require one parking space for every 200 square feet. The site has a total of 67 parking spaces, thereby resulting in a deficit of 20 spaces.

If the Zoning Board is supportive of the parking variance, it's recommended that the variance be limited specifically to ACCESS Community Health Network. In addition, the study hours, it's recommended that it be tied to those hours as this was what was provided, the information and study that's part of the overall parking evaluation. It's also recommended that if the Zoning Board is supportive, that they be required to provide the code-required landscaping along Arlington Heights Road which requires a three-foot high screen.

The Petitioner has requested a variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4, *Schedule of Parking Requirement*, to allow a reduction to the minimum required parking from 87 to 67 parking spaces. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Great, thank you very much, Derek.

Okay, who's speaking on behalf of this petition? All right, sir, have you signed in?

MR. FRANCKE: Yes, I did.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, you've signed in already. Please identify yourself on the record and spell your full name.

MR. FRANCKE: Yes. Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the

APPROVED

Board. My name is Hal, H-a-l, Francke, F-r-a-n-c-k-e. I'm an Attorney with the Law Firm of Meltzer, Purtil & Stelle. My office is at 1515 East Woodfield Road in Schaumburg.

I'm pleased to be before you this evening on behalf of the Petitioner, ACCESS Community Health Network, which is the Owner and Operator of the ACCESS Community Health medical facility at 1120 North Arlington Heights Road. We do have a PowerPoint presentation that will I think help explain our request.

Let me just note before we begin the individuals that are here with me this evening to answer any questions that you might have. I'm going to basically give you an overview of what we're going to be talking about and introduce the people that are here this evening, and then I'll turn it over to Matt Glavin who is the General Counsel for ACCESS. In addition to Matt, with us this evening is our Natalie Avalos who is the Regional Manager of ACCESS; Gisella Gomez who is the Health Center Manager at the facility here in Arlington Heights; Eddie Cruz who is Vice President of Operations; Francisco Diaz who is in charge of facilities; also Ted Pak who is the Architect with the architectural firm that has designed the plans for the renovation project that is causing the request, the need for the parking variation request. Then finally, Javier Milan who is with KLOA, Inc., they were engaged to do a formal parking survey in support of the request to establish the adequacy of the existing parking spaces on the property.

So, I think with that, I'm going to turn the floor over to Matt Glavin. As I said, Matt is the general counsel for ACCESS Community Health Network. Matt is going to introduce you to the facility, for those of you who aren't familiar with it, locate the facility in terms of the property and the surrounding streets and he'll show you the survey of the property actually which is in the folder to let you understand where the building is and where all the different parking spaces are. Then I think the way we've got this set up, I'll come back and walk through the details of the request and how we think your support is warranted.

So, with that, I introduce Matt Glavin.

MR. GLAVIN: Thank you, Hal.

Hello, Board, nice to be here. We appreciate your time. I just want to tell you a little bit about ACCESS Community Health Network. If you'd like to go to the next slide?

In short, we're a not-for-profit corporation that operates community health centers in Cook and one in DuPage County. We've been in the Arlington Heights community since 2012. Initially, we rented from Northwest Community on West Central Road, 675 West Central Road. We moved to the 1120 North Arlington Heights Road building in 2016 as a tenant, and at the very end of the following year, 2017, we purchased the building.

We provide primary care services such as family medicine, internal medicine, pediatrics, podiatry, psychiatry, but we're not just another medical service provider, there are many of those in Arlington Heights and an excellent hospital. But in addition, we are a federally qualified health center. What that means is, number one, we get some financial support from the Federal Government and, number two, we are required to treat any patient that walks in the door.

As a result, at this health center, we take care, 60 percent of our patients are Medicaid patients, and a full 20 percent of our patients have no insurance whatsoever. That's 80 percent of the patients we see at this health center, and those are

APPROVED

the patients who find it most challenging to have consistent medical care, particularly primary health care. Let me put some numbers with that.

In the last 18 months, at this health center, we treated 30,481 patients. So, the patient base that we're serving are really a vulnerable, under-served population. That's part of what being an FQHC means, and I think with the number of patients we see, I think it establishes that we're a valuable and needed medical citizen of the Village of Arlington Heights.

The next slide just shows you where the property is located. Again, I know you're all very familiar with the Village. This is 1120 North Arlington Heights Road, and the next slide is the plat of survey. The building is on the left-hand side there, and the right-hand side is the parking, and the rightmost column is Arlington Heights Road.

But we don't just strive to take care of a vulnerable population. We also pride ourselves in providing that population with a high quality health center. So, the renovations that we're talking about at this health center is over \$4.8 million, including FF&E and IT and so forth. About half of that, well, less than half of that, we have financed ourself. The rest of it is from a Federal American Rescue Plan capital grant, an ARP grant. We are very proud to have received that grant, and it's allowing us to renovate both floors of this building that we use, the second floor and the first floor.

The renovation, as you can see in the packet, is only to the interior first and second floor. No changes to the exterior whatsoever, and the basement remains completely unused. The Staff mentioned the square footage of the building as, preceding our presentation, a little over 17,000 square feet. The first and second floors, the above-grade floors is 13,616 square feet. If that were the space that you would consider, we would only need 68 parking spaces. We have 67.

There's no plans to add additional medical service providers. There's no plans to expand the hours of operation. We've been transparent with the Staff, and this is reflected in the letter that we sent, that we would consider adding one dentist and one pharmacist to the health center. But the pharmacy and the dentist would only be for existing ACCESS patients who would be able to access dental and pharmacy while they're there for their medical appointment.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, new future ACCESS patients will not be able to have dentistry or pharmacy support?

MR. GLAVIN: We don't have dental or pharmacy currently. When we renovate, we're going to have room for it. In some of our health centers, we do have a dentist come in and we do have like a 600 square-foot pharmacy, but again, it's limited just for existing ACCESS patients. It's not publicly advertised. We don't take people off the street for dental work or for pharmacy. It's just for existing patients who are already there for their medical appointments.

The renovation will add exam rooms, and I want to explain that for just a second because it may seem counterintuitive if I say we don't plan to add medical service providers, but we are adding exams. That may not make a lot of sense but let me explain the need for additional exam rooms. Ideally, in a primary care outpatient health center, a patient comes in, they are escorted to an exam room by a medical assistant. They are roomed if you will, their vitals are taken, their current complaints are taken, and they're queued up for the provider to come.

Ideally, you have three or more exam rooms per provider. So, you

APPROVED

can get patients in those rooms and the provider can go down the hall and take care of each of them. When the provider finishes taking care of the first patient, they leave the room, we clean that room. They take care of the second patient, same thing, we bring a new patient in. It makes it very efficient and allows our providers to see the maximum number of patients.

Right now, the waiting time at this health center is between 30 and 60 minutes. It's really unbearable, and it's because we only have 11 exam rooms. We either have six or seven providers at the health center on a given day. That does not allow us to turn over those exam rooms like we should to allow the provider to really see patients efficiently. When we have a specialty, like podiatry, we typically assign one exam room to a podiatrist, and so those appointments can be very backed up because once a podiatrist sees that patient, we have to escort the patient out, we have to clean the room, then we bring the next patient in which means the podiatrist has to wait until the next patient is roomed.

So, that's why I say we need additional exam rooms. We hope the renovation will include additional exam rooms, but we don't have a current plan to add a primary care provider.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: But regardless, you don't intend to put any additional exam rooms in the basement, correct?

MR. GLAVIN: Correct. The basement will remain unused. The other reason we need additional exam rooms is telemedicine. I know everybody is aware telemedicine is something that came to the forefront during COVID 19. It is here to stay. Right now, because of the way the health center is, our providers can't really conduct a telemedicine appointment, even just by phone, because there are no private spaces for them to go.

The providers share a work area. What our providers end up doing is go to an unfinished space on the second floor. They even go to their cars with their cell phone to do a telemedicine appointment so they're private and consistent with HIPAA privacy and security requirements. When we have additional exam rooms, not only will we be able to room and turn over patients more efficiently, thereby cutting down on the waiting time, and frankly cutting down on the amount of time cars are in the parking lot, but we will also have room for providers to conduct telemedicine appointments not just by telephone but also by video. So, that's why we're looking, if you see the plans, you see these additional exam rooms. That's what that is for.

I'm going to turn it back over to our attorney to address --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I had a couple of questions for you.

MR. GLAVIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, on your third and fourth bullet point there, you say no plans to expand hours of operation, no plans to add new medical service providers. What is the time horizon for your plans, right? Because therein lies the rug, right? The details of what is the existing plan, how far out does that plan work, you know, that sort of thing.

MR. GLAVIN: We have no plans whatsoever to change the hours of operation. We have 30 people working at the health center. It's difficult to staff a community health center, particularly an FQHC that serves this under-served population. It's not a lucrative practice. So, we have no plans to expand, we have no plans to hire

APPROVED

additional people or to expand the hours of operation at all.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Are those plans evaluated on an annual basis, quarterly basis? How often in your experience are plans like that revisited and potentially tailored or adjusted?

MR. GLAVIN: Well, let's see. I would say that we have evaluated this particular health center in 2019. We always look at all of our health centers, but really in 2019 we looked at it, and so about five years, but we have no plans to expand. It's really a matter of finances.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: But you moved to a substantially larger facility recently here at 1120 North Arlington, right? So, I mean, a 2019 plan is essentially antiquated when you look at the current facility, correct?

MR. GLAVIN: Well, we moved in 2017.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, they've been here for a while, they just bought it.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Oh, I thought they were at --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No, they were here.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I thought they were closer to the hospital on Central.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You actually were here as a tenant and then you've purchased the building and now you're looking to renovate it, correct?

MR. GLAVIN: That's exactly right. We moved into the building in 2016.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so you were on Central before that?

MR. GLAVIN: Yes, we were at 675 West Central.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, I thought I had the date --

MR. GLAVIN: Yes, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And a couple of quick questions if I could. You had thrown out the number of patients over the last 18 months. Could you run that through me again?

MR. GLAVIN: Sure. The number of patients at this health center over the last 18 months, these are in-person encounters, 30,481. It's about 1,700 a month.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: 1,700 a month, okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: How are your patients getting into the facility?

MR. GLAVIN: That varies. We have patients who take mass transportation. We have patients, you know, it's a family practice so we have patients that carpool, and we have patients that drive.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: And why is the basement, well, let me back up before I ask the question that way. Is the basement feasible for expansion in the future for rooms?

MR. GLAVIN: It really isn't. There is no bathroom down there. There is no, in fact we have a couple of slides and I think they were included in that. Yes, there we go.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Quickly, about the basement, you're asking for a variance without any conditions. Would you accept a variance with the condition that medical services not be provided in the basement unless you come before the Zoning Board again and ask for a new variance?

MR. GLAVIN: I think that condition would make sense. Frankly, I think it's

APPROVED

already built into the system because if we are granted the variance we're asking for today and then we apply for a building permit for the basement, this whole process is going to start again. So, yes, short answer, yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, further to Mr. Selbka's question, and you heard Derek raise the points when he was doing the Staff overview, the Village has asked for certain conditions to be attached to your variance. Okay, assuming that Mr. Selbka's condition is attached, right, regarding basement usage, what is your position on the three conditions that Derek identified on behalf of the Village?

MR. GLAVIN: Well, here is our position. Initially, we don't think any condition is necessary because the condition that this Board member mentioned is already automatic because of the zoning issue and the building permit that would be required. We don't think a condition relating to possible ancillary services with the dental and pharmacy is appropriate because, again, those would only be for existing ACCESS patients who are already at the health center to get their medical services. So, for example, we have families that come in and bring their children, they would be able to have their children see a dentist. We would be able to fill their prescriptions. Third --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So -- okay, go ahead. I apologize, go ahead.

MR. GLAVIN: No, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: No, no, please.

MR. GLAVIN: The other condition that was suggested is that if we added any medical service provider, staff provider, we would have to come before the Board for a further variance. The problem with that is a very practical one, and that is, as a federally qualified health center, as a community health center, we have a lot of turnover. We lose a provider, we have to replace that provider. We wouldn't be adding provider hours, but we would be adding a provider. So, and that's a difficult thing. I think we experience more attrition than a more conventional medical practice, again, because of finances.

So, the condition concerning the basement I have no problem with. I think it's already baked into the process. The condition about hours of operation I've got no problem with. I would not like to see a condition about adding a pharmacist or a dentist because it would just be for, again, for existing patients who are already on site. That's our response to that.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so are you honing in on the conditions?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Kind of, but I want to ask one other question before I even get there. You're adding these labs to make it more efficient, correct? So, with that efficiency, I'm assuming you're going to see more patients. Do you have an idea as to how many more? I mean, you're going to be able to get them in faster so you'll be able to see more.

MR. GLAVIN: That's what we're trying to accomplish. We're trying to eliminate the 30 to 60-minute wait. Because we're not adding providers, the number of appointments that we can book for a day is limited. So, we are not expecting an increase in the number of patients. We're expecting an increase in the efficient --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, instead of a doctor seeing three per hour, per your kind of earlier example, right now they're not seeing three per hour, but they can with the new setup is where I'm at.

MR. GLAVIN: Exactly right. That doesn't mean we're going to have --

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: But you're not getting new patients, you're just getting them in and out faster?

MR. GLAVIN: Exactly right.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'm not sure I follow that logic or buy that logic, but okay. Now, I know where you're going to --

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Derek, then after you do that, I've got a question.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Not the cover slide, the cover sheet, you know, that the Village generates for us, because I think there may be a little bit of a disconnect here because the conditions I was talking about or specifically referencing were, I think you're on page three here, keep going. There.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's two or three.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, it was on two, it's on two. So, last paragraph of two essentially, it's the third paragraph in that section. You'll probably want to blow that out.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's under the interoffice memo.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: There it is. If the Zoning Board is supportive of the variance; do you see that?

MR. GLAVIN: No problem with the landscaping condition.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, I would hope you'd take that one off --

MR. GLAVIN: Of course.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: -- because if we're going to fight about landscaping --

MR. GLAVIN: No, no, no.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's going to be a long night.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: It's going to be a long night.

MR. GLAVIN: No problem at all, and we understand that.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, check the box on number three.

MR. GLAVIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, yes?

MR. GLAVIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, we can work backwards then. Number two, essentially, I'll read it, I was going to paraphrase it but I'm not going to do that now. It is also recommended that the variance be conditioned to the hours provided and evaluated as part of the parking study; therefore, an extension to the hours would require further study and the Petitioner would need to return to the Zoning Board.

MR. GLAVIN: Yes, we are not going to expand the hours of operation. That condition would be acceptable.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, check.

MR. GLAVIN: Check.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Number one, if the Zoning Board, I'm reading the first sentence there, okay, if the Zoning Board is supportive of the variance, it is recommended that the variance be limited specifically to ACCESS Community Health Network.

MR. GLAVIN: No problem there either, check.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, actually we're into fourth by making it so there's no, nothing built in the basement which to your point probably --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: We'll let Mr. Selbka restate the fourth condition, right, just to make sure we're clear.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Actually, I have a question for Derek before I state that condition. The general counsel has stated that if the basement was not included in the square footage, the community health center would only require a total of 68 parking spaces; is that correct?

MR. MACH: That's correct. However, it's not uncommon to see office type uses, medical, to start using the basement for storage, records, things like that that ultimately are supporting what's happening on the first two levels.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: So -- sorry, go ahead.

MR. FRANCKE: No, no, no, go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Finish your thought, Joe.

MR. FRANCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: So, I think that as a condition of granting this variance, we should include as a condition that the basement not be used for medical labs or for any purpose other than storage. I understand that that's fudging a little bit as the Zoning Code, but that will inherently limit the number of patients that can be pushed through this facility and, therefore, I think that it can alleviate the concern about enough parking spaces to a great extent for me as opposed to, you know, preventing the hours or preventing the services that they provide that would be a significant burden on the medical facility. I'd rather we just limit the square foot that could be used to actually provide the medical services to around 67 spaces which is what they've got, which is what they're saying that they're not going to use the basement.

Now, I understand that that's sort of figured into the Zoning Code, but I think if they're not going to use the basement for anything but storage, that alleviates my concern about overtaxing the parking.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so you're going to get a chance.

MR. FRANCKE: I know. I know, chomping at the bit, you know that.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I'm an attorney; I want to try and make sure I understand that because it will try and crystallize the point I think or the additional condition beyond the three that are enumerated there, on the screen there and in the paper that was provided by the Village.

Joe, are you saying your condition is an additional fourth condition or are you replacing the first three conditions that the Village has already provided and replacing them with your condition? Which approach are you taking?

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: I would be comfortable with replacing my condition with the hours and any restriction on the type of services they'd provide. So, and I don't think that that is a concern but the hours of operation, I think by limiting the number of square feet that you give the medical services, that takes care of the issue of parking overflow. Limiting the number of hours, if anything, that could make parking overflow worse because you're limiting the time that the people can come in and be serviced.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Are the hours up there on the screen that you see there, are those the current hours of operation?

MR. FRANCKE: I believe they are.

APPROVED

MR. GLAVIN: Yes, they are.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so those date and time ranges there on the screen do not reflect a restriction of your existing hours, correct?

MR. GLAVIN: Correct.

MR. FRANCKE: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so my view on that is I do not think it wise to replace the Village's three enumerated conditions with your fourth condition. I would be supportive of adding it as a fourth condition in view of Mr. Glavin's testimony as to how the basement will not be used, and I think it's a legitimate additional condition to add given the totality of the testimony we've heard today. Let the record reflect that Mr. Glavin is shaking his head yes, and of course he'll have a chance to address that.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Relating to construction, won't the inspectors go in and see how that space is being set up? If they see it's set up for storage or a server or whatever versus treatment rooms or a pharmacy or whatever, that issue would pop up and we would know that they've violated a condition.

MR. MACH: They would be required to obtain building permits.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes. So, I think it's kind of self-policing, isn't it?

MR. FRANCKE: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: It's the after-the-fact construction that, not necessarily, after-the-fact activities, right, not necessarily impugning that you folks are going to do that, but we all know that that has occurred in the past when people take liberties, right?

MR. FRANCKE: Okay, if I could? Okay, thank you. If I could, I'd like to explain why I agree with what the Zoning Board member Selbka or Commissioner Selbka, I don't know what you call yourselves, what Commissioner Selbka proposed, I think it's spot on and I agree with it. I would prefer that it replace that second condition and not be a fourth condition. If I could, let me explain why.

If we could, Derek, can we go back to our PowerPoint and go to what was going to be the next slide? Keep going where Matt said I was going to explain the variation. Next slide there. Okay, so, and some of this, you know, Matt has already told you.

The above-grade floors on the building total a little over, as you can see, 13,000 square feet. When we first got involved in this project, we talked to the Staff and we indicated that, you know, based on our review of your Zoning Ordinance, you do two things. Number one, as the third bullet point indicates, your ordinance determines parking requirement based on square footage. It doesn't base it on employees, patients, hours of operation or anything. Your parking requirement is based on square footage of the building.

Now, it was our initial interpretation of your ordinance that the basement doesn't even count because it's below grade. So, the way your ordinance is written, that's why Matt said if you just count the top two floors, this building is only one space short of what your ordinance would require. That being said, we understand that the Staff's position, and we don't have a problem with this, which is why we're here tonight, the Staff's position is kind of consistent with what, you know, several of you are saying. Well, what if the basement one day gets built out? Forget about whether it's above-grade or below-grade, what if it gets built out?

APPROVED

We understand that. That's why the Zoning Ordinance was framed, or the request for the variation was framed to say we're not one space short, we're 20 spaces short. That's why we're here before you this evening and we're asking for a variation approval to go from 87 to 67. In other words, we've taken a very conservative approach in coming to the conclusion and agreement that we need a variation for 20 spaces.

But, again, your ordinance is based on square footage, and as several of you have said tonight, it is sort of self-policing because if they were to come back in and say we're going to now build out the basement, they couldn't do it without a building permit and it would trigger a review of this entire process. That's why Matt is saying if we're in that position, we have no problem, you know, coming back to the Village. I would respectfully request that we first come back to the Staff, and only if Staff thinks we need to come back to the Zoning Board and get a new variation that we do that. I wouldn't say that automatically we have to come to the Zoning Board.

But we think, getting back to my opening comment, this is why, the way your ordinance is written, we agree with what Commissioner Selbka said, that the condition should be tied to the square footage and whether or not it's improved or not.

If you can go, Derek, to the next slide now?

So, we did, at the request of the Village, prepare a, have KLOA, again, Javier Milan is here to answer any questions you have, we did have them do a complete parking study which is again in your folder or the file. As I indicated, they took this conservative approach and they said, you know, what's the parking required including the whole basement? They analyzed that the needed parking based on, both based on the Village's requirements and the requirements or the ratios published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, they looked at the three busiest days, they found that the average use of the existing 67 spaces is only 41 percent, and at the peak they were only 75 percent full for two 30-minute periods on a Thursday.

So, there is even adequate capacity, even though there's no plans for this, to build out the basement because there's existing capacity in the parking lot right now. Appreciating your concern but, you know, and there's no belief that there's going to be more patients, it's just the patients that are already coming and a lot of them as you can see are going to have the ability to wait less, fewer hours, fewer minutes. But even if you're right that more patients come after the renovation is completed, there's capacity in the existing parking lot. That's why, you know, we would say we have no problem with a condition that says if they build out the basement, that's why Matt said right away if you want to add a condition that says we have to come back if we build out the basement that's not a problem. I would just again respectfully suggest that before we come to you we first meet with Staff and let Staff determine whether that's a problem or not, because we may be able to convince them there's still no problem.

So, I mean --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I think that's implicit within that comment, that you're going to go in front of the Staff first, right?

MR. FRANCKE: Okay, well, the condition, if you go back to that thing you asked Derek to pull up, said if the hours change or the people change, we have to return to the Zoning Board.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: But, again, implicit within that comment is you

APPROVED

start out with Staff, right?

MR. FRANCKE: That's fine, as long as that's understood. As long as that's understood.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. FRANCKE: So, I think this is pretty much, there's one last slide we added which I don't know, that you read, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning, the four standards. I mean, personally I've been doing this for a long time. I think this is a poster child case for a variation request for, you know, if approved, for something that will further the public health, safety and welfare. The property is constrained, there's no place for them to put more parking so they have limitations. It's a unique situation where they became a tenant, then they bought. As I say, there is no ability to provide more parking anywhere. The last item, we're not asking for more than is necessary.

So, you know, I do think that the standards have all been met and that concludes our presentation.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Perhaps not. There may be questions further from us.

MR. FRANCKE: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, the one thing that I think we need to be cognizant of, right, is the fact, it hasn't really been mentioned, is the fact that, you know, this part of Arlington Heights Road is highly congested, right. You folks are really close to the Fire Department, right, on the same side of the street, right.

MR. FRANCKE: I think it is farther north, I think.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: No, it's --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's adjacent to the north.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, it's adjacent to the north.

MR. FRANCKE: Yes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: That building, I was looking for the building up there, but I don't fully see it. Yes, this is further north, and that's why I was pulling up Google Maps because I was seeing for myself if the Fire Department is right there, right, right to the north.

MR. FRANCKE: Right, just to the north.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so that's something that kind of factors in my mind, you know, and I think all of us who travel and utilize North Arlington Heights Road recognize that there's a lot of traffic in both directions, north and south, right. But I think it does work in your favor that your parking study shows that lower occupancy there, because if you were going to ask for more spots, I would be strongly evaluating that and probably leaning towards no because I don't want to put more cars on the road there in that area.

But I must tell you, when the Village and the Staff come out with conditions that they attach to a variance, we give a fair amount of deference to those, okay. So, as I sit here right now, I am not inclined to set those aside for Mr. Selbka's fourth condition. I am willing to consider all four, and I think we all recognize that the third one presented by the Village regarding landscaping is essentially a fait accompli, right?

MR. FRANCKE: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: But that's how I view things and I view this right now. You know, if business continues to go, you know, well and a build out of the

APPROVED

basement becomes necessary in the future, three, four, five, seven years down the road, right, none of the crystal balls are that finely tuned, then of course things will be, you'll have to come in for the permitting process and have to go through all that. But it seems like, to me, it does not make sense to strip out the three conditions provided and recommended by the Village. Now, whether, I'm willing to listen to the other Board members and see if you guys have questions regarding the conditions --

MR. FRANCKE: Well, if I can just clarify? I think Matt said that he doesn't have a problem with the hours being part of the condition, but he has a problem saying if there's any change in providers that we have to come back --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I don't see where we're asking that.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: They're not --

MR. FRANCKE: I thought that's what it said.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It might have been one that was spoken earlier, but the three that's --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: That's when I said put it up there, right, because I heard --

MR. GLAVIN: It was part of the discussion with Staff earlier.

MR. FRANCKE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: That didn't make it into the formal recommendations. Derek, can you put that sheet now, that slide two or page two of that back up there? Because, and we understand your point on your flux, your turnover on your providers, right.

MR. GLAVIN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: See, that one is, that condition is not in there. That point is not reflected in one of the conditions presented by the Village.

MR. FRANCKE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. GLAVIN: Yes, the hours and not building up the basement and the landscaping, we have no problem with those conditions.

MR. FRANCKE: Right, and the last sentence, I'm just saying, therefore an extension to the hours, I know, Mr. Chairman, you said it's implicit, but if I were, as an attorney writing this into an ordinance of approval, I would say an extension to the hours would require further study and the Petitioner would need to return to the Zoning Board if Village Staff, you know, has a concern or deems it necessary to reevaluate the variation previously granted. That's what I would say, because this seems to say we would need to return to the Zoning Board.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Derek, just to be clear, there's a difference between the three-foot high screen required on the frontage and the landscape, they're not one and the same, correct?

MR. MACH: It's just Staff is asking that they infill where the landscaping is absent which is the code requirement.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: What's that three-foot screen that we're asking for?

MR. MACH: Asking that they provide the code-required screening along Arlington Heights Road three feet high.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: That's different than the landscaping that they

APPROVED

require?

MR. MACH: Well, that would be the condition.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I think the screen is defined as a fence or landscaping.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: A berm or there are some options or forms to pick on.

MR. GLAVIN: Whatever the ordinance requires.

MR. FRANCKE: Right. We have trees up there, too, right? You have a big tree up front, right?

MR. GLAVIN: There's a couple there.

MR. FRANCKE: So, you'll probably just want to --

MR. GLAVIN: We can fill in with, yes.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Mr. Chairman, we have a number of other people here. I don't know if they intend to speak. I think no one had indicated having any objections. I'd like to hear if there are other public comments.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: What people are thinking before we get into it further, into any kind of conditions or negotiation --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Right, that sounds good. We're going to go to that, but I want to respond to Counsel's comment about that one sentence, the completion of that one sentence in there; therefore, an extension to the hours would require further study and the Petitioner would need to return to the Zoning Board.

Derek, does that, correct me if I'm wrong, that means that Petitioner would then need to commence the process in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals which requires and implicitly necessitates interaction with the Staff, correct?

MR. MACH: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: There we go.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Peter, I think what Counsel is asking, now I don't want to put words in his mouth, is he would like the Staff to be able to waive the requirement to come in front of the Zoning Board if the hours are changed. I think that's what he's --

MR. FRANCKE: Not, well, I appreciate that, not waive it. All I want to say is we'd need to return to the Zoning Board if the Staff deems it necessary. That's all I'm trying to say. This says would need to return to the Zoning Board, period. It doesn't say if the Staff deems it necessary, that's all I'm trying to say.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: You will agree that then if the extension to the hours was to occur, you're going to recommence the process with the Village's Staff, correct?

MR. FRANCKE: Yes, that's not a problem.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And let them deal with --

MR. FRANCKE: That's not a problem.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: And to the extent necessary to come in front of the Board --

MR. FRANCKE: And if Staff says you've got to come back, that's not a problem.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: You can go again, right.

MR. FRANCKE: Right.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, that's what I was saying, but I hear what's your saying and I don't think he's asking for a waiver of that.

MR. FRANCKE: I'm not asking for that.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All right, is that interpretation copacetic?

MR. MACH: Yes.

MR. FRANCKE: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, now we can go.

Mr. Glavin, you don't have anything else to say, correct?

MR. GLAVIN: That's correct. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay. All right, so now we can go, and we assume there are no defined objector, right?

MR. MACH: Just to clarify, someone can speak in opposition, but if they wanted to formally object and testify --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so a resident who wants to make a public comment at the hearing may do so at this point in time. You're not necessarily considered to be an objector. Sir, that would be you. Come on up.

MR. COSTELLO: Right, so I have --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Wait, wait, wait. Come on all the way up so you can be caught on the record with the microphone.

MR. COSTELLO: So, I received this notice of this hearing.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Wait, wait, wait. Follow instructions.

MR. COSTELLO: My name?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, come up so he can catch, because remember, a reporter is transcribing it.

MR. COSTELLO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, he's got to hear you on the microphone.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, so when I raised my hand, it was just to make sure that it would be in order simply to come and speak. So, you've clarified now, I'll announce myself, okay?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Please.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, my name is John Costello. I am a newly retired practicing dentist who has just retired after 57 years.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Nice.

MR. COSTELLO: My family moved to Arlington Heights when I was this big in 1949, and I've watched a lot of things happen and I think I can bring something to bear that might be helpful to the Board.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Derek, do we need any name, address, to formalize anything? Because you do not consider yourself, in view of what you've heard today, to be an objector?

MR. COSTELLO: No, I simply want to make some comments that I think could be helpful.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Very good, please proceed.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, so you've got my name. Do you need my address

APPROVED

now? How about if I say I'm the owner of the property at 1040 North Arlington Heights Road?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: That's good. That was no surprise.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, and people who have been here a long time may recall that I had that house moved to that location in 1978, picked up and moved, a two-story home, from Rand Road where it used to be located next to Roto Lincoln Mercury and the discotech that was there way back when. Here's a couple of things that I would start with.

When I moved that home, I had to hire an architect to present how the home would sit on the piece where it now sits. I hired an architect and that home was originally designed to face Oakton. I was told that that wouldn't work because the driveway for that home which would, the way the home was built have to be on the west side, would be too close to the traffic signal. When they gave me the permission to move it and it sits now the way this property sits, I'm actually closer to the traffic signal than I would have been.

So, I'm just giving you that background for what was valid in 1978 here by the Village in terms of granting a permit in my mind has not gotten less congested, it's gotten more congested. This building's ingress and egress is the same road in as out, right? This has only got the utility section on the corner of Oakton and Arlington Heights Road, one more building, and then this. So, I believe, and it's not an objection, but I believe you're very wise in considering that the traffic in and out of this is not going to be diminished but increased by this renovation. What I bring to the table for consideration is when you create more operatory or exam rooms, the flow in my mind, although the waiting time may be less, you're going to have more people coming and going each day.

My second point is it would be interesting for the Board to find out if this federal grant money is conditioned on anything regarding the number of patients or the number of services provided, because I see this escalating in numbers, especially since we are dealing close enough to Chicago with a migrant crisis and there is no area in my mind anywhere around that's going to be exempt from that. So, that is a whole other ball of wax. Where my property sits, I feel that when you want to leave that property, the only reason that my ingress and egress is simple is that many years ago I approached the neighbor who owned to the south of me and we elected to make a U-shape out of our two driveways so that someone would not be backing out to Arlington Heights Road, because when you're backing out, the people eastbound on Oakton that are just making a right turn, it's a precarious situation.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: What's your address again -- let me interrupt you?

MR. COSTELLO: 1040, right on the corner. So, I'm not questioning these gentlemen on their observations and their statistics, but I know from many years and practice that if you have more rooms, you are going to have a higher volume of people coming in and out of that center.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: And where was your office at?

MR. COSTELLO: Before?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: You retired, you said you were at --

MR. COSTELLO: Yes, it's at 1500.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: 1500.

APPROVED

MR. COSTELLO: Yes, on that corner of Thomas. It's now my son's office. I was fortunate enough to have him join me 11 years ago, so I still speak as if I own it, but I'm not practicing, but that's where the office is.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, you're quite familiar with traffic on Arlington Heights Road.

MR. COSTELLO: From the time I was that big. It was a two-lane highway called State Road when we got here in '49.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: But the property at issue would not be backing out on Arlington Heights Road.

MR. COSTELLO: No, no, they have room to turn around, but I'm indicating that way back in '78, I had thankfully the foresight to approach the people and say this is not good to back out here.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Right.

MR. COSTELLO: You have people going westbound on Oakton that want to make a left, and you have people when the light permits on turning on right that you're coming right towards that driveway. So, you want to be pulling out of there, not backing out.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, anything else, sir?

MR. COSTELLO: No, that's it.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Thank you very much.

Any other members of the audience who wish to be heard on this petition? Come on up, sir.

MR. AUSTIN: My name is Bruce Austin. I live at 1119 North Dunton. I live right behind the building. I've lived there, it will be 24 years. The folks here have been more than courteous.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Be more specific, are you talking about the Petitioner?

MR. AUSTIN: Yes. I didn't realize they had that many people coming through. It doesn't impact us. I'm not sure about the renovation. The only thing is I ask, I hope they don't put LED lights like the building next door did because come winter our trees drop the leaves, the LED light on that one building shines into, when they leave it on all the time.

But I just want to let you know that they've been very good. The hours, I didn't even realize they were there until 7:00. I mean, they impact us next to zero. So, if that helps you in your decision at all, they've been very courteous.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, anything else?

MR. AUSTIN: And I didn't even know, I've never met any of these guys, but they've been good neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Good. Good to know. Thank you very much.

MR. AUSTIN: All right, thanks, folks.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, seeing nobody else interested in commenting, now we'll take a motion to close, right, for deliberation.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to close the public hearing for 1120 North Arlington Heights Road, ZBA Case No. 24-002.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All in favor?

APPROVED

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hearing none, we'll now move to deliberation. I was contemplating giving the Petitioner to ask to make further comments, but frankly, the comments from the two audience members didn't seem to warrant it. I was watching your faces and I didn't see you stand up.

MR. FRANCKE: I was only going to say that with respect to the first comment, I think you've addressed it by this condition.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Got it, okay. So, we're in deliberation phase.

All right, Joe, do you want to go first?

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Sure. The two conditions on the landscaping and the screening obviously apply, but I still don't see the need for a condition to set hours. But I would be fine voting for it and I do think that the condition of prohibiting the basement to be used for anything but storage would deal with this and bring the building very close to the code requirement for parking spaces. So, that's my thinking. I would vote in favor of the variance either way without the hourly condition or with the hourly condition, and the fourth condition I put in that the basement should not be used for anything but storage.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: And you're copacetic and you're agreeable to the variance being limited specifically to the ACCESS Community Health Network?

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Tom?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I would agree with everything. Nothing really to add. I'm glad to hear that Mr. Austin feels they're a good neighbor, that's always helpful. That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, so let me just double check something. Would you vote in support of essentially the fourth condition?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Fourth condition, yes, having to do with the basement.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, no, I think the four conditions make sense to me. In listening to the neighbor, you know, I do think that making the lab space more efficient opens up the ability to bring in more patients, which is not a bad thing per se, and there is a little bit of wiggle room in what the traffic stated counts were. So, I'm okay with that. I do think you're probably right that, you know, some of the, you know, folks coming up from down south may be out looking for health care and it's going to spread to some degree, but I don't know if we can necessarily address that with this --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, and let's be clear though, the latest CBA data shows 119 countries around the world so it's just not down south.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right, yes, yes. Good point.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, Frank?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I'm in agreement with the four conditions as we have discussed. I think that's the best way to police any kind of influx or any kind of increase is adding that fourth condition.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, and that's where I land on this, too, the four conditions, three from the Village plus Mr. Selbka's. So, Mr. Selbka, would you like to

APPROVED

make a motion where you utilize the, I assume you're going to utilize the three conditions that the Village has provided plus your fourth?

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Right.

Okay, Derek, can you put up the conditions?

MR. MACH: Just to clarify, there was discussion regarding the hours. If the Zoning Board could please clarify, it's per the hours presented as part of the study and then the Staff report, or is it the hours as presented and then the hours are expanded if Staff deems necessary?

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: My understanding is if Staff deems necessary for them to come back to the Zoning Board.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Whoa, whoa, what does that mean? I was looking at how it's written here, right there. I was looking at how it's presented in paper for all of us to look at and I believe Mr. Glavin had concurred with the hours that are put there.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No, the hours are fine. I think the point that's being called out is does it automatically come to the Zoning Board as written or does it go to Staff and the Staff determines --

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Oh, that's what Mr. Francke had --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: That's the --

MR. FRANCKE: As an addendum to the --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Is that your point, Derek?

MR. MACH: Okay, I follow, I think for a moment there I had a --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Disconnect. We had a little bit of disconnect, okay.

MR. MACH: Yes, if they were to expand the hours and then Staff deemed necessary that it needs to return, but you're saying if I understand you correctly that, you know, it's as presented and if they're going to expand the hours, Staff is going to determine that --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You're going to review it, and if you determine that it needs to come to the Zoning Board, then it comes. If you determine it doesn't need to come, then it goes to wherever it needs to go.

MR. FRANCKE: We're just suggesting three words be added to that sentence to the Zoning Board, if the Staff deems --

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Necessary, yes, right.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Well, let me try and put it together and see if I do it right. All right, I make a motion to approve the variance based upon four conditions:

1. That the variance be limited to ACCESS Community Health Network.
2. That the hours of operation remain the same. If ACCESS wants to change the hours, they will be required to consult with Village Staff. If Village Staff disagrees, ACCESS Health will have to come in front of the Zoning Board.
3. That the area in along Arlington Heights Road be properly landscaped in accordance with the code, and that a three-foot high screening will be placed on the frontage of a public way.
4. That the basement will be used only for storage and not for medical offices or labs or seeing patients without ACCESS Health coming back in front of the Zoning Board.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I follow along with what you're doing. I just

APPROVED

think the first one, the first two were kind of garbled.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Want me to try one more time?

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes, and let me just caution you on this, and Derek, this is how I'm interpreting. The first condition is set forth in the first sentence, one, crystal clear, concise. Second condition is provided in the second and third and fourth sentences, right? Then the third condition is provided in the last two sentences, right, and then your fourth condition is accurate.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Okay, that's fine with me.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, try again.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: All right.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: So, rescind your motion.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: All right, I'll restate the motion.

Motion to approve the variance based upon four conditions:

- 1. That the variance be limited specifically to ACCESS Community Health Network.**
- 2. That the hours of operation be limited to Monday 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Tuesday-Thursday 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Friday 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturday 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., and closed on Sunday. Any change in the hours would require ACCESS Community Health to obtain approval of Staff with the option of coming again in front of the Zoning Board if ACCESS Health cannot obtain the consent of Staff.**
- 3. That ACCESS Health provide landscaping in accordance with code along Arlington Heights Road and a three-foot high screen be placed on the frontage of a public way.**
- 4. That the basement can only be used for storage and not for medical offices or examination rooms or labs of any kind.**

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Well done.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: We have a second.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second, yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. MACH: Mr. Selbka.

COMMISSIONER SELBKA: Yes.

MR. MACH: Chairman Siavelis.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Yes.

Congratulations, your variance is granted.

MR. FRANCKE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: With the four conditions.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Good luck.

APPROVED

MR. GLAVIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, now that the two petitions have been fully heard, we now move to the public comment phase.

Is there anybody here in the audience to make a public comment on matters unrelated to the petitions heard today?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, hearing none, great. We'll close that phase and let's move to adjournment. Do we have a --

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I've got a comment.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Oh, yes, yes. Actually, we do have other business I believe.

Mr. Drake?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes. Tonight, we had a good example of professionals coming in, architects and lawyers, and I think overall it was a really smooth meeting. But oftentimes we've had petitioners that come in here, would present their own petition, and we hope that they do okay but oftentimes they have not done certain things that we asked them about, like talking to their neighbors that are nearby or having reviewed the Board packet that's available online. They haven't reviewed the Board packet because oftentimes they don't know it's posted online and you would think common sense would be I should talk to the people that are next door, behind me and across the street, but they assume that sending those letters out and putting the sign up is fulfilling requirement.

I've been talking to Derek about this for a while. My feeling is that the Staff can help our petitioners, especially what I'm going to call laymen, to come in here and be better prepared. It will help our meetings and I think it's a pretty simple thing. One is to encourage them to talk to those neighbors that are nearby, to try to contact them face to face. Then secondly, letting the petitioners know that that Board packet is up on the Village website prior to these meetings and encourage them to look at it before they come in so they've seen comments that the Staff is making and even other comments maybe from neighbors that have come in.

So, I would hope everybody agrees with that. It's kind of a housekeeping thing in my mind, but I'll leave that as open for discussion.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I mean, I think your points are reasonable and make sense.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I don't know where we take it from there, but I think what you're saying is logical and I think it would facilitate a more efficient operation, of which I'm always in favor.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: And my thought is that I make a motion that we insert it into the minutes and ask the Staff to do this. They could come back and say they don't want to do it or they can't for some reason. I mean, this shouldn't be a surprise to Derek, we've been talking about it for a while and I didn't sense any Staff resistance per se, but I think we need to address it formally somehow.

MR. MACH: And Staff did discuss briefly and, yes, this is something that we can incorporate in the application.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Since procedures are being examined, let's

APPROVED

memorialize this in a motion. That way it's properly done and it's properly presented, and this will be an item for, you know, formal discussion.

So, is there a motion consistent with what Mr. Drake addressed?
Can he self-move here, Derek? He probably could, right? He's not the Chairman so he can move?

MR. MACH: It's not specifically listed on the agenda is my hesitation.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: But this is public comment.

MR. MACH: Yes, this is public comment but, you know, as far as a motion, but I don't foresee any issue with, you know, and we'll pursue it.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Okay, let's do this. Let's keep it out of a motion since there isn't sufficient notice, right, for a motion. Restate your two points nice and clearly so we have it, you know, clearly and concisely done and away we go.

Does that work, Tom?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes, it's fine. So, this is not a motion, but I'm going to read the wording as I would suggest that petitioners attempt to speak with the nearby residents affected by their project, including properties next door, across the street, and behind their petition property. In addition, we'd encourage the Staff to advise petitioners that the Board packet with Staff comments and other pertinent information related to the Zoning Board of Appeals review is available to the public on the Village of Arlington Height's website prior to ZBA meetings and provide details on how to access those materials. I could send this to you.

MR. MACH: Thank you, I appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: That's makes total sense. It's a little self-explanatory, you know, having done it, we've heard it, and we know that it goes a lot smoother, but to your point, it's to the folks who don't know that.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Actually, it's for over 100 of these meetings and there have been lots of people that have no idea that material is on the website or don't think to knock on the door of the guy next door who actually --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right. Yes, I agree.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: I'm good with that.

Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: So moved.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON SIAVELIS: Hearing none, we are adjourned, concluded.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.)

APPROVED

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RON LeGRAND, SR., depose and say that
I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of
Illinois; that I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and
that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript to the best of
my knowledge and ability.

RON LeGRAND, SR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF
_____, A.D. 2024.

NOTARY PUBLIC