

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2025**

Members Present: Peter Vargulich
Zachary Ewoldt
Jeffrey Funke
Gary Gruber
Rita Payleitner

Members Absent: Colleen Wiese
John Fitzgerald
Dave Rosenberg
Gina Lawson

Also Present: Ellen Johnson, Planner II
Bruce Sylvester, Assistant Director CD-Planning & Engineering
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Chair Vargulich called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Chair Vargulich called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the November 18, 2025 meeting of the Plan Commission

Motion was made by Mr. Funke, seconded by Ms. Payleitner and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2025 Plan Commission meeting.

**5. The Shops at Pheasant Run, 4051 E Main Street (SC Landman LLC)
Application for Concept plan**

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

6. Public Comment

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

- a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, December 16, 2025 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, January 6, 2026 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Wednesday, January 21, 2026 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- b. Planning & Development Committee
Monday, December 8, 2025 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, January 12, 2026 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

10. Adjournment at 7:59 p.m.



Planet Depos®
We Make It *Happen™*

Transcript of Hearing - The Shops at Pheasant Run, 4051 East Main Street

Date: December 2, 2025

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION

-----X

In Re: _____ :

The Shops at Pheasant Run, :

4051 East Main Street (SC :

Landman, LLC) . :

-----X

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

St. Charles, Illinois

Tuesday, December 2, 2025

7:00 p.m. CST

Job No.: 564184

Pages 1 - 64

Reported by: Kristine Wesner, CVR

1 Proceedings of the ST. CHARLES PLAN
2 COMMISSION, held at the location of:

3
4 CITY OF ST. CHARLES

5 COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6 2 East Main Street

7 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

8 630.377.4400
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Pursuant to agreement, before Kristine
23 Wesner, Certified Verbatim Reporter, and Notary
24 Public in and for the State of Illinois.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

A P P E A R A N C E S

PRESENT:

PETER VARGULICH, Chairman

JEFF FUNKE, Vice Chair

ZACH EWOLDT, Commissioner

RITA PAYLEITNER, Commissioner

GARY GRUBER, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

Ellen Johnson, Planner

Bruce Sylvester, Asst. Dir. of CD -

Planning & Engineering

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C O N T E N T S

AGENDA ITEM	PASS/FAIL	PAGE
Shops at Pheasant Run	No Vote	xx

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Good evening,
3 everyone. Call to order the St. Charles Plan
4 Commission.

5 Colleen Wiese?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt?

8 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Here.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke?

10 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Here.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber?

12 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Here.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Dave Rosenberg?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gina Lawson?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Rita Payleitner?

20 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Here.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Awesome.

22 All right. Pledge of Allegiance,

23 everyone? Thank you.

24 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Thank
2 you.

3 We have presentation of the meeting
4 minutes from November 18th. Is there a motion to
5 approve?

6 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: I'll make a motion.

7 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Second.

8 COMMISSIONER ROSENBERG: Motion and a
9 second.

10 All those in favor?

11 (Chorus of ayes.)

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Opposed? Motion
13 passes.

14 Item 5, the Shops of Pheasant Run.
15 This is a concept plan submittal by SC Landman,
16 LLC, located at 4051 East Main Street. The
17 purpose of the concept plan review is to allow an
18 applicant to obtain informal input on a conceptual
19 development prior to filing zoning applications
20 and preparing detailed plans and drawings. The
21 concept plan process also serves as a forum for
22 citizens and neighboring property owners to ask
23 questions and express their views of this
24 potential development.

1 The procedure tonight will be to start
2 with comments from staff, followed by the
3 applicant's presentation. After that, the Plan
4 Commission will ask questions that they may have.
5 Then members of the public, if they wish to speak,
6 will have a chance to do so, and then, finally,
7 Plan Commission members will provide their final
8 feedback.

9 The Plan Commission does not take any
10 action to approve or deny a project at this stage.
11 After this meeting, the plan will be discussed at
12 the Planning and Development Committee of City
13 Council on Monday, December 8th. If the applicant
14 decides to pursue this project, zoning
15 applications will be filed, and a public hearing
16 will be held with notice provided to all property
17 owners.

18 I ask that anyone who wishes to speak,
19 please be recognized, and then stand at the
20 lectern. Please state your name for the court
21 reporter, spell your last name, and provide your
22 address.

23 Ellen? Thanks.

24 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

1 SC Landman, LLC has filed a concept
2 plan proposing redevelopment of the remaining
3 33 acres of the Pheasant Run Resort property. Two
4 site plans have been submitted for consideration,
5 and the ownership team is here tonight to present.
6 And I will mention that this is concept-level
7 review. Although the two site plans submitted do
8 give quite a bit of a detailed review for each
9 individual lot, but we're looking at this from a
10 conceptual basis at this point.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure. Thank you.

12 All right. If the applicant would like
13 to present --

14 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Thank you. Good
15 evening. For the record, my name is Katie Jahnke
16 Dale -- J-A-H-N-K-E; Dale, D-A-L-E -- from the law
17 firm of DLA Piper, which is located at
18 444 West Lake Street, Chicago. Along with my
19 colleague, Peter NeCastro, we represent the
20 applicant in this matter.

21 The applicant is present here tonight
22 and is an affiliate of Vequity. Their name is up
23 there on the screen, which is also a
24 Chicagoland-based developer. The screen shows the

1 over -- or the project team. Like, as staff
2 mentioned, we have, you know, put a lot of thought
3 and detail into this, even though it is a concept
4 review plan, but the slide is our full, kind of,
5 suite of consultants, many with local experience
6 here in St. Charles.

7 That -- I'm going to have, I believe,
8 Spaceco, come up and do a brief overview of the
9 site plan. Then I'll come back up and talk about
10 the relief that we would be looking for as part of
11 the PUD, and then, most importantly, we want to
12 hear your questions and comments tonight. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

15 MR. MCGOVERN: Good evening. My name's
16 Brian McGovern -- M-C-G-O-V-E-R-N -- with Spaceco
17 at 9575 West Higgins Road, Suite 700, in Rosemont,
18 Illinois. We are the civil engineers on the
19 project, so we would be all over some higher-level
20 site planning and engineering comments tonight.

21 So the site plan is 12 lots for retail
22 at Main Street and Kautz Road in St. Charles.
23 Right now, we're at 12 lots with two accesses to
24 North Avenue, one access to, recently constructed,

1 Pheasant Run Drive, and one access to Kautz Road.
2 The site is 34 acres with stormwater provided at
3 the south side of the site. Approximately, the --
4 we have water, sanitary, and storm/sewer
5 connections available to us. The site will follow
6 the Kane County stormwater ordinance.

7 The two connections to East Main Street
8 will -- will require an IDOT permit. At this --
9 at this time, we're obviously at the preliminary
10 and conceptual phases of design, but that's just
11 kind of a high-level overview of the site plan.

12 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Okay. Like, staff
13 mentioned as well, we have a second site plan
14 that, overall, is very much similar to the one
15 that was just presented. One has 12 lots; one has
16 15, which gets me to the zoning that we would be
17 seeking for a way to file the formal application,
18 which would be a PUD. We're not looking to change
19 the BR zoning and all the uses fit within the
20 permitted -- or the allowed uses in the BR zoning,
21 just kind of given the overall size of the site,
22 33, 34 acres, approximately, the PUD would allow
23 for us to give the comfort that is needed to do
24 the significant infrastructure upfront in order to

1 prepare the site for development.

2 And then there are a few preliminary
3 deviations or allowances that we'd be seeking or
4 have identified already, one of which is to get
5 preliminary approval for some drive-through
6 instances [sic]. Again, that would be just to
7 allow for us to go to the market, try to find
8 tenants or users.

9 Future site plans would come back --
10 typical with the -- the PUD process. There is a
11 chance, because we are out there, actively
12 marketing the site, that when we come back with
13 the application itself, we could have some site
14 plans that we'd be ready to present for users that
15 are pretty far along in discussions with.

16 And with that, we are all here. We
17 have all of our consultants, as well as
18 representatives for the applicant here, for
19 questions or comments. But thank you so much for
20 your time tonight.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just a quick
22 question.

23 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah?

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Which of those

1 site plans do you feel you're leaning towards, at
2 this point, in the interests of the property?
3 Because -- I mean, one end is definitely adding
4 another dealership, which is, you know, all within
5 the allowable uses, but that's a pretty different
6 use than what's in that same area on the other
7 property.

8 COMMISSIONER ROSENBERG: I'll be
9 honest, today is December 2nd. It may be a
10 different answer than it is on December 3rd, so
11 I'm not sure if we could say which one today. We
12 are very actively out there, trying to, you know,
13 it's to no one's benefit to have it sit vacant for
14 long. About half of the infrastructure costs are
15 going to be spent upfront, we hope, next year. So
16 we're -- we're very active in the market, trying
17 to find users. And so if we knew which one we
18 were leaning towards, we would have taken one of
19 the slides out, but I think we're still -- still
20 working on that.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. And then I
22 have a question related to your narrative on the
23 project. You identified that you will be
24 potentially looking at financial support because

1 of extraordinary costs. What exactly does that
2 mean?

3 MS. JAHNKE DALE: So --

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: At this point.

5 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah. So we're in
6 preliminary discussions. We have a consultant and
7 are actively, as recent as today, pulling together
8 the application. So we're in very early talks
9 with -- with staff about that. But we would be
10 looking at -- we're within a TIF district. A lot
11 of -- there's a lot of TIF-eligible costs that we
12 would be incurring around site prep, environmental
13 on the site, other public improvements that we
14 would be providing, but we're very early in that
15 process.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And to the -- our,
17 you know, rough order of magnitude, what kind of
18 dollars are we talking about?

19 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Ballpark, call it 3,
20 3.5 million. It's, I believe, roughly less than
21 20 percent of -- of the overall.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay.

23 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Any questions?

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Other questions?

1 Other -- from anybody?

2 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Yeah. I've got a
3 couple questions. You know, I see -- and this,
4 obviously, preliminary, right? It's conceptual,
5 and you're trying to get as many -- it looks
6 like -- as many drive-throughs as possible on the
7 site. I mean, how many do you have conceptually
8 on there? I didn't count them.

9 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Hold on really
10 quickly.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Eight?

12 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Five?

13 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah. I believe it's
14 around seven or eight. Some of those, like I
15 said, we may come back initially with, if we have,
16 you know, the users locked in. Otherwise, we
17 would just be looking for the upfront -- the
18 permission, so we can find those users, and then
19 come back with the details at that later date.

20 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: And, you know -- and
21 I understand the whole -- I'm an architect myself.
22 And I know that, you know, in today's market, you
23 know, drive-throughs are, you know, the -- you
24 know, they're the -- they're the development.

1 They're the -- the popular archetype.

2 You know, my concern is, right now, is
3 that this is very, you know, auto driven. You
4 know, I get it. You have the car dealerships next
5 door, but it would be nice if you got great
6 opportunities for design for the site, whether
7 it's pedestrian, creating -- I think there's a
8 hotel that you have planned in one -- the hotel?

9 MS. JAHNKE DALE: That's one of the
10 uses that we --

11 (Simultaneous speech.)

12 MS. JAHNKE DALE: -- have listed as a
13 possibility.

14 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Just something to
15 think about conceptually or, you know, maybe you
16 have this really rigid retention pond. Maybe
17 create something nice, you know, walking paths or,
18 you know, areas that people who are, you know,
19 staying at the hotel, they can go to -- walk to
20 one of these restaurants that you have and, you
21 know, kind of cohesively bring this site together.

22 Because, right now, it's just -- you
23 know, how many parking spaces can get on there?
24 You know, how many drive-throughs, and how many

1 cars can I fit in the drive-throughs? You know,
2 it's just very rigid, and it's very -- and I get
3 it. It's part of the process, but, you know, I
4 would look at it from a bigger picture and kind of
5 beautify this thing with landscaping, walking
6 paths and, you know, bring this site together, you
7 know, from -- from a pedestrian standpoint. And,
8 you know, if it means bringing in, you know,
9 that -- that retention pond, a lake or something,
10 where you have opportunities for these restaurants
11 to be on a lake.

12 And so I think there's some great
13 opportunities that are kind of missed in this
14 plan, so -- it's just my initial observations.

15 MS. JAHNKE DALE: No. We appreciate
16 that feedback. Staff actually said kind of
17 similar comments. We're still looking through
18 those and opportunities to -- when we get a little
19 bit more. We are pedestrian-friendly, so we
20 appreciate that.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I would just add
22 that I would -- there was a comment, I think, in
23 the staff report, and just in general, that it
24 looks to me that the individual sites are

1 overparked right now. And I would say that I
2 wouldn't be interested in having you put in any
3 additional spaces that aren't required by zoning,
4 unless there's a particular user that can provide
5 data that they can support why they need more than
6 what the zoning requires, which I think would add
7 to, potentially, more green space, give more
8 flexibility to add pedestrian ways, either along
9 the lots, along the -- the east-west driveway in
10 the concept plan, around the pond.

11 I mean, it looks like there's plenty of
12 space between the pond edge or head waterline, and
13 the -- either the south property line or the
14 adjacent pavement on the lot. I realize you
15 haven't done all final gradings, so there's
16 grading transitions once you get above that
17 waterline.

18 You know, there's a number of things
19 like that that happen and understand that that's
20 further detail, but it just seems, especially
21 given the easements that are wrapped around the
22 property, especially in the south, where you have
23 30 and 20-foot sanitary easements -- I'm pretty
24 sure you don't get to dramatically change the

1 grade on those. I'm sure public Works doesn't
2 care for that, but I would allow them to comment
3 on that. But those, to me, would be places where
4 using the opportunity to have a path.

5 I'm -- I'm indifferent as it relates to
6 whether the ponds are wet or dry. I think they're
7 both going to work very well, understanding that
8 there could, potentially, a -- a site balance that
9 you're, you know, would need to address rather,
10 you know, digging it deep enough to have a pond
11 that functions well, you know, requires,
12 potentially, a lot of excavation. And then what
13 do you do with that soil? You know, kind of a
14 thing if you don't have a place to take it, other
15 than hauling it off.

16 And then it becomes a cost, whether
17 it's a TIF cost, or if it isn't a TIF cost, or
18 it's your cost, and those aren't the kind of
19 things that are helpful to people's budgets. So I
20 get that, but I think that the open space is a
21 large enough piece in the back and not being able
22 to take advantage of that.

23 Or, candidly, you have people to the
24 south that there's a sidewalk that runs up Kautz

1 and that they would be able to link in and maybe
2 walk around a path that goes around there, or link
3 to connect, via pedestrian path systems, to any of
4 the retail users that you ultimately sell to. I
5 mean, I think that there's opportunities there
6 that would be -- that would be nice to explore.
7 Realizing that that's not exactly the plan that
8 you have today, but I think you have enough land
9 to make that happen, honestly.

10 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Glad we have Spaceco
11 here to hear this feedback, so thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Can I ask a
13 procedure question, Mr. Chair?

14 Are -- are they going to do a
15 presentation or no? Are we just diving in with
16 our comments?

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: They've done it.

18 MS. JAHNKE DALE: We kept it very
19 brief --

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It was very brief.

21 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Oh, that was
22 it?

23 MS. JAHNKE DALE: -- for a concept
24 plan --

1 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Their civil
3 engineer --

4 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- and so, now,
6 we're just --

7 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Okay. Okay.
8 Great. Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- launching in.

10 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: I didn't want
11 to over -- okay.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. That's okay.

13 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I would not be in
15 favor of more than two monument signs, which are
16 allowed via our zoning. Down at each signalized
17 intersection, I think, would be the most logical.
18 Kautz and Main, and Main and Pheasant Run Drive, I
19 think it's called. I don't, personally, see the
20 need for four. Understanding that each lot has
21 frontage and they'll their own sign, plus you have
22 wall signs that are allowed in our ordinance. So
23 I would not be in favor of additional monument
24 signs for the project.

1 And I was just curious. There was a
2 comment about public art, and I think that
3 thinking about where those are, thinking about how
4 a pedestrian interacts with it, I don't know what
5 scale you're talking about. Is it something
6 that's appreciated at a pedestrian scale, at a
7 vehicular scale, like when you drive by it, you
8 know, kind of thing?

9 I'm not sure what you're talking about,
10 but I think that thinking through how pedestrians
11 interact, where they drive, where they walk, and
12 what kind of art you're looking at, it would be
13 nice to have a sense of maybe a few examples
14 when -- if you come back, to just give us a flavor
15 of what that is and where would that would be
16 integrated. Realizing you weren't trying to
17 integrate all that stuff right now, but there was
18 a mention of it in -- in the narrative.

19 And I would say that the plant list
20 would be nice to be expanded to include perennials
21 and grasses. Wasn't anything wrong with the woody
22 plants that were in there, other than I think
23 there could be more. And I think that's one of
24 the things that would be part of your final

1 detailed plans for each lot anyways as you do
2 foundation plantings, et cetera, but I would think
3 that some perennials would be helpful to that.

4 As an example of this whole pedestrian
5 conversation -- now I'm just referring to the --
6 what was in our packets -- the 36/39 plan, there's
7 not a lot of pedestrian systems so that would --
8 we've talked about that. There's also on Lot 2,
9 which is a multi-tenant user of 13-, 14,000 square
10 feet, 130, 140 parking spaces in that one plan.
11 If that's a lot that -- that moves forward with
12 that direction, over half the parking is behind
13 the building, but there doesn't seem to be,
14 represented, any logical way to get to the front
15 of the building from a pedestrian walking, and
16 they also have to cross what's shown as a
17 drive-through aisle. So I would think that making
18 sure that those people can safely cross at a place
19 that makes sense would be helpful to bring patrons
20 to the front of the building. I'm assuming
21 they're not going to have double entries in the
22 front and back. Or I would be surprised.

23 And I think that the parking study
24 would be helpful. You have KLOA. You have

1 Spaceco's civil engineer. I think that that would
2 be helpful to understand, is there off-site
3 improvements needed because of the additional
4 traffic that will be generated for the project?
5 Especially on the west side, where it's a
6 relatively short distance between the full access
7 place and the signalized intersection at Kautz and
8 Main Street. So I'd be very interested in seeing
9 that part.

10 Others?

11 Please.

12 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: I looked at
13 it through the eyes of your request for a PUD down
14 the road, right? And I looked at some of your
15 previous projects, and they offer a lot of
16 interesting aesthetic -- attractive -- attractive
17 design elements. And so as you move -- should you
18 move forward, I look forward to seeing those
19 offerings applied, and that would check a box for
20 appropriateness of a PUD.

21 I also look forward to your project
22 meeting the public-interest finding of a PUD. I
23 know you kind of tossed out some ideas. You know,
24 I don't know if one sculpture will make that,

1 but -- and also on the preliminary rendering, I --
2 I echo what Mr. Chair said, that I don't see any
3 pedestrian connectivity, and as staff recommended,
4 starting with the public sidewalk connection to
5 the existing sidewalk. I mean, we need to have,
6 you know, some. It is, I know you said, pretty
7 rough, but I -- we have to have that.

8 And as for the site plan, I don't think
9 you mentioned it, Peter, yet, but I agree that the
10 internal cross road that staff mentioned, it needs
11 to move north or a Frontage Road, which probably
12 isn't as attractive, to have access into the site.
13 Perhaps, it would come in -- you know, I don't
14 know how you'd do it, but staff recommended,
15 perhaps, going -- having that move north and
16 continuing on the -- you know what I'm talking
17 about? The -- yeah.

18 It probably cuts the gas station in
19 half, that that would be -- as opposed to making
20 everybody loop around, staff made notes that the
21 people will shortcut, and they will. They will.
22 Perhaps, if we had a safe pass-through for them,
23 that that would -- in a future design.

24 I, too, see a lot of drive-ins, and I

1 understand the need to market that. And I also
2 see the dismay of a car wash. I'm not sure we
3 need a car wash. If there could be better use for
4 that and -- but I understand you're still
5 marketing it, and you want to get kind of a
6 high-level approval, but I think -- I think it's
7 important, though, to move that front -- that
8 road -- that road to connected directly with a
9 signaled drive. Thank you.

10 MS. JAHNKE DALE: That's definitely
11 something we're studying in response to staff's
12 comments --

13 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Okay.

14 MS. JAHNKE DALE: -- so thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Did you say that
16 the PUD, that you were looking to get some level
17 of preliminary approvals for drive-throughs?

18 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Potentially. So I
19 know, from our initial conversation, we would like
20 to get a certain number approved, knowing that it
21 would have to come back once we have the final
22 site plans and the users. But that -- it would be
23 one of the, kind of, approvals that we would like
24 baked into the PUD.

1 And, potentially, when we come back
2 with a formal application, if we have some of
3 those users and site plans kind of locked in, we
4 would want those kind of baked into the
5 preliminary approvals -- again, hoping that we're
6 ready to begin construction as early as -- we say
7 Q1 of next year. We think that we were, like,
8 maybe a little aggressive, but we're ready to move
9 pretty quickly, and having those users locked in
10 with and kind of fully baked is critical to that
11 from a, you know, financing standpoint.

12 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I think -- I
13 think the request or the, you know, the logic
14 behind it, I just think it's important to note
15 that, you know, we do require special use for
16 drive-through facilities, and the intention is for
17 that to take each facility into account and how it
18 relates and interacts with every other user
19 development in this center.

20 I would personally find it difficult to
21 preliminary, you know, vote on a preliminary
22 approval of -- of this many drive-throughs, or
23 even a portion thereof, without seeing how things
24 would play out. You know, a -- I know we're just

1 talking Starbucks, but I always use it. A
2 Starbucks is significantly different in demand and
3 in traffic than a Tropical Smoothie or Smoothie
4 King.

5 So, you know, from a -- once it passes
6 through the City, I think it is that they each
7 have to come through and get their special use. I
8 just -- that's just from my perspective. I think,
9 you know, we, as Commissioners, need to take into
10 account how each lot interacts.

11 It's a lot of drive-throughs, you know,
12 just -- just to be honest. I think -- without
13 trying to be too rude to some of our neighbors to
14 the east, but, you know, this is the gateway to
15 St. Charles. I think it does need -- if there is
16 this many drive-throughs, there does need to be
17 higher standard in architecture. As people are
18 coming into our community, the dealerships, too,
19 just to the east, have done a good job of modern
20 dealerships. But I don't want to be, like some of
21 our neighboring communities, with all the
22 drive-throughs or rather unappealing shopping
23 centers, you know.

24 St. Charles is different, and that --

1 that's just from my position. You know, this --
2 this does need to be, you know, maybe some
3 architectural standards and enhanced features on
4 each of these buildings, so there is some uniform
5 so it's not just a haphazard of what's going on
6 with their national branding.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Ellen, just a
8 question: Independent of whether the PUD is used
9 or not used, let's say the PUD is used when they
10 come forward for the preliminary plan approval.
11 If you will -- if they don't have the users and
12 are approving, if you will, actual plans, right,
13 but they're asking for -- for drive-in, you know,
14 drive-through facilities to be part of the PUD, it
15 would still, even if they didn't have those as
16 part of the preliminary plan submittal, they would
17 still be required to come in with each one of
18 those? If I'm remembering correctly.

19 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, that's correct. The
20 PUD approval itself could -- could make it a
21 certain number of drive-throughs allowed on the
22 property in general, but then there would need to
23 be a PUD preliminary plan approved for each
24 individual site once there's a user solidified and

1 finalized for each individual lot.

2 So the Plan Commission would be seeing
3 a site plan and architectural plans, landscape
4 plans for each individual lot as the users are
5 finalized, but the entitlement for the
6 drive-through itself would already be preapproved.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Be approved.
8 Right. Right.

9 Okay. So I don't know --

10 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- if, Zach, that
12 makes any difference to you from your perspective,
13 but I do think it's going to allow us and each one
14 of those users to be reviewed again, even if it --
15 even if they are granted, if you will, as part of
16 their preliminary approval -- five, four
17 drive-throughs. And then if they want to come in
18 and ask for more, each one of those plans would be
19 reviewed. They would just have to ask for them
20 versus any of that.

21 But I had a question that -- along the
22 line of this -- and, Zach, you reminded me --
23 related to -- I know that a lot of individual
24 users, especially retail users, have, looks for

1 lack of a better description, right, that they
2 want to have. But then they also have a series of
3 looks -- many of them, not all, but a series of
4 them, right, that they can -- Hey. We'll give you
5 more of this look, more of that look. It's still
6 Casey's; it's still, you know, whomever, right?

7 And so I think that that's part of
8 being able to kind of pick and choose from the
9 architecture, right? And not necessarily turn
10 this into a full-blown architectural set of
11 standards for the project.

12 The other part that I thought was
13 interesting and I thought that you started to do
14 it, which was -- and I -- and this is, again,
15 reminding me -- that the -- the landscape plans
16 that were prepared initially show a pretty
17 continuous planting zone, all the way across
18 Main Street. And I can't remember if it comes
19 down Kautz or not, but certainly all along
20 Main Street, which is a little -- ends up being a
21 little bit more, honestly, I think, than our
22 standard ordinance requires as far as buffering,
23 parking areas, and, you know, things like that.

24 Are you guys committed to doing that?

1 Because, I mean, I thought that was a very
2 positive thing, honestly. And most people are,
3 like: Well, you know, I'll do what's required.
4 And that's, like, for our ordinance, I think for
5 this zoning district, it was, like, 50, 60 percent
6 of the parking has to be buffered, but that look
7 along Main Street, specifically, was almost a
8 hundred percent of the frontage.

9 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah. I mean,
10 it's -- what we're showing currently -- of course,
11 the site plan is all going to move around a little
12 as we're incorporating what we hear tonight, what
13 we hear from staff, and what we'll hear next
14 Monday, but if that's something that you see as
15 positive, we'll definitely take note of that and
16 to the extent possible as we, you know,
17 incorporate all the feedback we're receiving,
18 yeah, we'll note that.

19 I think to the point about the PUD and
20 what's being approved now versus later, I actually
21 think that, to your point -- I'm glad you pulled
22 in staff; I was going to, otherwise -- we're not
23 really -- we're not trying to get these, you know,
24 all prebaked without the level of detail or, you

1 know, the look that you would usually get. I
2 think just getting the kind of preapproval allows
3 us to kind of look at this site cohesively and
4 kind of set those expectations as we're out in the
5 market.

6 And, you know, if we have nine
7 drive-through users and we only have seven or
8 eight approved, we know that we, you know, need to
9 look for a different user, or we need to come back
10 and make the case for it. It allows us to look at
11 the site holistically.

12 When it comes to signage, which we will
13 look into and know that, you know, if -- if we
14 need more signage, we need to explain it in more
15 detail than we have to-date. We can landscape it
16 more cohesively with a plan, and then, like I
17 said, developing this, you know, 12-time -- you
18 know, coming in 12 different times for 12
19 different lots, tests just didn't really make
20 sense, given the opportunity that a study of this
21 size at this location, of such prominence,
22 warrants, in our opinion.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

24 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: You know what? And

1 I would add to that that I think if you were to
2 create some design guidelines, you know, not only
3 for the landscaping, but for the architecture,
4 whether it's the trash closures or the signage or
5 what have you that are more consistent, so you
6 don't have all these different colors and, you
7 know, materials going on where there's a
8 cohesiveness throughout -- throughout the site.

9 You know, along with, you know, there
10 needs to be a big idea. I think that you have to
11 come up with this big idea. You know, because I
12 see it as -- it's kind of top-heavy on Main Street
13 and then, in the back, you kind of -- you lose it
14 with this big lake. I mean, right now, it's
15 portrayed as a big lake, but it, you know,
16 there's, you know, it doesn't seem that inviting
17 to me.

18 So, you know, if you were to -- you
19 have the great opportunity here to design
20 something nice with the monument signs, the
21 entrances of, you know, you talked about the
22 entrance to St. Charles, and I think if you have
23 great architecture and consistency in the
24 architecture materials, I think if you could, you

1 know, present a great product that retailers are
2 going to want to come to.

3 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yep.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, I only --
5 just also offer the east-west driveway -- I mean,
6 there's -- there's a conflict/resolution at the --
7 at the east end, depending on who your final user
8 is. Is it the auto dealership, or is it, you
9 know, a gas station or whatever that is --
10 whatever you ultimately choose? And whoever wants
11 to buy the corner, in the hard corner, I get that.

12 But one of the things I think is the --
13 at the far west end, there's a pretty -- I mean,
14 not a usable lot area, but there's a pretty wide
15 area that ends up -- again, at this level, doesn't
16 appear to be used for anything -- stormwater
17 management, nothing. It looks like the stormwater
18 management is more central to east in that long
19 narrow area. It almost would seem like there
20 would be an opportunity to get the driveway. I
21 mean, I realize it wants to line up with the
22 Portillo's -- the back of Portillo's driveway for
23 all the reasons that traffic people like that, and
24 that's fine.

1 But I also think that the driveway
2 could swing to the south, and then come back and
3 give the driveway more movement instead of kind of
4 long, little bend, and then long streak. I think
5 those are the kind of things that add character,
6 encourage, to a minor amount -- to a minor
7 position, a slower speed, right? Curving streets
8 tend to provide a sense of being a little slower.
9 And I think that given the amount of traffic that
10 will be generated, and we'll see all the study for
11 that, I think people moving at a slower rate would
12 make sense.

13 I'd hate to see you end up -- and you
14 may need to, but who knows -- like, having to have
15 speed tables or speed bumps and stuff like that,
16 because people are just driving too fast, and
17 you're ending up -- because of all of these
18 driveways connecting back -- you're ending up with
19 accidents. I mean, I realize it's private
20 property. This isn't a right-of-way, but still,
21 those are the kind of things that don't bode well
22 for the -- for people coming there, as well as the
23 users and everybody involved.

24 So I think there's some chances to do

1 that, and I don't know how you -- how close you
2 guys are on calculating the volume. Look like
3 there's 5 feet of bounce for what was shown right
4 now, but I don't know how much play is in that
5 because I realize, you know --

6 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: You're
7 talking here? Where are you talking?

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. In the pond.
9 In the pond.

10 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Oh, in the
11 pond?

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The pond has
13 5 feet of bounce in it right now.

14 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah. Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: But I think that,
16 you know, making some changes to the driveway and
17 giving it a little more interesting character, I
18 mean, you'd end up adding some land to the north
19 side of it, which might be useful from a user or
20 users, at least down at the east, where you're
21 looking at, maybe, starting the project.

22 But, you know, maybe the bounce moves
23 to 6 feet. I don't think -- I don't think that's
24 prohibited in our ordinance, but if there was a

1 way to think through -- I didn't realize you have
2 to have a release rate and all of these detailed
3 calculations, but I think that might be something
4 to consider, understanding that you have to detain
5 so much volume, you know, so --

6 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: And I hear
7 you on your landscaping, but I also think it's
8 imperative that, in there, we have the pedestrian
9 way.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

11 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That was a comment
13 from staff.

14 (Simultaneous speech.)

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. That we
16 extend that down --

17 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- all the way to
19 the light. Yeah. As well as from Kautz --

20 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- from the corner
22 here at the warehouse up --

23 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Right.

24 Right. Right.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- to the corner.

2 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I think it's
3 important, not just to even talk about the public
4 walk, you know, on the frontages. There needs to
5 be connections from the public walk into each
6 site, as well as, you know, an internal -- you
7 know, more internal circulation. So I would
8 anticipate connections to each building from the
9 public walk, at least along Main Street.

10 (Simultaneous speech.)

11 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: That way people
12 can walk --

13 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: And not worry
14 about the traffic.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I mean, you see --
16 you see that along Randall Road, here in town,
17 just north of -- north -- I'm sorry -- south of
18 Main Street, the retail users on the south side,
19 there's a pedestrian path system that runs down to
20 Oak Street and, you know, and each one of those
21 retail users, their sidewalk comes out to meet
22 that.

23 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: And it's
24 easier done here --

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So --

2 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: -- right,
3 without parking lots in front. I like that you
4 don't have the parking lots in front, that that
5 will be more visually and --

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Well --

7 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: -- and
8 practical, you know, to have your -- as Zach said,
9 your connectivity between lots.

10 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: If I may talk
11 about some of the site circulation on the east
12 side, so, you know, whether it's the dealership
13 or -- or the gas station and how it relates to the
14 car wash, that's seen some tough site circulation.
15 I'm just looking at, you know, the right -- what
16 appears to be a right-in, right-out. It's pretty
17 quick turns for these roads, you know, whether
18 you're turning right with right into the car wash
19 and the design with the gas station, and then
20 people are either -- when they get out of the
21 tunnel, they're either going to go right in --
22 they're conflicting with that traffic, or they're
23 going to be zipping through the neighboring
24 property, and then even with the car dealership,

1 there's still -- is some interesting site
2 circulation and potential vehicle conflicts.

3 I know we're not doing a full design on
4 that, but I really think that that site
5 circulation between those two users, you know, the
6 car wash and whatever goes to the east and how
7 that relates -- needs to be looked at. You know,
8 it -- my opinions on a car wash are, you know,
9 typically, I'm not for it, but it's a permitted
10 use.

11 So that being said, you know, I
12 recognize there's a right to build one on the
13 site, but I do think that the configuration and
14 how it relates -- if this is a user that's a large
15 user, like a Jet Brite, for example, on a busy
16 day, they'll fill all those lanes, and some. So,
17 you know, how does that interact? How does that
18 create conflicts with the neighboring, you know,
19 properties?

20 So that use in itself, maybe, it has a
21 better location elsewhere on the plan just to help
22 soften that -- that right-in, right-out, you know,
23 next to the gas station or car dealership because
24 I can -- that that both being high-traffic, you

1 know, draws. And I know, yes, it has access at
2 the light to the east, but if you provide, you
3 know, if you provide an entrance, people pull in
4 anywhere they can, especially if they're not from
5 town.

6 So just some things to consider with
7 conflicts between those two users on how they
8 interact.

9 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Peter, from a
10 procedural, when is the traffic study done in this
11 process? Is it required? Is it at the final --

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: In the
13 preliminary.

14 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: On the -- for the
15 preliminary?

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: For the
17 preliminary submittal, they would be required to
18 do a traffic study. Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: But would you --
20 would you have to allow it kind of based on the
21 final PDU [sic]? Like, if you -- if you approved
22 certain -- some of the drive-through components,
23 do you have to modify that?

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I think that would

1 be, potentially, a staff question or it would be a
2 question to the City's outside consultant that
3 reviews the traffic studies submitted by their
4 consultant, which is KLOA. But that would be that
5 kind of a question for them to answer. I don't
6 know that staff would want to answer that. I
7 think they would defer to our outside
8 consultant --

9 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Well --

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- related to
11 that.

12 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I think what
13 Gary's asking, too, is: Let's say you have one of
14 these users that has more unique and higher
15 demand, would the study be redone with that
16 drive-through user? Or does it require simply
17 just, maybe, a traffic memo or update, you know,
18 brief update, not a full study?

19 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. I think for the
20 traffic study, that would need to be submitted
21 with the PUD submittal, which would be the next
22 step in the process. We get a traffic study, and
23 there would need to be assumptions made for the
24 users of each lot, and they would assume certain

1 uses and certain demand from those uses. And then
2 if it ends up being that a user comes in, like an
3 amusement park that has, you know, quite a higher
4 parking demand, then, we would, at that -- would
5 review plans for that particular lot, we would, in
6 that case, say: Okay. We need a traffic study or
7 the traffic study that's in development revised
8 because of this higher intensity user.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah. Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So I think that
12 they, you know -- like, is it going to be a
13 dealership presumably by the time you get to the
14 preliminary plan submittal and all the engineering
15 and all the other documents that are required, it
16 might make a decision on, is it going to be the
17 gas station, hotel, stuff at the east end, or is
18 it a dealership? I bet they'd want to know before
19 they do -- before they come. But if not, then if
20 it ends up one and it becomes the other, then it
21 would be staff's decision to ask for an update,
22 you know.

23 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: And a car
24 wash also has to have a special use, in addition

1 to the drive-throughs, right, Ellen? The car wash
2 has to --

3 MS. JOHNSON: We look at car washes as
4 required by special use for the drive-through part
5 of a car wash --

6 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Oh,
7 technically --

8 MS. JOHNSON: -- car wash is permitted;
9 drive-through is special use.

10 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right.

12 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Thanks for the
13 clarification.

14 MS. JAHNKE DALE: And we've started
15 that traffic study. It was -- we heard back as
16 recently as today, and also same with IDOT, for
17 review, which is a pretty lengthy process. And,
18 of course, as plans are changed as we are going
19 through this process, we'll update it, so -- yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Will you be
21 pursuing both right-in/right-outs off of
22 Main Street?

23 MS. JAHNKE DALE: That is currently the
24 plan, assuming IDOT produce it.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. That --
2 well, that's definitely IDOT.

3 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Right.
4 Right. Right.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Those guys will
6 definitely want to weigh in on that.

7 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: If I may touch on
8 something that Jeff mentioned regarding materials
9 with -- especially with signs and -- and trash
10 enclosures. Again, I understand national
11 branding, things like that. Where possible,
12 though, you know, where -- whether it's
13 foundations of the individual signs -- the
14 freestanding signs -- and that -- that's a
15 fantastic, you know, step forward, I think where
16 there's -- it's -- you know, doesn't have to be
17 uniform, but complementary materials, so you have
18 a selected palette that's approved, or, you know,
19 that would be appreciative, so meaning, you know,
20 you, as tenants, you know: Okay. If you're doing
21 masonry around the freestanding sign, you could
22 pick from one of these three stone types.

23 That way it's just, you know, you know
24 it's cohesive, you know it's -- it's going to

1 blend, you know it's going to tie into everything.
2 That's something that I would be, you know --
3 outside of -- I'm not saying the whole buildings
4 and everything have to match, but cohesive --

5 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah. And
6 you guys have done that in previous projects.

7 MS. JAHNKE DALE: I was going to thank
8 you for doing your homework.

9 (Simultaneous speech.)

10 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: -- is
11 standalone, but it's -- also blends in with --
12 yeah. So that's --

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is there any
14 deviations that you can share with us, related to
15 why you want to do a PUD, beyond what's in the
16 staff report?

17 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Not beyond what's in
18 the staff report, other than the two items that I
19 mentioned that are somewhat on zoning, but very,
20 very important, which is -- well, I guess three
21 items. One is it's going to be a significant
22 investment to get a site of this size ready with
23 most of it upfront. So we need -- in order to,
24 you know, attract capital to -- from the inside,

1 we need kind of the certainty that the PUD would
2 give us, that we aren't, you know, coming in for
3 one -- one-off sites. And then the drive-throughs
4 are quite critical, knowing that we can go out and
5 attract those users.

6 I would say those are the main items,
7 and to the point of the public benefits, I
8 always -- across all municipalities -- struggle
9 with what, you know, and look for direction from
10 local stakeholders and decision-makers, like
11 yourselves. If you have ideas, public art is one
12 that we typically -- is well received and we've
13 done before. If you have thoughts about what that
14 public art should look like or other public
15 benefits, you know better than anyone what -- what
16 would be kind of well received. So we're open to
17 that feedback tonight as well.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, I think
19 you've received some of that --

20 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah. Absolutely.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Pedestrian
22 friendliness, you know, and that component being
23 something that would kind of -- honestly, it would
24 set it apart from other retail centers. A lot of

1 our -- a lot of these existing retail centers, you
2 know, just were done in St. Charles a while ago,
3 and that wasn't, apparently, as high a priority as
4 we make of it today, which is good, from my
5 perspective. So I think -- I think being able to
6 do that and provide that pedestrian opportunity.

7 Integration of art, whether it's along
8 the walkways, along the driveways, in the middle
9 of your pond, you know -- I mean, I think those
10 are all pretty interesting pieces. Again, it
11 depends on what those art pieces are.

12 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I mean, you know,
14 the scale is super important because especially,
15 you know, anything near a pond or whatever, the
16 scale is really big. And so small pieces -- 8,
17 10 feet -- get lost, honestly. I mean, if you're
18 going to put something out by that pond, you'd
19 better have something 20-plus feet if it's going
20 to really hold its own in this space.

21 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Or have it in
22 a space -- because public interest is a big part
23 of the PUD. It's one of those boxes you have to
24 check. And, like you're saying, make it a place

1 of interest, maybe, and so a place where people,
2 after they conducted their business, will walk to
3 or take it in in that way. Yeah. So --

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. So --

5 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: But --

7 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I have a question
8 for staff. With this being adjacent to the
9 airport, is this portion of the property subject
10 to some of the same restrictions that the car
11 dealerships to the east were on with the uses
12 and -- and some other, like, height and lighting
13 restrictions?

14 MS. JOHNSON: I believe so, in terms of
15 the residential use. They can't have residential
16 use. That's all that I'm aware of, specific to
17 this site.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I think
19 more of the restrictions from DuPage Airport
20 Authority were for the warehouse portion because
21 of current runways and glide paths not only in
22 use, but in heights and different things like
23 that. There was much more restriction. And I
24 think it was actually part of their submittal,

1 they showed where DuPage Airport Authority had
2 that the requirement for glide path protection
3 and, you know, stuff like that --

4 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- which, then,
6 sets tones for heights and stuff, which is why
7 it's all warehousing -- and so anything falls
8 below that, so --

9 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: And the
10 residential piece was big, which we don't have to
11 worry about here.

12 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. Right. No
15 big deal. No big deal.

16 All right. Anything else?

17 All right. Is there anyone from the
18 public? We do have a piece related to this
19 project.

20 COMMISSIONER PAYLEITNER: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Not a general
22 comment, but related to this piece, we do allow
23 public comment at this point. No? No?

24 Team, you guys -- no? You guys are

1 saving it for later? All right.

2 (Simultaneous speech.)

3 MS. JAHNKE DALE: We're here listening.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just checking.

5 Just checking. Just checking.

6 (Simultaneous speech.)

7 MS. JAHNKE DALE: It's best to hear

8 this --

9 (Simultaneous speech.)

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sorry. I like it.

11 All right. All right.

12 All right. Well, any final comments we
13 want to give to them? I think that will conclude
14 our conversation on this piece today. Any final
15 comments?

16 Yes, Bruce?

17 MR. SYLVESTER: I would just ask, there
18 were a couple of comments from Commissioners about
19 the east-west road and its eastern terminus with
20 Pheasant Run Drive, and maybe the applicants could
21 come up and -- and address that or give us any
22 thoughts they have about how that -- that
23 particular issue might be resolved.

24 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Do we have an answer

1 for that?

2 MR. MCGOVERN: It -- the site plan will
3 bolster it, so we're not really sure yet.

4 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Yeah. It's
5 definitely something that we're actually studying.
6 And so we would -- we need a little bit more time,
7 but definitely per the comment, and we'll be ready
8 to, you know, have those answers. And the one
9 consultant not here tonight is KLOA, so -- but
10 they -- they will get all of your feedback as
11 well. So glad you're familiar with them.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yep.

13 All right. Any final comments from
14 anybody on this topic?

15 We don't have any public comments, so
16 that's all fine. Okay.

17 MS. JAHNKE DALE: We really appreciate
18 the feedback, heard it --

19 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Sorry. Is there
20 public comment -- is there a --

21 MS. ADDUCI: I have comments, but --

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Oh. We have a
23 public comment period --

24 MS. ADDUCI: Yes.

1 MS. JAHNKE DALE: But not --

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- because it's
3 general -- because it's general, not specific to
4 this topic.

5 MS. JAHNKE DALE: Great.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No problem.

7 All right. Thank you very much.

8 Hopefully, you guys can come back, your team can
9 come back, and I look forward to seeing how you
10 integrated a lot of these comments, understanding
11 you're also going to get some input on the 8th
12 from our elected officials.

13 MS. JAHNKE DALE: That's the goal.

14 Thank you so much.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you. Thank
16 you.

17 That concludes Item 5. Item 6 is
18 public comment -- general. Please, if you could
19 introduce yourself --

20 MS. ADDUCI: Sure.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- name and
22 address for our court reporter.

23 MS. ADDUCI: My name is Jill Adduci. I
24 live on the east side of St. Charles,

1 1105 West Francis Circle, right across from
2 East High School. And although my comments aren't
3 directly related to this, I want to say thank you
4 for all the work you're doing here. It's
5 fabulous, and I would be impacted by the
6 Pheasant Run stuff, so that was very interesting.
7 And I just, I guess, want to say, hope there's not
8 another car wash and another dealership.

9 Okay. Good evening, Commissioners, and
10 thank you for the opportunity to speak. Again, my
11 name is Jill Adduci, and I reside on the east side
12 of St. Charles for over 20 years.

13 I'm here today because I recently saw
14 two very large scale, in-your-face murals go up on
15 the east side of town on the new buildings near
16 Jewel-Osco. Immediately upon seeing them, I took
17 my civic action by e-mailing my alderperson and
18 asking what guidelines our City currently has in
19 place for murals on commercial buildings. I was
20 informed that there are no specific mural design
21 guidelines at all.

22 I replied that this was something we
23 need to address promptly, especially as our town
24 grows and we work to preserve a cohesive visual

1 identity and maintain the charm and character of
2 St. Charles.

3 Yesterday, I learned -- just
4 yesterday -- that your -- this Commission worked
5 out some mural guidelines for the Historic
6 District. I'm here today to respectfully request
7 that we look at this -- these guidelines, expand
8 these guidelines to apply to the entire city, not
9 solely the historic corridor.

10 I believe citywide standards would
11 benefit St. Charles for many reasons. One, it
12 would preserve our visual consistency and
13 community character that you guys all talked about
14 tonight that's important to us.

15 Two, preventing unintended aesthetic
16 impacts from oversized or inappropriate designs;
17 provide clarity for property owners and developers
18 upfront; ensuring fairness so all building owners
19 follow the same rules, and maintaining a balance
20 between artistic expression and community
21 standards; protecting property values and
22 supporting thoughtful, intentional growth; and
23 avoiding community disputes that occur when
24 public-facing artwork is installed without

1 approval or oversight.

2 I would also like to request
3 clarification on the approval process for the
4 existing murals installed by the Greco Company.
5 My understanding is that these murals were not
6 included in the original development plans that
7 were submitted for approval. If that is the case,
8 I would like to know who authorized or permitted
9 their installation afterward.

10 Furthermore, if these murals were
11 installed without proper approval or outside scope
12 of previously approved plans, I would like to ask
13 whether the City can require their removal before
14 final inspection and final sign-off on these
15 buildings. It seems reasonable that an unapproved
16 visual alteration of this magnitude should be
17 corrected prior to the issuance of final occupancy
18 or certification.

19 Because if this situation sets a
20 precedent, that any building owner may install any
21 design of any visual scale with no review or
22 approval, we risk losing that aesthetic cohesion
23 that Zach talked about and thoughtful planning
24 that has long defined our St. Charles. We do have

1 a certain look. We do have a gateway into our
2 town on the east side.

3 Lastly, I want to express that I'm not
4 simply raising a concern. I am here as a very
5 concerned community member on the east side, and
6 I'm willing to assist this Commission in any way
7 possible -- if you need my hands, my brain, my
8 gifts to work on this, creating a citywide mural
9 guideline that is fair, consistent, and
10 enforceable, similar to the standards of other
11 municipalities. And we need to require -- that --
12 require these of builders and property owners.

13 That's all I had to say. I was very
14 impressed with your thoughtfulness and questions
15 to this group tonight, and I just implore you to
16 take a look at the overall plan. If we have no
17 guidelines in place, it is a big mess. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Ellen, is this
21 something that staff can look into a little bit
22 more or provide some feedback in the next meeting
23 or two, whether there's anything in our ordinance
24 that works with that, or, specifically, her

1 question about Greco's project? I mean, since
2 elevations were approved for that project as a
3 PUD, and if there -- if there weren't murals, then
4 I think that's a --

5 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Isn't a mural
6 considered signage or no?

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No.

8 MS. JOHNSON: So a mural is only
9 considered signage if there's text, like,
10 specifically advertising the business or, you
11 know, so in this case, these murals are not
12 considered signage. Murals are not regulated in
13 our zoning ordinance. It's looked at as painting
14 of the building, which is not regulated. But I
15 definitely hear the gray area and the fact that
16 these buildings were approved as part of a PUD
17 with building elevations approved --

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right.

19 MS. JOHNSON: -- so I -- yeah. It's
20 something that -- that we'll need to discuss
21 internally.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure.

23 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Did they have
24 graphics on the elevations when they --

1 MS. JOHNSON: No.

2 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: -- submitted
3 requirement?

4 MS. JOHNSON: No.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. No. There
6 wasn't -- I don't remember any --

7 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I would --

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- you know,
9 full-scale murals.

10 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Yeah. I don't know
11 if they --

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- as part of
13 that.

14 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: -- added it in.

15 (Simultaneous speech.)

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I mean, they had
17 signage placement, you know, on the buildings, but
18 not anything else.

19 MS. JOHNSON: The pickleball facility
20 had some murals shown on their approved
21 elevations, but the ones that have gone up are not
22 shown.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I would equate it

1 to, if we don't regulate painting -- let's say we
2 approve an elevation for a building, and then they
3 come back and just paint it a different, you know,
4 paint it all a different color. It's -- you know,
5 we had an approved elevation, so it's -- we -- we
6 need to stand by that. That's why they went
7 through the process. That's why -- I'm agreeing
8 that I think that they should abide by the
9 elevation -- this painting, you know, it differs
10 from what we saw.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I mean,
12 honestly, there were elevations. There were
13 illustrative renderings that they provided of
14 their product, which showed the character of their
15 buildings, you know, where they were using
16 masonry, where they were -- you know, where the
17 window systems were going to be, et cetera. And
18 if there wasn't -- even if it wasn't drawn, if
19 there wasn't specific notes about large-scale
20 murals, then, to me, I'll let -- I'll defer to
21 staff, but that seems like a good question to
22 figure out.

23 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: I actually agree
24 with you, and I appreciate you bringing that up.

1 And I drove by there and I saw that. I'm, like:
2 Wow, you know, it's a lot larger than -- and it's
3 not like a Portillo's, you know, small graphics
4 that they have. But it's -- it's very large, and
5 it's very telling, so --

6 MS. ADDUCI: And we're going to have a
7 lot -- it sounds like a lot more buildings, so we
8 need to get --

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Okay. All
10 right.

11 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: And then there's two
12 of them, correct?

13 MS. ADDUCI: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Correct.

15 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Is it common for
16 other -- what do our neighbors do? Do they -- do
17 they govern murals in any way, or is it common for
18 other municipalities?

19 MS. JOHNSON: I think it's -- it's town
20 by town. I don't know specifically any
21 communities that have specific guidelines for
22 murals, but -- I mean, it's definitely possible
23 they exist. I just don't know about them. We'd
24 have to do some research.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Go to the
2 North Shore. It's all controlled. Don't kid
3 yourself.

4 All right. Okay. Well, staff will
5 work on that. Thank you for bringing -- bringing
6 this up to us.

7 Any additional business from our Plan
8 Commission members or staff? Nothing?

9 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: Next meeting date?

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Meeting is going
11 to be the 16th, correct, or no?

12 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. We'll not -- we'll
13 cancel that meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That's canceled.
15 All right.

16 MS. JOHNSON: Merry Christmas.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Fair enough.

18 All right. Is there a motion to
19 adjourn?

20 VICE CHAIR FUNKE: I'll make the
21 motion.

22 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Second.

24 All right. Plan Commission adjourns

1 7:57, :58. Thank you. Thanks everybody for
2 coming.

3 (Off the record at 7:59 p.m.)
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Kristine Wesner, CVR, the officer before whom the foregoing proceeding was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the testimony given; that said testimony was taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that reading and signing was not requested; and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this proceeding and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 9th day of December, 2025.



My Commission Expires: July 01, 2029