

RECEIVED

OCT 3 1991

DEVELOPMENT DEPT.
ZONING

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

BEFORE THE DU PAGE COUNTY
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

IN THE MATTER OF:)

Petition for a Conditional Use and)
Variations for the Property Located)
on the Northwest Corner of St.)
Charles and Bloomingdale Roads.)

) Petition

) #4011-91

) SCHOLKE/PRAISE
FELLOWSHIP CHURCH

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had and testimony
taken at the public hearing of the above-entitled
cause, before the DU PAGE COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF
APPEALS, held on Monday, the 23rd day of September,
A.D., 1991, at the hour of 7:30 o'clock P.M., at
the DuPage County Court House, 505 North County
Farm Road, Wheaton, Illinois.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

MR. THOMAS MILLER, Acting Chairman.

MR. EUGENE JEKA, Member.

MR. HAROLD PLETCHER, Member.

County Court Reporters, Inc.

219 NAPERVILLE ROAD
WHEATON, IL 60187
(708) 653-1622

DuPage Reporting Service, Inc. Court Reporting Services
Youker Court Reporters

OAK BROOK OFFICE
(708) 654-1121

KANE COUNTY OFFICE
(708) 897-8852

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: (continued)

MR. FRANK D. BERNARD, Member.

MR. J. VINCENT CROWLEY, Member.

MR. ROBERT J. KARTHOLL, Member.

MR. DALIP BAMMI, Secretary.

ALSO PRESENT:

MR. HAROLD E. SCHOCKE, President, ABC Ltd.,
appeared as Petitioner.

MR. CHARLES R. MUIR, Director of Architecture,
ABC Ltd.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: We'll call this meeting to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals appointed by the County Board from various townships to hold public hearings on petitions filed with the Zoning Department. We are a recommending body only. No decision will be made this evening. On October 8th we will hold our recommendation meeting over at 421 County Farm Road in Room 2E at 7:30 P.M. at which time we will make our recommendation. And we will review this case and others and make our recommendations on them, which will be forwarded to the County Board who will hand down the final decision. If any additional information is required this evening or anyone wishes to furnish any additional information regarding this petition, it must be filed with the Zoning Office over in the Complex no later than 4:30 P.M. on 9/27.

Tonight our petition is Number 4011-91. It was published in the Daily Herald on 9/6. And it reads as follows --

However, before we go into that, our pro-

cedure for this evening will be first we will hear from the petitioner. After the petitioner has made their presentation, the board and staff will ask questions. After those questions are answered we will ask for questions from the audience. After those questions are answered we will then give the audience an opportunity -- all those who wish to testify in favor and/or opposed or make a general statement. After all that is completed we will then give the petitioner an opportunity to make a final statement and close the hearing.

Tonight's petition is to consider a conditional use for the continued operation of an existing religious institution and to allow parking in a residence district, variation to allow less than 10% landscaping within the new off-street parking facility, and variation to allow parking to 5 feet from the rear property line all while located in an R-4, Single-Family Residence District on the property which is located on the northwest corner of St. Charles and Bloomingdale Roads. The petitioner is Harold Schocke, ABC Limited, Post Office Box 3460, Barrington, Illinois, for the

Praise Fellowship Church. Is the petitioner represented by Mr. Schocke? Are you going to be the only one to testify?

MR. SCHOCKE: There may be questions from Charles Muir, the architect.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Why don't you both stand and we'll swear you both in; and then as you speak give your name and address and your affiliation with the petition.

(Whereupon two witnesses were duly sworn by the Notary.)

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I'm sorry, I said October 8th for our recommendation meeting. It's October 10th. It's on a Thursday. I must have looked at the wrong calendar tonight. Are you going to have some exhibits to present?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Will you present them and have Mr. Bammi, our secretary, mark them for identification?

MR. SCHOCKE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Any of the exhibits that you

present we keep.

MR. SCHOCKE: That's why they're not in nice frames. I know that. No use putting a \$50 frame in your attic or storeroom. Mr. Bammi will mark them?

MR. BAMMI: Is this the order you're going to present them?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes.

MR. BAMMI: Petitioner's Exhibit Number 1 is a plat of survey. Petitioner's Exhibit Number 2 is the geometric plan, site plan. Petitioner's Exhibit Number 3, utility grading and soil erosion control plan. Petitioner's Exhibit Number 4 is also labeled the geometric plan. This is dealing more with drainage, is that what it is?

MR. SCHOCKE: Well, we're showing one that we have colored in to highlight different areas. We have two parcels.

MR. BAMMI: Okay. I think we -- There's no additional information here.

MR. SCHOCKE: No.

MR. BAMMI: Why don't we leave that one aside.

MR. SCHOCKE: Fine.

MR. BAMMI: Fine.

(Whereupon the documents referred to
were marked as Petitioner's Exhibits
1 through 3.)

H A R O L D S C H O C K E,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Thank you, gentlemen. The reason we're here is I already stated it, but I will go over it briefly. The first one is the plat of survey. We won't spend much time on this other than the fact that I wanted to show you that this is Parcel 1 over here, which is a narrow strip that's currently part of the Parcel 1. However, no development has occurred on this parcel, Parcel 2. But as we're proposing to work this over into a parking lot, we have to make some changes in here. And that's why I wanted to show this with the line in it.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Schocke, could you stand on the other side so the people in the audience could see it?

MR. SCHOCKE: Sure. Because we're going to be making some proposed changes in here, which we'll show in the next one which is much more vivid, I really wanted to draw your attention to this one line over here which is really the line that separates the two parcels to show you it's just a narrow strip here we're considering for additional parking, okay? This one here is the one that really kind of highlights it. The changes that we're recommending here would be the shaded area which is kind of a gray. And that line that I am talking about would go right on up through here which would get into parts of Parcel 1. All of this over here is currently there. And this is the proposed parking lot.

One of the variances that we're asking for is along the north border of this. And that's where there is railroad tracks, power lines of someone's, and then they have just recently put in a new underground huge water pipe this spring. And that is to get water from Lake Michigan out in this area. This is all down in here. Then there's that trail that's in the back here too. So we have almost like a nature

or natural boundary in the back. And the rest of the property that adjoins it or abuts this property even after you get past this wide easement here would be R-4. This area in here we're proposing that we make quite a bit of changes in here to handle our drainage situation with the current impervious areas which would be up in here because we are making some changes. And then there is this additional impervious area that we would be adding in here. Because of the nature of this back here, we were asking for this variance to just be 5 foot. Currently that's what this is back here. We just want to continue this line on around to follow the same line that we had that currently exists up here. That would be for the 5.

The other variances we're asking for was in some areas we would be on an aggregate basis a little bit less than the 10% green space area that's required in your code. However, in an attempt to satisfy the water detention areas, we have put planters in with some green areas in here. And I think we have got that all broke out. What shade do I have that on? Here we go. On the landscaping

when you look at the new parking south of the existing northwest lot, which would be this -- this is the existing right here and this is the new parking right here -- we do have our 10% there. On the new parking on Parcel 2, the property west of the existing property which would be all of this right in here, we calculate that out and that comes to 7%. And in the over-build on the west end of the existing, which would be this right in here -- and this is where the property line goes up between those two parcels; and this is where we're having to change the grade a little bit and we put parking in there -- there's a little narrow strip in there that does not have any green in it. So it -- I put that in as zero. And I have got it all broken out on square footages. But the aggregate average on that then comes to 6.1%.

Now, what's driving all of this need for additional parking is that the existing fixed sanctuary setting is 836 people in the current sanctuary. Then we have two overflow units that's incorporated in that building. The first one seats 130 and the second one which is an overflow area seats 532. So it is con-

ceivable and in special services they have had full of 1498 people; in round numbers that's 1500, you know, people. And when you look at DuPage County's parking seat ratio, which is your code, one parking for every four, potential parking required for that seating is 375 cars. With this proposal that we have here, we have got a total space for 380 cars. So it's a little bit more -- Excuse me. Let me back up. I made a mistake. Then we put in five for employees. So that makes your code come up to 380. What we have in here is 397 cars on a proposed petition here.

Now, I guess in planning and assemblages we would take a little bit of an exception with your code not stating that yours is wrong, ours is better or anything except that we're maybe a little more conservative. We always worked on the basis one car for every three people especially in the society in which we live in today which is much more mobile, you know, than it used to be when certain segments of the community would walk to church. And if we used our recommendations, we'd be coming back in saying we need parking for 500 cars or really 499. However,

that's not possible on this site. So we have got in the 397. So that is what is driving the need for additional parking for the current facility that is there at this time.

What I could do, I know some of you were taking notes. I have this already made up if you would like to have copies of this.

MR. BAMMI: Do you want to submit it as an exhibit?

MR. SCHOCKE: Why don't we. Let's just submit this as an exhibit.

MR. BAMMI: We will mark this as Petitioner's Exhibit Number 4.

(Whereupon the document referred to was marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 4.)

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes, because I think it goes well to have that. I don't know how many I have got there, but there's enough.

MR. BAMMI: Do you want to go over your Exhibit Number 3?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes. If you have any questions, we will come back to this one. This plan here really

is showing our engineering work where we're coming back.-- and I don't whether you folks can see that over where you are sitting at, but how we're putting this detention pond in. And all the engineering is on this sheet here. It is an exhibit. Was this mailed to them, Charlie? So they have got copies of that. This was mailed, so you hopefully have had a chance to review that. It's really rather straight forward. I can go through -- I can go into other areas of this, but I prefer at this point to see if you have any questions and then I can answer questions that you may have. And it may be a more fruitful discussion of it rather than me presenting more -- continuing on with the presentation.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does that conclude your presentation?

MR. SCHOCKE: That would be my presentation then.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Bammi?

MR. BAMMI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Go back to the railroad that's behind you. Is that the one

which the County is converting into a prairie path?
I believe it is.

MR. SCHOCKE: That is true, yes. And it goes down there for a little ways, and it branches off where the railroad goes on straight.

MR. BAMMI: Right. That's right.

MR. SCHOCKE: And like he said, there's what, a 3-foot diameter water line they just put in there plus they have got high transmission wires all on the same easement there. The railroad that was there, they did take that up.

MR. BAMMI: Yes, that's correct. That's a Great Western and it's been acquired by the County. It's going to be a prairie path all the way through. On the north of that, the prairie path, would be the single-family residential, is that correct?

MR. SCHOCKE: Well, the prairie path that goes between the church property and the property to the north, that's R-4.

MR. BAMMI: That's what I meant. That's single-family residential.

MR. SCHOCKE: That's correct. Across the street

on Bloomingdale is R-4. To the west, which would be right here, adjacent to it is R-4. Across St. Charles is R-4.

MR. BAMMI: Right. I guess I understand your -- or what your rationale for extending this line for the parking, making it 5 feet. And 5 feet is not enough to do any landscaping or anything at all. However, it seems to me that one could move this back and increase the space here. Is that not possible?

MR. SCHOCKE: I think that would be possible, but in my opinion from an aesthetic value, that would be a second choice rather than a first choice. For one reason when you get back here, this is a rather steep bank.

MR. BAMMI: I understand.

MR. SCHOCKE: And it's been allowed to just grow in a natural state.

MR. BAMMI: What would you say is the height differential between where the parking will be and the top of the bank?

MR. SCHOCKE: The prairie path?

MR. BAMMI: Yes.

MR. SCHOCKE: Charlie?

C H A R L E S R. M U I R,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

It's on the next one.

MR. SCHOCKE: It's on the drawing here.

MR. MUIR: Yes.

MR. BAMMI: The finish grades?

MR. SCHOCKE: That's 783, 781. So there's two feet right down here. Up on this end, which I guess we shouldn't even talk about that because that is already in place. It's just right down here. It'll run between 2 and 3 feet.

MR. BAMMI: Which really is not much. I mean when you talk about residential across from the prairie path, you know, you will be able to see ~~as~~ standing there you will be able to see the parking lot and the cars and everything. And I think one of the things that we always strive for is to provide some sort of a visual buffer, a meaningful buffer that can be achieved through either berming and combination landscaping or heavy landscaping. So I would offer

it to you, my thought that you ought to look into at least giving us 12-foot landscaped, you know, corridor there as a minimum if not more especially in light of the fact you do seem to have land to the south where you could provide additional parking without affecting any setbacks.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: You want to state your name and address for the record?

MR. MUIR: Charles Muir, 0 N. 029 Leonard Street, Winfield.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: What is your affiliation with this?

MR. MUIR: Architect.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: The architect?

MR. MUIR: Yes. I just wanted to mention that part of the detention pond area there is included in this. One of the things was having enough pervious area included with the pond, the direct water from the parking lot into the pond. And that's why in this area that was left as part of that.

MR. BAMMI: Well, it seems to me -- I don't know how the drainage lines will be, the layout of your

MR. BAMMI: That's a very significant amount that will be created. So I would encourage you to look into that also more closely. And it's just a question of meeting the 10%, but I think at least to the overall design aspect which in my opinion will also be an improvement to your facility.

MR. SCHOCKE: Well, engineering that we have already done it, and we have explored a lot of possible ways to approach it. I don't believe we can meet the requirements that's going to be required for detention if we -- The only area I know of that we can bring and get up to 10% is we'll have to sacrifice parking spots.

MR. BAMMI: Well, you are 17 more than what we required. Even though you say that you need that many more, it seems to me that you have been operating with the existing building for some time now, right?

MR. SCHOCKE: They're operating with the existing building with two services. They can't hold single services.

MR. BAMMI: What you are creating now is a scenario now where we -- where they could have it on a single

service?

MR. SCHOCKE: That's a preferable way to do it. They are parking in here now. And they have for a couple of years when it looks like they won't get hung up in there because it's just sod. Nice dry weather like we have had all summer -- the Summer of 1991 they have parked in there all summer.

MR. BAMMI: Well, our numbers were based on actual on-site review of what was happening in the County, you know, for the churches. Again it's an average number. So recognizing it's an average, however keeping in mind it is a realistic number based on what we observed in the field. And I think they have a cushion of about 10 additional spaces which to me would be sufficient. And you have 17. So if it means that you are taking a few spaces off, you might want to consider that. When I talk about 10%, one of my concerns always has been when we have strips like this, they look nice on paper with a green color but really, you know it as an architect, you are not going to be able to grow anything in there. What we are seeking is some meaningful break with landscaped areas.

And I think that's what I would encourage you to explore. That's all I have got, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Crowley?

MR. CROWLEY: Yes. Mr. Schocke, would you define once again for the board what the objective of this petition is?

MR. SCHOCKE: Okay. The objective is we're wanting to build more parking areas to accommodate the seating capacity that already exists in the church currently. And since they now own this piece of property and we have engineered it in such a manner that we have it this way, we can take looks and see what alternatives we can do that we just discussed. But the objective is to be able to handle the people that come to the services. And right now we can't do it. They're turning people away because they can't park them. There is no place to park their cars.

MR. CROWLEY: Is this only for the one service, one single service?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes, sir. It'll be for the evening service that they would be turning people away. And then for the -- Which would be the second service on

Sunday morning. People are more inclined to go to the later service than the early service. So that's why they have had to come in with a second service because they couldn't accommodate the parking. In other words, their constraint is not the seating capacity of the facility. The constraint is the parking of getting the people there.

MR. CROWLEY: How many services do you have then? You have two, one in the evening and --

MR. SCHOCKE: Two in the morning, one in the evening, and midweek services.

MR. CROWLEY: What is your total enrollment of the church? Is it 1500?

MR. SCHOCKE: I can't answer that. I am the developer. I am not a member of the church. But I know that they have a huge Sunday school. How many children that is, I don't know. Do we have that?

MR. MUIR: I don't have that statistic, no.

MR. SCHOCKE: If we would have that, we would be back in some old consulting board we have got. I don't have that at all.

MR. CROWLEY: You're indicating here a need for

MR. SCHOCKE: Dollars. \$297,000. And if we engineer it to where we can go back and accommodate the 10% for the landscaping and if we took these about a dozen parking spots there and we came down here the 10 foot required limit and then back up, well, that's going to take some work because that's going -- we're just going to lose those. Otherwise we'll -- we'd have to change all of this down through there. We essentially have the same cost and spaces as we did. There's not much way to change that.

MR. CROWLEY: And that's giving up less than 10% for landscaping to do this is what you are saying.

MR. SCHOCKE: Well, the only way I can get landscaping in there is -- Also there's two areas. One is to take it away out of the parking areas. And the other way is to take it out of here. And if I do that, that's not going to pass. That'll get turned down for water control. So we have got this so it just meets the minimums now with the required minimums on that. So there is only one place for it to come from on this additional ground. That's in here, and that would be from parking areas.

MR. CROWLEY: Speaking of minimums, how did you calculate your retention area then? What was that predicated on?

MR. SCHOCKE: We had an engineering firm do that. Do you know, Charlie? I don't.

MR. MUIR: That is designed on all the impervious areas of the two parcels combined. There is an existing detention pond there now which meets the requirements of this area here. When they originally built the building, this parcel was not included in that. It was allowed by the County. So now the detention here takes care of the whole site, both completely, Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. So I guess one hand dictates the other. You have maxed out the number of parking spaces and building and, therefore, you can only have so many parking spaces to meet the requirements of the detention pond.

MR. CROWLEY: It's all predicated on normal rainfall or --

MR. MUIR: Well, it's all calculated out by the requirements of the County as far as -- And all that information would go in at time of permit acquisition.

But the engineering firm has met with the County about that. So the figures have been shared there.

MR. CROWLEY: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Bernard?

MR. BERNARD: Mr. Schocke, you say that you need all these parking spaces for approximately 1500 people so as to allow a single service in the A.M. hours.

MR. SCHOCKE: That's correct.

MR. BERNARD: What's the hardship in having two services?

MR. SCHOCKE: Well, I think there's two things. One is in Evangelical churches -- and I don't want to sound like a preacher -- My father is a pastor, so I will go into a little area that way.

MR. BERNARD: Since you are not -- Well, go ahead.

MR. SCHOCKE: Let me finish. It's always been more attractive to have one service because of the way of the presentations you have. Given a choice there is no church that I am aware of that would ever have two services if they could do it in one. In other

words, they go to two services and three services if they're given to it by some type of constraint.

MR. BERNARD: Well, okay. I don't want to get into a religious debate, but we know there are churches who have four services on a Sunday. The point being you either have to limit the number of people that attend, which is a very poor way of doing it and we don't want to do that, or you have to get a bigger parcel of land which apparently is not within your area, or you have to have multiple services. As I see it that's the choice because I concur with what has been said previously. I think you have too severe a parking situation. And I am not comfortable with the amount of variance you are asking for a setback. So I just leave you with the thought that in my opinion one of your options is to have multiple services. And I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Bammi, have you had any comment from the Environmental Concerns Department regarding this?

MR. BAMMI: Yes. They have stated to us that at this point they can grant preliminary approval.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Schocke, immediately north of your property isn't there a high line that runs through that, and then on the other side is the railroad track?

MR. SCHOCKE: I believe that the high line is right on that easement with the railroad. It is not on the church's --

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I know. It's on the railroad right-of-way. But isn't the high line -- Isn't your property line and then there's the high line and then there's the prairie path on the other side of that?

MR. SCHOCKE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: And there's vegetation growing in all amongst the high line, isn't there?

MR. SCHOCKE: Absolutely. And it's in a natural state. In other words -- Which is good because it allows wildlife, birds and etc. to habitat in there. And that is probably because of the nature of the easement and who owns it, which with the high line there and what was an abandoned railroad, it's just being allowed to grow up between our property line or the church's property line and the path itself.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: How far would you say the path is from your property line?

MR. SCHOCKE: Ten feet.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: It's only 10 feet?

MR. SCHOCKE: I think. Is it about 10, 12 feet in there?

MR. MUIR: He's talking about the path.

MR. SCHOCKE: I'm talking about the path itself. If you walk off the edge of the property line and go up to that path --

MR. MUIR: I do not know that.

MR. SCHOCKE: I have never measured.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: The railroad is only within 10 feet of your property line?

MR. SCHOCKE: Beg pardon?

CHAIRMAN MILLER: The railroad is within 10 feet of your property line because the prairie path is going down the center of the tracks.

MR. SCHOCKE: It is close.

MR. MUIR: That is something that we can verify.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I just was curious. I have nothing further.

MR. SCHOCKE: Would you know there's a church here? Yes, because the steeple goes up 40 feet in the air.

MR. PLETCHER: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Jeka?

MR. JEKA: Yes, I guess you couldn't answer for me, can you, how often does the church have to use the overflow seating? Does that occur only on holidays, every Sunday for the second service, or during certain seasons?

MR. SCHOCKE: It's in two segments. They're using the first one rather consistently now. And, of course, the real constraint is at this point in time the -- is probably more intense in the educational area, in other words, the classrooms for the children, than it is in the sanctuary itself.

MR. JEKA: Well, let me see if I can understand. First of all do you mean that typically you're not using the second overflow seating, the available expandable overflow seating two?

MR. SCHOCKE: Not with two services, no. We'd have to come in. If we were in one service, yes,

going to be a constraint.

MR. JEKA: Yes, sir.

MR. MUIR: Could I make a comment about that?

MR. JEKA: Sure.

MR. MUIR: I would just add to that when the building was originally designed, you would take on "x" number of people to fixed seats, and that's what the parking was provided for. But as the church continues to grow, those overflow rooms were made for that possibility, that one day more people would continue to come to the church. And when you would come to that time, then you would definitely have to expand your parking area to meet the needs of the additional people.

MR. JEKA: With two services as there now exists, what is the typical median attendance at the larger of the two services?

MR. SCHOCKE: It is running around 900. But you have got to take -- That's more than the sanctuary will hold. You have got to remember they're breaking up into classes because they have a Sunday school section there. During that part of the services is

not when you have most problem, which is typical in a lot of -- not all, but a lot of these Evangelical churches. You also come back in and have what you call a worship service, and you empty out the classrooms except the toddlers and the infants, and you bring them into the worship service. And that's the reason why so many of the churches like to have one service, not for the Sunday school part. And that's not -- I mean Christian education space will impact that first. It's when you want to bring everyone together into a central point for a worship service which we think is important.

MR. JEKA: When you bring everybody to a central --

MR. SCHOCKE: Which would be the sanctuary.

MR. JEKA: That would include the Sunday school and the other persons.

MR. SCHOCKE: That's correct. And now if you are bringing them all in, with the exception of toddlers and infants, why, then there are 900 to 1,000 right now. And we don't -- And with the parking, you know, they have got here now, it just doesn't even come close to accommodating it. You have got

to remember they don't have this here.

MR. JEKA: How many new spaces are you proposing to add?

MR. MUIR: Should I read this off?

MR. SCHOCKE: Go ahead, you're closer to it.

MR. MUIR: The existing Parcel 1 has 186. They're limiting some in this over-build of 14. And then proposed Parcel 1 and 2 spaces being created is 225, which gives a total of 397.

MR. JEKA: What was the net additional -- new additional spaces? Two twenty-five?

MR. MUIR: Two twenty-five.

MR. JEKA: And the current is what?

MR. MUIR: One eighty-six minus fourteen. So you are talking 172.

MR. JEKA: So you're proposing to more than double the current space?

MR. SCHOCKE: I really think 14 ought to come off the 225, not the 186.

MR. MUIR: Well, it works either way.

MR. JEKA: Okay. But you're proposing to more than double current number of parking units.

MR. SCHOCKE: That's correct. And this is all consistent with the master plan that was done for the church originally when this church was built in '85 and '86.

MR. JEKA: On the drawing I notice that you will have to remove a number of very mature looks like large maples, one or two sycamores, and a lot of very mature maples to expand that detention area, is that correct?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes, some of these would have to go because we have got to take quite a bit of soil out of there. But then we're turning around and coming back with -- well, this is not a landscape plan per se, but we're showing areas of landscaping around this pond, this detention basin.

MR. JEKA: Do you know enough of the detention logistics to know if there was a 10% reduction of the number of spaces whether you would be able to save a substantial number of those trees along the outer edge of the detention area, the area that looks to me on this map to be the west or nearest the parking area?

MR. MUIR: This becomes an inlet then into the detention area along up to -- There's a little creek now on the property. And they have expanded that, and the little creek goes into the existing detention pond. So it's being expanded.

MR. JEKA: And that runs along the path of those trees?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes. I don't think that -- There might be -- If we came back just a few parking areas to get into that 10% landscape code, maybe four if you didn't kill them with the machinery. Because you are also going to have to reshape all this. These would -- Because this is the inlet, that's just the natural lay of the ground. And those will go too due to any basin work at all. So you're looking at maybe you might save, if you can keep the equipment off them -- Now, for oak trees, you're not going to save them.

MR. JEKA: Could I ask you -- Well, I fully appreciate your understanding about the numbers and the logistics. But I know that you are not a member of the parish or elder or executive or the like. I think

it would be helpful to me if we could get some type of a written statement from some official of the church as to the typical number of total people present at the larger of the two services, what you would anticipate if there was one service, and the maximum. That's so we can get a little better idea of numerical logistics because I think you're saying that that really is the core of your hardship argument, the numbers. And so I think it becomes pretty important to get as close an idea of those numbers as we possibly can. Would that be agreeable?

MR. SCHOCKE: Yes. I can do that. We have that information in our office. I just didn't bring that information with me. We have got -- well, we've got all their financial data and all their attendance data from 1982 to last year, up through last year. I do have it. I just don't have it in hand.

MR. JEKA: I think we need to have it in some type of evidentiary form. And most usable -- We need it in the most usable form as we can to ascertain the situation.

MR. MUIR: That was by -- You were talking about

the 27th?

CHAIRMAN MILLER: That's Friday.

MR. SCHOCKE: Now, can we format that on like a two- or three-page report and just mail it in to you, or how do you want that?

MR. JEKA: I will defer to Mr. Bammi. So long as it's reasonably evidentiary for our purposes.

MR. SCHOCKE: They even had it broke down by ages of children.

MR. JEKA: Can we defer that? Mr. Kartholl has some questions also with respect to that. Why don't we let him get through that and then at the close of this we can discuss the format of the additional information with Mr. Bammi's input, okay?

MR. SCHOCKE: Sure.

MR. JEKA: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think I can interject at this time we seem to be getting into a number of things that you are going to have to work out; and there's no way you are going to get it done by Friday, which is the closing date for additional information being supplied. I suggest that you write a letter to Mr.

Bammi requesting that this be deferred from our October recommendation meeting to our November recommendation meeting which would be on November 14th. That way that'll give you time to work out any problems with the engineering and get together with the staff to work out landscaping problems and give you also an opportunity to come up with some of this other information that the members are asking for. I know you are probably anxious to get going on this, but try to get all this stuff put together by Friday is going to be a little difficult.

MR. SCHOCKE: Well, I don't think so because we have got it all.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Have you met with the staff on your landscaping?

MR. SCHOCKE: No, we have not met with them yet. But it won't take long to put that information together that we were just discussing. That's probably two hours worth. Since we have already got it, it won't take long.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: It's a suggestion. Let's see if you can get it all -- all the stuff by Friday.

If you can, that's fine.

MR. SCHOCKE: The adjustments on this we could come back with some overlays on that because we have already got it on computers.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I suggest that you meet with staff as rapidly as possible. Mr. Kartholl?

MR. KARTHOLL: Yes. Just as follow-up on the same line here. Ordinarily we have someone who has first-hand information and can engage in somewhat of a dialogue with us about the use of the property generally, in this case the details about the church. And I would very much like to know information about members of the church and where they come from and where they would go if they didn't go to this church, when services are held, when classes are held, who attends the services, when they attend services, who attends the classes. There would obviously be answers to these questions that would trigger additional questions, which might help us help you shape this petition. I don't think that we can rely on your computer-generated information on statistics. I would like a letter from the people that you represent giving