

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2017**

---

Members Present: Chairman Wallace  
Tim Kessler  
Jeff Funke  
James Holderfield  
Tom Pretz  
Peter Vargulich  
Laura Macklin-Purdy  
Tom Schuetz  
David Pietryla

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Russell Colby, Community Dev. Division Manager  
Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

Vice Chairman Kessler called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Chairman Wallace called the roll. A quorum was present.

**3. Presentation of minutes of the November 7, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission.**

**Motion was made by Mr. Funke, seconded by Ms. Purdy, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**4. Pet Care Facilities in M1 District, Off-Premise Signs in Business and Manufacturing Districts (Robin Massey)**

Application for General Amendment

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

**Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to close the public hearing.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Wallace, Pietryla, Funke**

**Nays: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Motion carried: 9-0**

- 5. Fydoland, 1311 E. Main St. (Robin Massey)**  
Application for Special Use for Pet Care Facility

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

**Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to close the public hearing.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Wallace, Pietryla, Funke**

**Nays: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Motion carried: 9-0**

**MEETING**

- 6. Pet Care Facilities in M1 District, Off-Premise Signs in Business and Manufacturing Districts (Robin Massey)**  
Application for General Amendment

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

**Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to approve Pet Care Facilities in the M1 District & Off-Premise Signs in Business and Manufacturing Districts (Robin Massey), Application for General Amendment, subject to resolution of any outstanding staff comments.**

**Chairman Wallace made a motion to amend the main motion to add a condition that any sign built pursuant to this amendment shall be combined with the existing property owner sign, and the allowable square footage shall be no more than 150 percent of the square footage allowed in the underlying ordinance or in the underlying zoning district. Seconded by Mr. Pretz.**

**Roll Call Vote (Motion to amend the main motion):**

**Ayes: Kessler, Funke, Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Wallace, Pietryla**

**Nays: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Motion carried: 9-0**

**Roll Call Vote (main amended motion):**

**Ayes: Kessler, Funke, Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Wallace, Pietryla**

**Nays: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Motion carried: 9-0**

- 7. Fydoland, 1311 E. Main St. (Robin Massey)**  
Application for Special Use for Pet Care Facility

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

**Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Ms. Purdy to recommend approval of Fydoland, 1311 East Main Street (Robin Massey), Application for Special Use for a Pet Care Facility, subject to the resolution of any outstanding staff comments.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Ayes: Kessler, Funke, Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Wallace, Pietryla**

**Nays: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Motion carried: 9-0**

- 8. Valley Shopping Center Resubdivision (Plank Road, LLC)**  
Minor Subdivision- Final Plat

Chairman Wallace recused himself from discussion of the agenda item and left the meeting.

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

**Motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Mr. Funke to approve the Valley Shopping Center Resubdivision (Plank Road, LLC) Minor Subdivision Final Plat subject to any outstanding staff concerns.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Ayes: Kessler, Funke, Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Pietryla**

**Nays: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Recused: Wallace**

**Motion carried: 8-0**

- 9. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff-None.**
- 10. Weekly Development Report**
- 11. Meeting Announcements**

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**  
**Tuesday, December 5, 2017**  
**Page 4**

- a. Plan Commission
  - Tuesday, December 19, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
  - Tuesday, January 9, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
  - Tuesday, January 23, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- b. Planning & Development Committee
  - Monday, December 11, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
  - Tuesday, January 16, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

**12. Public Comment**

**13. Adjournment at 8:17 p.m.**

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x  
In Re: :  
Public Hearing including :  
Application for General :  
Amendment; Pet Care :  
Facilities in M1 District, :  
Off-Premise Signs in Business :  
and Manufacturing Districts :  
(Robin Massey). :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, December 5, 2017  
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 126930A  
Pages: 1 - 36  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

9 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Chairman Wallace not present.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This meeting of  
the St. Charles Plan Commission will come to order.

No. 2 on the agenda is roll call. Tom.

MEMBER PRETZ: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Pietryla.

MEMBER PIETRYLA: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Kessler.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

MEMBER PRETZ: Pretz, here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. No. 3 on  
the agenda is presentation of the minutes of the  
November 7th, 2017, meeting of the Plan Commission.

Is there a motion to approve?



1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So moved.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

4 (Ayes heard.)

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. 4 on the  
6 agenda -- 4 and 5 actually are public hearings.  
7 Give me just a moment here.

8 The first is for Pet Care Facilities in  
9 the M1 District, Off-Premise Signs in Business and  
10 Manufacturing Districts (Robin Massey), and the  
11 other is Fydoland at 1311 East Main Street, also  
12 Robin Massey.

13 Just give me one moment, please.

14 So these are both public hearings, and I'd  
15 like to review our procedure for public hearing.

16 First, the applicant will present the  
17 application. In this case it's going to be  
18 Robin Massey, and when she's done it will it be  
19 Robin Massey again. And then the Plan Commission  
20 will ask questions about and make comments to the  
21 applicant regarding the presentation, and next the  
22 audience will be invited to ask questions and make  
23 comments.

24 The applicant will then have a chance to

1 make a final statement if you wish. Then if the  
2 Plan Commission has determined we have enough  
3 evidence to make a recommendation to the City  
4 Council, we will close the public hearing.

5 Are there any questions?

6 (No response.)

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Now, anyone who  
8 wishes to offer any testimony, ask questions, or  
9 make comments, I would ask you to raise your right  
10 hand and be sworn in. Anybody that's going to be  
11 speaking come up and say -- sure, just raise your  
12 right hand. Anybody else here that's going to  
13 intend to make comments?

14 (No response.)

15 (Witness sworn.)

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

17 All right. So, finally, I want to make  
18 other comments. Only one person at a time. If  
19 you speak, come up to the microphone, speak into  
20 the microphone, state your name and your address  
21 for the record. We have a court reporter here --  
22 and this is for all of us Plan Commissioners, too,  
23 because we all like to engage. Only one person at  
24 a time and please speak slowly. We do have a

1 woman using an iPad that's hooked up to -- what is  
2 that called -- stenograph. So if more than one  
3 person speaks at a time or you don't speak slowly,  
4 it won't show up on the iPad. So let's see if we  
5 can make the technology work.

6 So I guess the next thing is we'll have  
7 the -- we'll have the applicant make a presentation  
8 on Item 4, Pet Care Facilities in the M1 District,  
9 Off-Premise Signs in Business and Manufacturing  
10 Districts.

11 And stick to that one and not the Fydoland  
12 because we're doing them one at a time. Can you  
13 do that?

14 MS. MASSEY: Not with the speech I put  
15 together.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You're going to  
17 have to just put that paper down and talk.

18 MS. MASSEY: I'm sorry. Which one do you  
19 want me to address first?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We actually have  
21 this in two different applications. One is for  
22 the off-premise signs in business and manufacturing.  
23 The other is for the application for special use.

24 Does that make sense?

1 MS. MASSEY: It does. Most of it will  
2 apply to both, but what I can do is break it down  
3 to -- it will be a little discombobulated, but I  
4 think I'll get my point across.

5 (Chairman Wallace joined the proceedings.)

6 MS. MASSEY: Good evening, Chairman Wallace  
7 and Members of the Plan Commission. My name is  
8 Robin Massey. I'm the owner of Fydoland Dog Care  
9 Center. I'm a pet professional and business owner  
10 with over 20 years of experience in my field. My  
11 credentials include pet care columnist, host of a  
12 local pet radio show, professional speaker on all  
13 things dog, former cochair of the Chicago chapter of  
14 2 Million Dogs Puppy Up cancer walk, founder and  
15 cocoordinator of the Dundee Township Park District  
16 Dog Days of Dundee festival, member of the board  
17 of directors for Anderson Animal Shelter, and  
18 member of the St. Charles Fine Art Show committee.

19 In nine years I have built with the help of  
20 my staff and supporters three successful locations  
21 in the Fox Valley area, with our largest store  
22 being right here in St. Charles.

23 I'm here today because I filed two general  
24 amendments to the zoning ordinance in hopes of

1 offering more amenities and services to the  
2 St. Charles community. Right now I'll just  
3 specifically talk about allowing off-premise signs  
4 for lots without street frontage in the business  
5 and manufacturing districts BL, BC, BR, M1, and  
6 M2 districts.

7 Almost four years ago I stood before the  
8 St. Charles Plan Commission asking for another  
9 general amendment to the zoning ordinance to add  
10 the definition of a pet care facility to the code  
11 definitions and to allow pet care facilities in  
12 the B1 District. So why am I here today?

13 In three years Fydoland outgrew its current  
14 location. When I came to the Commission almost  
15 four years ago, I had no idea that our business,  
16 services, and products would grow as quickly as  
17 they have. I am thankful and grateful for how  
18 well we've been received.

19 In 2014 we started out with zero customers in  
20 St. Charles, and today we have almost 2,000 active  
21 clients. Because of our popularity we've had to  
22 turn people away from our daycare services because  
23 we've been sold out of space. Though it may seem  
24 like a wonderful problem to have, the truth is we

1 are not able to meet the needs of our community in  
2 our current location, which means I cannot do my job  
3 to the best of my ability. Hence the reason I'm here  
4 today.

5 The amendment that I'm proposing is allowing  
6 off-site premise signs for lots without signage in  
7 business and manufacturing districts BL, BC, BR,  
8 M1, and M2.

9 With -- talking about the first proposed  
10 amendment of Fydoland changing the M1, it would  
11 make sense to allow off-site signage that is  
12 currently available in the downtown district and  
13 other adjacent districts but not in the areas like  
14 M1 that are trying to be redeveloped to meet the  
15 current needs of our community. A change in the  
16 sign zoning ordinance would only affect a few  
17 current businesses but can help our community grow  
18 and help community members find the businesses  
19 that they are looking for.

20 Both amendments would be beneficial to the  
21 business community if they would allow business  
22 owners alternatives and options to grow their  
23 business in our St. Charles community. The changes  
24 will help by drawing in businesses to fill empty

1 buildings, meet more of the needs of our community,  
2 and draw in more revenue from surrounding  
3 communities. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. Plan  
5 Commissioner questions?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have -- go ahead.

7 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a question for staff.

8 The applicant has mentioned that it would  
9 only affect a few businesses. Do you happen to  
10 know how many there would be, any other information  
11 related to that?

12 MR. COLBY: So this is in reference to the  
13 amendment regarding the signs for lots without street  
14 frontage. There's a list of -- a bullet point list  
15 of parcels where staff surveyed properties within  
16 the zoning districts to determine how many lots exist  
17 without street frontage, and we came up a list of  
18 6 general locations where this amendment would  
19 enable placement of an off-site sign. So it's  
20 relatively few.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that would be the --  
23 it's page 6 of 19 -- you're in the wrong one  
24 actually. Go back and click on the general

1 amendment one. 4702 East Main Street, which are the  
2 lots located around Hilton Garden Inn, 1415 South  
3 Avenue, which is Marshall's Towing, and then this  
4 location and the adjacent property, 1315 East Main  
5 Street, 230 north Randall Road, which is the  
6 XSport Fitness car wash, and 2406 West Main Street  
7 which is Sherwin Williams -- they don't have  
8 frontage, Sherwin Williams?

9 MR. COLBY: They do not. The front part  
10 of the lot where the front row of parking is is  
11 actually part of the lot that the bank is  
12 sitting on.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And XSport, are they on  
14 a separate lot than the rest of the XSport --  
15 yeah, yeah.

16 Okay. Other questions?

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question as far  
18 as clarification of these. I'm not sure I  
19 understand this amendment.

20 So if this were to be approved, how does  
21 it affect these six businesses? They would be  
22 allowed to locate signs elsewhere on a major road?  
23 Is that what it's saying?

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They'd have to have a



1 private agreement with the property owner to place  
2 a sign on their property. Correct?

3 MR. COLBY: Correct. So there's a section  
4 of the existing sign ordinance that applies to the  
5 CBD1 and CBD2 districts that's included in the memo.

6 So there's language that states that, "In  
7 those districts for lots without street frontage, in  
8 lieu of an identification sign located on the lot,  
9 an identification sign may be located off-premise  
10 on an adjacent lot with street frontage subject to  
11 the authorization of the property owner."

12 So that ability then would be extended to  
13 these lots without street frontage in the  
14 commercial manufacturing districts.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So if this were passed,  
16 you're saying it would be extended?

17 MR. COLBY: They'd have the ability to do  
18 so under the zoning ordinance assuming that the  
19 adjacent property owner with street frontage was  
20 willing to allow their sign to be displayed.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So, for instance, if  
22 XSport -- the car wash is in the back behind the  
23 building, and if I recall, I think there is no  
24 sign except if you know it's there. There's none

1 on the front off of Randall; they're only in the  
2 back. So does that mean they can put them up  
3 front on Randall?

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I believe it's the same  
6 owner, though.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, it wouldn't  
8 be contiguous anyway.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Okay.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I guess the other  
12 question would be -- let's take, for example, the  
13 XSport car wash. If they wanted to have the owners  
14 of Oberweis put up a sign, they can negotiate for  
15 that, and that would be allowed for that particular  
16 parcel of property?

17 MR. COLBY: Well, only if the -- Oberweis,  
18 the lot that they're located on, that lot would  
19 have to have no street frontage for that to apply.  
20 Otherwise, they don't have the ability to locate a  
21 sign off-site.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wait. Who -- if  
23 Oberweis doesn't have it?

24 MR. COLBY: So if they have street frontage,

1 which I'm guessing they do, then they would not be  
2 able to place any off-site signage.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, I mean if the car  
4 wash wanted to put it over there.

5 MR. COLBY: Oh, well, the code states it  
6 has to be an adjacent lot.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: An adjacent lot?

8 MR. COLBY: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which means that --  
10 would you consider the XSport facility an adjacent  
11 lot for the car wash just because it's next to it?

12 MR. COLBY: Yes. Yes, it's adjacent because  
13 they're contiguous.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would like to  
15 just remind the Plan Commissioners that we've had  
16 this condition before and it wasn't a CB district  
17 right across --

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: CBD2.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- CBD 2 District  
20 right across from Salerno's. Terry Grove owns a  
21 building that doesn't have any street frontage,  
22 and he negotiated with the owners of that shopping  
23 center to put a sign, a pole sign actually out on  
24 Route 31. So this isn't that uncommon just for

1 this particular zoning district.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I was just trying to get  
3 clarification and understand exactly what it meant.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. So is  
5 this the actual proposed signage that you have here  
6 on page 19?

7 MS. MASSEY: Something very similar to that.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: My only concern is that it  
9 looks like it's just sticking a sign on -- is the  
10 barbecue place going to still be there?

11 MS. MASSEY: Actually, it's Dimples Donuts  
12 now. So they've updated their sign, everything  
13 looks nice, and ours will be complementary to that.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: I mean, it would be nice to  
15 see an updated version because right now the  
16 existing signage, it seems like the base is  
17 falling apart. It would be nice instead of just  
18 slapping a sign on there to think about it from a  
19 design perspective.

20 MS. MASSEY: Sure. At that time that was  
21 taken, Dimples wasn't there.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: I understand.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Everything would  
24 otherwise have to comply with the sign ordinance;

1 correct?

2 MR. COLBY: Yes. And that was a question  
3 that was raised in the comments on page 5 of the  
4 staff memo. There are some options for the Plan  
5 Commission to consider regarding how the area of  
6 the signs would be determined.

7 First, if the off-premise sign is being  
8 allowed, should it be allowed to be its own  
9 standalone sign. So then a single lot could end  
10 up having two signs, one for the business on the  
11 lot and one that's a sign for the off-site location.

12 Alternately, should they be required to be  
13 combined onto a single sign, the next question  
14 would be the sign face area calculation, should it  
15 be required to fit within the area that's already  
16 allotted to that lot, or should there be additional  
17 area granted for the off-site sign.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any discussion on that?

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would think that if  
20 it was combined into one sign and not two separate  
21 freestanding signs, I think that feels like the  
22 whole design works better rather than two separate  
23 freestanding signs.

24 MS. MASSEY: I agree with you.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: One behind the other or  
2 one in front of the other one.

3 MS. MASSEY: It would be very congested  
4 looking.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: On square footage I  
6 think that -- that's a hard nut to crack because  
7 there's probably different issues related to how  
8 those are calculated based on total square  
9 footages and things like that.

10 I think you could end up with some very  
11 really large signs if you gave full credit for the  
12 additional lot or the off-site lot to be credited  
13 to the frontage. I would think a maximum 50 percent  
14 increase would be my suggestion.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think that the sign  
16 ordinance should be otherwise adhered to as though  
17 it's one sign. That's my opinion.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that I have  
19 to agree with that simply because the purpose of  
20 the sign ordinance is to control and regulate  
21 signage on street frontages, and if we were to  
22 start doubling up in those opportunities --  
23 although, I have to say -- you know, I want to go  
24 back to this list that you have here. Are these

1 the only ones in the entire corporate boundary,  
2 Russ, that have that condition in M1?

3 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's only M1  
5 though?

6 MR. COLBY: No, this would be all of the  
7 business and manufacturing districts.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All of them?

9 MR. COLBY: And this would not include any  
10 property that's within a PUD because in a PUD you  
11 can place signs in any location within the PUD.  
12 So many of the city's commercial developments are  
13 within PUDs. So none of those would apply. They  
14 already have this ability.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So the potential  
16 impact of whatever we do is only limited to these  
17 six. Okay. Then if it is these six properties,  
18 how many -- how many adjacent -- suppose there's --  
19 well, for example, the XSport. There's two lots  
20 adjacent. Could they put two signs out?

21 MR. COLBY: No, they would only be allowed  
22 one off-site sign because it's essentially taking  
23 the sign that otherwise would have been allowed on  
24 that lot and having it located in another location.

1           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, given the low  
2 impact then, I would say that I'm not opposed -- I  
3 think they should probably be combined for  
4 appearances sake, but I'm not opposed to allowing  
5 more area since we're only dealing with  
6 six properties here.

7           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So in terms of  
8 Fydoland, if she put this sign up on Route 64,  
9 would she also be -- she would not be able to put  
10 a sign on that side street?

11          MR. COLBY: Correct.

12          MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, the location is  
13 really based on the address of the property, or is  
14 it related to where they have an ingress and  
15 egress easement for access?

16          MR. COLBY: Well, the existing provisions  
17 for the CBD1 districts just talk about an adjacent  
18 lot with the frontage. So this amendment, if the  
19 Plan Commission wanted to recommend that, could be  
20 stipulated that it be a lot where there's access  
21 provided. That was one of the comments, as well.

22          MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes. I would think  
23 that if we're going to do it, that would make more  
24 sense. Otherwise, whether they -- in the case of



1 this property they have access from another  
2 direction from another street just because there's  
3 pavement available, you know, not because they  
4 have an ingress and egress easement. Is that  
5 correct?

6 MS. MASSEY: I don't quite understand.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: You only have an ingress  
8 and egress easement for access out to main street,  
9 but you can get to the same property from the 13th.

10 MS. MASSEY: True.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: That's what I'm saying  
12 is you don't get to have them on two streets.

13 MS. MASSEY: Right.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Only the ingress and  
15 egress easement.

16 MS. MASSEY: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Other questions?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any questions  
20 from members of the audience?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Comments?

23 (No response.)

24 MEMBER PRETZ: I was going to say that I'm

1 okay with the proposal for the signage. I think I'm  
2 most comfortable with just following the existing  
3 signage code versus expansion of the area.

4 MEMBER PIETRYLA: I have a question of Russ.

5 Hypothetically, if we require that the  
6 signs have to be together, if a sign exists --  
7 like your sign does not exist there yet -- is it  
8 possible that the other owner can just say, "No, I  
9 don't want" -- so that is a possibility obviously.

10 MR. COLBY: Yes, that remains under any  
11 scenario that we could come up with. You can't  
12 require the adjacent property owner to display  
13 the sign.

14 MEMBER PIETRYLA: So if we did merge them,  
15 obviously, that's just a potential extra layer of  
16 discussion between --

17 MS. MASSEY: Right, right.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that -- I  
19 mean, I'm wondering if we really have enough  
20 information and have studied this deeply enough.  
21 Because there are things you could do to make the  
22 sign not overlarge or overpowering.

23 For example, I'm just thinking of a couple  
24 of things. You say you have to keep the certain

1 height by the sign ordinance, but you could allow  
2 more area, it just can't be bigger. As you say,  
3 anything you have to agree with the adjacent  
4 property owner. I mean, we could say combine the  
5 signs, they can't go any taller than this, but you  
6 could fill in more of the area or something  
7 like that.

8 I'm not so convinced that we have enough  
9 information to make that call to say it shouldn't  
10 increase in area size at all or it should go  
11 50 percent or -- I mean, is there something that  
12 we could -- some more information you could get,  
13 Russ, to help make that kind of a decision?

14 MR. COLBY: Well, I think if the Plan  
15 Commission was inclined to say that the signs should  
16 be limited to the existing allowance for sign  
17 area, then there really isn't any further analysis  
18 that would need to be done. I think the question  
19 would be if the Plan Commission wants to entertain  
20 the idea of allowing larger signs and there's more  
21 information you would want on that to look at the  
22 sizes, that's something that we could bring back.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think the  
24 flip side of this whole conversation is that if

1 you don't allow any more area -- I mean, what  
2 business owner isn't going to have the maximum  
3 area for their business? And then somebody comes  
4 to them and wants to negotiate to tack their sign  
5 on, there's really nothing anybody can do. I  
6 think we're limiting the ordinance just by saying,  
7 "Okay, you can do it but you can't go bigger."

8 MEMBER FUNKE: But it needs to be approved  
9 by a permit.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It would be and it  
11 would be approved by a permit under current sign  
12 ordinance, but I can't think of any situation where  
13 a business owner wouldn't build the sign to the  
14 maximum allowable size, rarely, and so you've  
15 automatically said --

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: I don't necessarily agree.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I don't think I  
18 agree either.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: The area is determined by  
20 the lineal frontage on the main front; is that  
21 correct?

22 MR. COLBY: So the area of the sign is based  
23 on the frontage of the building and then there's a  
24 maximum.

1           You know, I think to answer your question,  
2           Tim, I think it would really be up to the individual  
3           property owner. If they wanted to find a way to  
4           include the additional signage on their own sign,  
5           they could make a decision to modify their sign  
6           because they may have some financial arrangement  
7           to be compensated for that.

8           But regardless of what we do with the sign  
9           area and however much we provide, we still can't  
10          compel that property owner to agree to provide  
11          signage for an adjacent lot. So I don't know if  
12          we can really answer that question very easily  
13          because there's hypothetical scenarios of the  
14          interests of one property owner versus another and  
15          what they would agree to much.

16          MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, in the case of this  
17          property as an example, is -- the freestanding  
18          sign that's there now is allowed, and then is the  
19          property owner, the doughnut shop, are they  
20          allowed wall signage that's calculated separately?

21          MR. COLBY: Yes, that's correct. So the  
22          freestanding signage is separate from any other  
23          signage.

24          MEMBER VARGULICH: So, Tim, to your point,

1 really what it comes down to is if you own frontage,  
2 then you can decide wherever you want to max out  
3 one aspect of signage over the other.

4 So if you're allowed 150 square feet of  
5 freestanding sign, and you want to sell it all or  
6 lease it all to her, then you can do that, and  
7 then you would just have your wall signage, which  
8 you'd be allowed. So I don't know that that  
9 should be --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think in any  
11 business that I've been involved in we've always  
12 tried to max out the street signage. I mean,  
13 that's your number one advertising. And I agree  
14 you can have some wall signage, but it's not as  
15 effective as any kind of monument or pole signage  
16 you're going to have on the street. That's how  
17 most businesses would operate. But that's my  
18 opinion.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: My opinion is I've been  
20 involved in signage provisions of the zoning  
21 ordinance in the past, and maybe it's time to  
22 bring this back up for an informational discussion  
23 at a future meeting and kind of discuss what --  
24 discuss the signage portion of the zoning ordinance

1 as a whole, and we can include this as part of  
2 that discussion.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I agree. And part  
4 of my approach here is that because of the number  
5 of properties that are involved here, the impact  
6 is pretty low. But I also agree with Todd, I  
7 don't want this to become -- I don't want to open  
8 Pandora's box so in the future if there are other  
9 properties that are carved out or created that we  
10 could go amuck of the ordinance in place.

11 But in this particular case I think it's  
12 pretty low impact, six properties and gives people  
13 an opportunity -- it gives those people who don't  
14 have signage a better opportunity to negotiate  
15 with somebody who does have the frontage.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, I have a question  
17 regarding this lot as well as the five or six that  
18 you've determined could utilize an amendment  
19 like this.

20 Going forward would those lots be allowed  
21 in our zoning ordinance now from a subdivision  
22 standpoint?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. In commercial districts  
24 you're not required to have street frontage for

1 a lot.

2 Now, at the time of a subdivision we would  
3 be reviewing for the access arrangement, so that  
4 would be a consideration. And, obviously, the  
5 signage has a connection with the access layout.  
6 So that's something that a property owner would  
7 need to consider at the time they're proposing a  
8 subdivision, but it is something that's permitted  
9 under the code.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other  
12 questions or comments?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If there are none,  
15 prior to moving on to the next application a  
16 motion will be in order to close the public hearing.

17 MR. COLBY: If I can make one comment.  
18 This general amendment application -- you know, we  
19 spent most of the time discussing the issue of the  
20 signage, but there's also a proposal to add the  
21 pet care facility used as a special use in the  
22 M1 District. So I want to make the Plan Commission  
23 is aware of that, and if there's any discussion you  
24 want to conduct on that issue, it would be



1 appropriate to do that now before moving on to the  
2 special use.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You're talking about  
4 No. 5 then?

5 MR. COLBY: No. Under No. 4 there's  
6 two different general amendment requests. One is  
7 regarding the off-site sign, and one is regarding  
8 having Pet Care Facilities added as a special use  
9 in the M1 zoning district.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And then No. 5 is an  
11 application for a special use?

12 MR. COLBY: Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do have a question.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Don't we have at  
16 least one, if not two Pet Care Facilities in  
17 M1 districts in St. Charles?

18 MR. COLBY: I know there's existing business  
19 that was -- when it was established it was classified  
20 as a kennel. I'm not sure now based on how it's  
21 being run if it would still be defined as a kennel,  
22 but that was a use that was established under the  
23 previous zoning ordinance when there were different  
24 zoning districts.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which one is that?

2 MR. COLBY: The one that's on the west side  
3 off of 15th Street.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Ruffner's.

5 MR. COLBY: I don't know the specifics of  
6 their layout within the building to know if it would  
7 fit the definition of a pet care facility or not.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would say it probably is.

9 MS. MASSEY: I believe it is. My  
10 understanding is a pet care facility is 25 percent  
11 less of that space is boarding, and theirs is  
12 significantly over that.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Do we have  
14 any further discussion regarding that including  
15 pet care facility as a special use in M1 special  
16 manufacturing?

17 What other districts is it a special use  
18 in, Russ?

19 MR. COLBY: Right now only the business  
20 districts, BL, BC, BR.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Russ, are there any  
22 precedents with other communities that do this  
23 that you know of?

24 MR. COLBY: Well, when this use was

1 established, it was thought that it was different  
2 from a kennel use because it had a retail component  
3 so it might be something that's more appropriate  
4 for a business district.

5 The M1 district is unique in that it covers  
6 properties that are older industrial properties,  
7 some of which are in transitional areas adjacent  
8 to commercial uses. And one of the purposes of  
9 that district is it's not specifically to encourage  
10 new industrial uses but rather alternate uses for  
11 properties that previously were industrial and  
12 maybe are not appropriate for that use going forward.

13 So it does allow a unique mix of businesses  
14 that are meant to better utilize those properties  
15 that may not be appropriate for industrial use.  
16 So it's kind of an in between zoning classification.

17 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Thank you.

18 MS. MASSEY: Actually, I have a little  
19 speech on that one, too, if you want to hear it.  
20 When you were first talking --

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Would you like to  
22 give it?

23 MS. MASSEY: If I may.

24 A move to 1311 East Main would allow

1 Fydoland the opportunity to grow and continue to  
2 provide the best service and best pet care products  
3 to the citizens of St. Charles and surrounding  
4 communities.

5 Right now 1311 East Main is zoned M1, which  
6 does not allow pet care facilities as a special  
7 use in the zoning district. However, according to  
8 the M1 purpose statement, Chapter 17.16.010 the  
9 purpose of the M1 special manufacturing district  
10 was to accommodate older manufacturing areas in  
11 the city that were either in transition from  
12 manufacturing to alternative uses or were in need  
13 of rehabilitation. The M1 district shall provide  
14 flexibility in design and parking requirements to  
15 allow for adopted reuse and/or redevelopment of  
16 viable light assembly, processing, heavy retail  
17 and service and office uses.

18 The addition of pet care facilities as a  
19 special use to the allowable businesses in the  
20 M1 district will meet the goals of the zoning  
21 ordinance by transitioning an empty building into  
22 a modern day desirable business, as well as allow  
23 the City to continue to control what businesses  
24 they deem is a desirable fit for the community in

1 the zoning district. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any questions,  
3 Plan Commissioners?

4 MEMBER PRETZ: I had one.

5 As far as any kind of public nuisance or  
6 anything like that, at your current facility have  
7 there been any outstanding issues?

8 MS. MASSEY: Not one. Not at any one of  
9 my three locations.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Staff, are you aware  
11 of any?

12 MR. COLBY: No, we are unaware of any  
13 issues at the facility in St. Charles.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I make a motion to  
15 close the public hearing on Item 4.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'm just wondering,  
18 have you spoken to it's L-y -- the building right  
19 next to that manufacturing building. I can't  
20 remember what the name of the --

21 MS. MASSEY: I'm not sure which one you're  
22 talking about. The one that's right in front of it?

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Lyon Construction.

24 MS. MASSEY: He actually is the owner of

1 that, as well.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. Just to make  
3 sure. It's always nice to talk to your neighbors.

4 MS. MASSEY: Absolutely.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sir, could you give  
6 your name for the record, please?

7 MR. MAUGER: Terry Mauger, M-a-u-g-e-r.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Sorry. Go  
9 ahead.

10 MR. MAUGER: I just wanted to let you know  
11 that Lyon Construction is aware. They only have  
12 5 or 6 parking spaces, and they're not really  
13 there much.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other  
15 questions?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything from members  
18 of the audience?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Tim, you were  
21 making a motion?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To close the  
23 public hearing on Item 4 on the agenda.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

35

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and  
2 seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

14 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
23 concludes Item 4 on the agenda.

24 (Off the record at 7:38 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case 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 12th day of December, 2017.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary 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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x  
In Re: :  
Public Hearing including :  
Application for a Special Use :  
for a pet care facility; :  
Fydoland, 1311 East Main :  
Street (Robin Massey). :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, December 5, 2017  
7:38 p.m.

Job No.: 126930B  
Pages: 1 - 11  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1       PRESENT:

2               TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3               TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4               JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5               JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6               DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

7               TOM PRETZ, Member

8               LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

9               TOM SCHUETZ, Member

10              PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12       ALSO PRESENT:

13              RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moving on to Item 5,  
3 Item 5 is Fydoland, 1311 East Main Street (Robin  
4 Massey) application for special use for a pet care  
5 facility.

6 Would you like for us to just go into  
7 questions, or do you have anything further?

8 MS. MASSEY: I really don't have anything  
9 else other than we have seen that it is a well-  
10 needed service in our community, and with the  
11 response that we've gotten, we've deemed it has  
12 been a desirable business in St. Charles.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I do have a question  
15 regarding parking. Because the -- Russ, correct  
16 me if I'm wrong, but -- I'm sorry -- I'm trying it  
17 find it here. The zoning ordinance would require  
18 63 parking spaces?

19 MR. COLBY: That's correct. The parking  
20 requirement is three spaces per 1,000 square feet  
21 of the use.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And the lot is  
23 currently striped for 57 spaces?

24 MR. COLBY: Yes.

1           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And what does that  
2 include? When we say "the lot," that's not just  
3 the lot that's on this parcel?

4           MR. COLBY: Correct. It's the parking  
5 areas that are shared between the -- this lot and  
6 the two adjacent lots which are under common  
7 ownership with this lot.

8           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there an access  
9 agreement with those?

10          MR. COLBY: Well, they're under common  
11 ownership, so they're essentially being treated as  
12 a single parking area.

13          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Would there be an issue  
14 if one of those adjacent lots are sold with not  
15 having enough parking on this particular lot?

16          MR. COLBY: There could be if the access  
17 was restricted to one of those lots.

18          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And you mentioned in here  
19 that the adjacent buildings are light industrial  
20 requiring one space per 1,000 square feet, so it  
21 seems that 57 is enough to accommodate all the uses?

22          MR. COLBY: Well, the -- it would be the  
23 63 plus whatever is necessary for those businesses.  
24 So looking at --

1           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, I'm sorry. 63 just  
2 for this one?

3           MR. COLBY: So looking at the total area  
4 that's available for parking, there's areas that  
5 could be designated for additional parking, and we  
6 believe it could meet the ordinance requirement.  
7 We'd have to verify based on the layout.

8           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

9           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I can just tell you  
10 that that's ample parking for this facility. I  
11 live by Fydoland and there's never anybody in the  
12 parking lot only because they come and go so  
13 quickly. I mean, given how successful you are,  
14 that's obvious. So I don't know if it has to be a  
15 certain amount, but that's ample because people  
16 come and go so quickly; they pick up their dog;  
17 they go home.

18           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What percentage of the  
19 building is considered to be used for nonpet care?

20           MS. MASSEY: About 5,000 square feet.

21           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So 15,000 would be used  
22 for the pet care use?

23           MS. MASSEY: Correct.

24           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Questions, other

1 questions?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just one.

3 You're moving because you need more space?

4 MS. MASSEY: Yes. We've had to turn people  
5 away. Especially during holidays and with the  
6 winter coming up, our daycare gets very, very  
7 busy, and currently we can only take a maximum  
8 number of dogs for safety purposes, and I hate  
9 turning people away that want to come in.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have another  
11 question just because I know the people who had  
12 the business there before, and they had a lot of  
13 problems with flooding. So I'm just wondering  
14 what you're doing for that.

15 MS. MASSEY: Great question. Terry will  
16 talk a little more to it but --

17 MR. MAUGER: Do you want me?

18 MS. MASSEY: Yeah. It's been eradicated  
19 but I'll let him speak to it.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry. Were you sworn  
21 in earlier?

22 MR. MAUGER: No, I wasn't.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Raise your hand.

24 (Witness sworn.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

2 MR. MAUGER: In I believe 2008 and 2012 we  
3 sustained the flooding. At that point -- 2008 was  
4 supposedly a 100-year rain, and we thought, well,  
5 we've got at least 50 or 60 years before it hits  
6 again. Well, in 2012 it hit again. I believe that  
7 was called a 60-year rain. So we really figure  
8 it's a long time now, but at that point we  
9 installed flood doors.

10 Are you familiar with Galena? Much like  
11 they have at Galena. Three of the doors are man  
12 doors. They look like regular doors, but they'll  
13 keep water out less than an inch -- less than an  
14 ounce per hour -- excuse me. Those three doors  
15 are man doors so people can go in and out. You  
16 never have to worry about if it floods. They're  
17 going to seal. They use a special seal that  
18 actually swells when they get wet. We only found  
19 one company in the United States that made those.

20 We also put dam-type doors in all the  
21 other openings. After we put the flood doors in,  
22 we had a 10-inch flood; we got no water. It took  
23 us about 20 minutes to clean up from around the  
24 foundation in the back of the building, nothing



1 through the doors. We couldn't afford to have  
2 another flood in our building, and that's what we  
3 did to prevent that.

4 So we feel it's very safe as far as  
5 flooding at this point. I'm not sure if you've  
6 seen our building, but it's very well maintained.  
7 It's not your typical 1930s building; it's got all  
8 new roofing; it's a well-kept building.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything from the  
14 audience?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I make a motion to  
18 close the public hearing on Item 5 on, 1311 East  
19 Main Street (Robin Massey) application for a  
20 special use for a pet care facility.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and  
23 seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

24 (No response.)

Transcript of Fydoland  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

10

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, Tim.  
2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.  
3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.  
4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.  
5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.  
6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.  
7 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.  
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.  
9 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.  
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.  
11 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.  
12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.  
13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.  
14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.  
15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.  
16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.  
17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.  
18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.  
19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
20 concludes Item 5.  
21 (Off the record at 7:45 p.m.)  
22  
23  
24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case 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 12th day of December, 2017.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary 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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x  
In Re: :  
Regular Meeting including :  
Application for General Amendment, :  
Pet Care Facilities in M1 :  
District, Off-Premise Signs in :  
Business and Manufacturing :  
Districts (Robin Massey) :  
and :  
FYDOLAND, 1311 East Main Street :  
(Robin Massey), Application for :  
Special Use for Pet Care Facility. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, December 5, 2017  
7:46 p.m.

Job No.: 126930C  
Pages: 1 - 21  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities and Fydoland

Conducted on December 5, 2017

3

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

9 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities and Fydoland  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Entering our regular  
3 meeting portion, Item 6 is Pet Care Facilities in  
4 the M1 District, Off-Premise Signs in Business and  
5 Manufacturing Districts (Robin Massey), application  
6 for general amendment.

7 We should probably do them one at a time.  
8 Following that is Item 7, Fydoland. If there's  
9 any discussion that involves both of them, we can  
10 have that discussion, but we'll take the motions  
11 one at a time on the individual applications.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Then I would  
13 recommend approval of Item 6 Pet Care Facilities  
14 in the M1 District, Off-Premise Signs in Business  
15 and Manufacturing Districts (Robin Massey),  
16 Application for General Amendment subject to  
17 resolution of any outstanding staff comments.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let's do them one by  
20 one. So that motion has been made and seconded.  
21 Is there discussion on that motion?

22 Russ.

23 MR. COLBY: If I can just make one  
24 comment. If the Plan Commission wants to provide

1 any direction regarding the ability to place more  
2 than one sign on a lot and the ability to add  
3 additional signage for the off-site signs, that  
4 should be stated as part of the recommendation.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: In the absence of any  
6 further direction, it would be construed as  
7 following with the existing sign ordinance?

8 MR. COLBY: Correct. Which the way that  
9 it's worded for the CBD districts it allows an  
10 additional freestanding sign, a separate sign.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So she could have a  
12 sign on that side street?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. She could have  
14 one on the property -- she could negotiate with an  
15 adjacent property owner to put one on the street  
16 frontage just as if she had street frontage but  
17 just one.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: In addition to the street  
20 frontage property owner on her side, which isn't  
21 really -- I mean, I don't know what the general  
22 consensus is. My feeling is that it should be  
23 combined in with the existing sign for that street  
24 frontage.



1           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't agree simply  
2 because it's -- again, I go back to it's a very low  
3 impact. I like your idea of revisiting this issue  
4 at a future time to discuss it, but I think in the  
5 absence of having any other information in front  
6 of us and we're only dealing with six properties  
7 and no indication that any more than the one that  
8 we're talking about is even going to take advantage  
9 of it, I think that we're -- I think we're  
10 handcuffing those people that don't have frontage.

11           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's six properties in  
12 this district.

13           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Six properties total.

14           MR. COLBY: Yes. Currently we identified  
15 six properties among all the business and  
16 manufacturing districts. There could be additional  
17 properties in the future, though.

18           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right, which is  
19 why I believe we should have a discussion about  
20 the sign ordinance in the future. But without  
21 that discussion and reviewing all of the things  
22 that I tend to agree with Todd on in our sign  
23 ordinance, I think we should allow the sign  
24 ordinance to stand as it is.

1           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, let me ask a  
2 question. Let's suppose that we have a private  
3 drive with lots that are back on the private drive,  
4 and each of them are adjoining a lot, a single lot  
5 that is on a public right-of-way. Let's say that  
6 there are three lots that aren't adjoining the  
7 public right-of-way, but they do adjoin this lot.  
8 Could each of those of us lots then have their own  
9 separate sign along with the property on the  
10 right-of-way sign?

11           MR. COLBY: Yes. Unless there's some  
12 limitation stated in the code.

13           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: See, that's a slope  
14 that I don't want to go down.

15           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But we don't have  
16 that condition. We may someday but that's why I  
17 agree that this item should be revisited. But I  
18 think you're making -- or we are attempting to  
19 make a change to the ordinance for this particular  
20 application when we don't have all of the information  
21 we need. And we can always come back and make  
22 that change, but until that time I don't want to  
23 change the existing sign ordinance, which is what  
24 we would be doing by putting conditions on this

1 particular application.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other discussion?

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would respectfully  
4 disagree and say that the only thing we seem to be  
5 talking about is adjusting one factor that the  
6 current ordinance allows, which is that every lot  
7 that is requesting a sign in a private agreement  
8 would get a freestanding sign.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The six properties  
10 that have been identified.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right. And I would say  
12 that by just adding that language to our motion  
13 that they have to all be combined with one  
14 freestanding sign, I don't see how that's some  
15 major adjustment to the sign ordinance. And if we  
16 still feel that way when we come back to recircle,  
17 which I don't think is a bad idea, we can adjust  
18 it then.

19 I think in the interim, whether it takes  
20 us six months or six years to readdress the entire  
21 sign ordinance, you can end up with every one of  
22 these conditions everybody having an extra  
23 freestanding sign on a street.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me just ask the

1 applicant, if there was a limitation where the  
2 property owner adjoining the street would be  
3 limited to one freestanding sign as opposed to  
4 allowing you to have an additional one, I think  
5 that what you said is that that's fine, that  
6 you're going to basically affix your sign to the  
7 existing freestanding sign.

8 MS. MASSEY: Correct. I was misunderstanding  
9 what you were saying, though. Before when you  
10 were talking about total square footage of the  
11 sign, if it's already at a maximum, then I can't  
12 add on. That's my only concern.

13 So as far as it being on the same monument,  
14 I think that that -- for any of these six businesses  
15 they're doing that that's reasonable. So, again,  
16 it doesn't look cluttered, you don't have all  
17 these freestanding signs, but there has to be some  
18 concession if a business is already using their  
19 maximum sign for their location. There's got to  
20 be some give so that if a business of mine can work  
21 something out with the business owner that there  
22 is space for them to do that.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: See I would be more apt  
24 to agree that the existing single sign, there would

1 be a concession to add space to that sign.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I could go  
3 along with that. My only concern here is that by  
4 not allowing some change, by limiting them to the  
5 number of signs and to the existing area, we're  
6 still handcuffing those people, those six lots  
7 that don't have -- I mean, we're not making it any  
8 easier for those people to put signage on their  
9 frontage because you can't have it any bigger than  
10 it already is, and you can't have more than one.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What would you think about  
12 adding a condition that the sign should be placed  
13 on the existing sign with an additional allowance  
14 of 50 percent of the allowable space of that sign,  
15 but in no event would multiple signs being added  
16 to it, like the example that I gave -- I mean, you  
17 could have a Valley Shopping Center sort of sign  
18 with 100 different businesses on the sign. In no  
19 event shall the resulting sign be more than  
20 100 percent larger than if it were only for that  
21 single lot, for that single parcel.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm heading that  
23 way but I'm not sure what you're --

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Or maybe 50 percent

1 larger.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So you're saying  
3 you could have the area of that single sign with  
4 both businesses could be 150 percent of --

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Let's say their  
6 allowable area is 50 square feet. If they added,  
7 then they could use 75 square feet.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: As long as it stayed  
9 within the existing perimeter of the sign? As  
10 long as it stayed within the existing perimeter of  
11 the existing sign.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: By the nature of giving  
13 them more square feet you could -- maybe the tweak  
14 is that it can't be any taller than what -- so  
15 they'd get more width.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I prefer to have a sign  
17 that's 150 percent as opposed to two signs.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would prefer to  
19 have a sign that was combined than to have two signs.  
20 I'm not sure that 150 -- I mean, you know, Peter is  
21 convinced that most people don't use their maximum.  
22 So why couldn't you have two signs that were on the  
23 same -- that were within the same perimeter of the  
24 existing that were double that size? I mean, why

1 couldn't you?

2           So I'm saying limiting it to 50 percent  
3 you could put -- in the existing sign ordinance --  
4 Russ, I have to ask this question -- we have a  
5 height requirement. Do we have a width  
6 requirement?

7           MR. COLBY: No.

8           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So we do have the  
9 height requirement. So we could say stay within  
10 the height requirement, but we don't limit the  
11 square footage to -- there's got to be a better  
12 way to limit the square footage than say 50 percent.

13           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, what's your thought?

14           MR. COLBY: Well, the height of the sign --  
15 nothing that's been proposed would allow for a  
16 sign to be taller. So all we're talking about is  
17 face area. And so when we talk about how large  
18 the sign can be, I think we have to base that on  
19 what's allowed currently by the zoning district  
20 where the property is located. So say it's  
21 100 square feet. So I think any additional sign  
22 area needs to be based -- I think a percentage  
23 makes sense because it needs to be based on how  
24 many square feet that existing sign can be.

1           So saying that you can add an additional  
2 percentage such as 50 percent, that's something  
3 that can be -- it's easy to administer. If we  
4 start to get into something that doesn't have a  
5 relation to just raw face area calculation is more  
6 complicated. We can't really regulate working in  
7 an existing sign face, for example. We have to  
8 base it on square footage, and starting with the  
9 square footage number that's allowed for that lot  
10 is a reasonable basis to make that calculation.

11           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And this would be  
12 for any business -- we're talking about these  
13 six businesses. If we make this change, it would  
14 be for any business that has a nonfrontage road?

15           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. There are  
16 six existing.

17           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

18           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

19           MEMBER PRETZ: I thought it was six.

20           MEMBER FUNKE: How many are vacant? Do  
21 you know?

22           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, the ones over by  
23 Hilton Garden Inn, there are multiple lots there.  
24 So that could be potentially more; correct?



Transcript of Pet Care Facilities and Fydoland  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

14

1 MR. COLBY: Yes. There's two or three vacant  
2 lots there.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And so you could have a  
4 situation where you have multiple signs, you know,  
5 on -- let's say Hilton Garden decides to give them  
6 a portion of their sign. You could have multiple  
7 different businesses on that sign.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: But no more than 150 percent.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's just what my  
10 thought was.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: So they would have to  
12 divide up the extra 50 percent between those two or  
13 three additional businesses if, in fact, they  
14 wanted to do it at all.

15 MEMBER PIETRYLA: If they even allow it  
16 at all.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: It would still be up to  
18 the property owner to grant that other lot the  
19 right to do so.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Basically, if they're  
21 allowed 100 square feet on their sign, and they want  
22 to do this, then they could have up to 150 square  
23 feet, and if they want to split it in half, take  
24 75 themselves, 25 for the other person, if they

1 want to split it in fourths or if they want to --  
2 whatever.

3 So I would say that -- I don't know if you  
4 want to propose an amendment or if you want me to  
5 or if anybody else wants to.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: Should I withdraw my second  
7 and then?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No, we can amend it.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We can amend it.

11 Is there any other discussion?

12 MEMBER PIETRYLA: So are we for sure saying  
13 50 percent, or is that just a number we threw out  
14 there?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, I just --

16 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Oh, okay.

17 Are there best practices in terms of  
18 something like this, Russ?

19 MR. COLBY: No, not for something like  
20 this. I don't think there's really a standard.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Well, I'd make a  
22 motion to amend the main motion to add a -- would  
23 I call it a restriction, Russ?

24 MR. COLBY: A condition.

1           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay -- a condition that  
2 any sign built pursuant to this much -- to this  
3 amendment shall be combined with the existing  
4 property owner sign, and the allowable square  
5 footage shall be no more than 150 percent of the  
6 square footage allowed in the underlying ordinance --  
7 or in the underlying zoning district.

8           Does that -- Russ, does that work?

9           MR. COLBY: Yes, I think so.

10          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

11          MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

12          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Moved and  
13 seconded. Discussion on that motion? We're now  
14 discussing the motion to amend only.

15          (No response.)

16          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So let's --  
17 oh, go ahead.

18          VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to just  
19 throw out there, again, I'm thinking that, again,  
20 it's low impact and apparently it's not enough  
21 that -- we have to revisit this, by the way, and I  
22 think we're just, as you said picking a number and  
23 saying we're just picking a number. So we really  
24 don't have any kind of information to back up

1 exactly what we're doing, which is a concern to me.

2 Because, again, I think that -- I'm a  
3 proponent of allowing business owners and property  
4 owners to have the full use and value of their  
5 property, and I think in this particular case we're  
6 hamstringing both the person that has the frontage  
7 as well as the person that doesn't by limiting the  
8 signage that they're allowed to have. We are  
9 causing a limitation.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I guess you  
12 could say it's their problem for buying it.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I think the only  
14 evidence that we have in front of us is the applicant  
15 because they're the only ones that are requesting  
16 this particular thing at this point in time.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And the flip side  
18 is there are only six others or five others.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So at any rate,  
21 I'm concerned about that, and I think we should  
22 review this later.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I agree. Let's have a  
24 roll call on the motion to amend.

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities and Fydoland  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

18

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.  
2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.  
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.  
4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.  
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.  
6 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.  
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.  
8 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.  
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.  
10 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.  
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.  
12 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.  
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.  
14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.  
15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.  
16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.  
17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.  
18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So now back  
19 to the main motion, the amended motion. Any  
20 further discussion.  
21 (No response.)  
22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.  
23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.  
24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities and Fydoland  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

19

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.  
2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.  
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.  
4 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.  
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.  
6 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.  
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.  
8 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.  
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.  
10 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.  
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.  
12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.  
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.  
14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.  
15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.  
16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right that passes  
17 unanimately, and that concludes Item No. 6.  
18 Is there a motion on item 7?  
19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I move to recommend  
20 approval of Fydoland, 1311 East Main Street (Robin  
21 Massey), Application for Special Use for a Pet  
22 Care Facility subject to the resolution of any  
23 outstanding staff comments.  
24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I second.

Transcript of Pet Care Facilities and Fydoland  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

20

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and  
2 seconded. Any discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

14 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
23 concludes Item No. 7.

24 (Off the record at 8:04 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case 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 12th day of December, 2017.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary 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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x  
In Re: :  
Regular Meeting including :  
Valley Shopping Center :  
Resubdivision (Plank Road, :  
LLC), Minor Subdivision - :  
Final Plat. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, December 5, 2017  
8:04 p.m.

Job No.: 126930DC  
Pages: 1 - 16  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Valley Shopping Center  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

1       PRESENT:

2               TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3               TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4               JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5               JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6               DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

7               TOM PRETZ, Member

8               LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

9               TOM SCHUETZ, Member

10              PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12       ALSO PRESENT:

13              RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Valley Shopping Center  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 8 is Valley  
3 Shopping Center Resubdivision (Plank Road, LLC),  
4 Minor Subdivision - Final Plat.

5 And on this the applicant is -- are you  
6 both with First Midwest? Okay. I'm employed by  
7 First Midwest Bank, and so I'm going to have to  
8 recuse myself from this particular application,  
9 but you're in good hands with Mr. Kessler here.

10 (Chairman Wallace left the proceedings.)

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, is the  
12 applicant ready to present?

13 MR. COLBY: I'll be making the presentation  
14 on this item since it's a nonpublic hearing.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Great.

16 MR. COLBY: This proposal is for a  
17 subdivision of what's known as the Valley Shopping  
18 Center on West Main Street and 15th Street. As  
19 you may be aware, the shopping center has been  
20 vacant for some time.

21 The owner, who is Plank Road, LLC, who is  
22 controlled by First Midwest Bank has proposed a  
23 subdivision of the property. That includes what  
24 was the former shopping center and also some of

1 the outlot buildings that are under the common  
2 ownership, which includes the Rookies building, what  
3 is now a chiropractor building, and a former car  
4 wash building at the corner at 17th Street.

5           There's a four-lot subdivision being  
6 proposed, and the layout is shown, the plat is  
7 provided, and, also, there's an aerial photo in  
8 the staff memo that shows how the lot lines will  
9 align with the existing development.

10           The largest lot which includes the main  
11 portion of the shopping center at the southern  
12 portion of the property and also the piece that  
13 extends up to the 15th Street street access to  
14 Route 64, that parcel is under contract to be  
15 purchased by the City of St. Charles for use as a  
16 police station.

17           The other lots that are proposed, Lots 1,  
18 2, and 3: Lot 1, the former car wash site has an  
19 opportunity either to be renovated as a car wash  
20 or some other type of redevelopment opportunity  
21 because it includes a larger area than just a car  
22 wash lot. Lots 2 and 3 have been drawn around the  
23 existing buildings for the chiropractor and  
24 Rookies so those businesses can continue to occupy

1 those lots.

2 There's been a cross-access easement that's  
3 being proposed over the existing drives to the  
4 east-west and then to the north-south out to the  
5 15th Street/Main Street intersection that would  
6 provide access to those lots.

7 There's relatively minor staff review  
8 comments on the plat that easement language needs  
9 to be provided for the utility and drainage  
10 easements. The cross-access easement would need  
11 code language added to the document referenced.  
12 There's a portion of 14th and 17th Streets  
13 adjacent to the sidewalks, so there would be a  
14 requirement that the sidewalks either be installed  
15 at the time of subdivision or at the time those  
16 lots are redeveloped. We also need to have some  
17 survey language shown on the plat and some  
18 information about easement areas.

19 Additionally, there's also a parcel that  
20 falls within Lot 4, which is the St. Charles  
21 Family Medical Center that's a stand-alone parcel,  
22 and there are easements for access and parking  
23 over Lot 4 that either need to be depicted or  
24 referenced on the plat. I believe there's maybe

1 an issue showing a legal description. Because of  
2 the way they were originally drafted they should  
3 at least be referenced on there.

4 Otherwise, staff has no further comments.  
5 This is a minor subdivision. There are no public  
6 improvements, community public improvements being  
7 triggered from this development other than those  
8 that would take place when these individual lots  
9 are developed. So staff is recommending approval  
10 subject to the resolution of the outstanding staff  
11 comments, and we have the representatives of the  
12 applicant here who can respond to any questions  
13 about their plans for the property. Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. Any  
15 questions from the Plan Commissioners?

16 (No response.)

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question  
18 and this may be for Russ.

19 You mentioned a number of items that are  
20 not depicted or determined in this final plat. At  
21 what point would those be depicted or determined?  
22 I mean, it's not typical that we would approve a  
23 final plat without that information.

24 MR. COLBY: The easement information will

1 need to be shown prior to the City Council approval  
2 of the plat. Provided that the applicant is going  
3 to utilize our standard easement language that's  
4 in the subdivision code, there isn't really a need  
5 for the Plan Commission to review that language.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What about  
7 depictions, though, where these easements are? I  
8 mean, we have a lot that is stand alone that's  
9 completely surrounded, I mean, it's an island in  
10 Lot 4 that's City property.

11 MR. COLBY: I'm familiar with those  
12 easements, and I believe there are some challenges  
13 to depicting those based on the type of exhibits  
14 that were attached to the easements. I think  
15 perhaps maybe the applicant could speak to that.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I know it's not a  
17 public hearing, but she's still recording, so it's  
18 helpful to have your name.

19 MR. GENSLER: Kevin Gensler on behalf of  
20 Plank Road, LLC.

21 Those easements are old and they're metes  
22 and bounds descriptions, so they're hard to locate.  
23 And it is a square within a subdivided lot, so how  
24 that happened -- well, it just happened a long



1 time ago. I don't think you'd approve it that way  
2 today. So we have to live with that because it  
3 already exists, and it's already owned by a  
4 third party.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: As long as you're  
6 here, I do have a couple of other questions then.

7 Any information you can give us on activity,  
8 or plans, or anything going on with Lots 3 -- 1,  
9 2, and 3?

10 MR. GENSLER: The Rookies lot, they are  
11 interested in purchasing the lot to -- the people  
12 who own Rookies. The chiropractor is interested  
13 in purchasing the lot. They're not under contract  
14 but we're in discussion with both owners. Both  
15 owners have been sent the plat of subdivision to  
16 approve so they know what is going on. And no  
17 firm plans for what is the old car wash lot.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And the old car  
19 wash lot is the property that was just -- the  
20 buildings that were just demolished?

21 MR. GENSLER: No, that's what was called  
22 the Grimm building.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That was just  
24 demolished.

Transcript of Valley Shopping Center  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

10

1 MR. GENSLER: That was just demolished.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And Fox Title,  
3 that's been sold.

4 MR. GENSLER: Fox Title is excluded from  
5 this. We were in negotiations to have them join  
6 in and make it a PUD rather than a subdivision,  
7 but we couldn't reach an agreement with them.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is it possible,  
9 Russ, that that could happen in the future?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes. Certainly.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.  
12 Any other questions?

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, I just had a  
14 question related to Lot 4 that the City is  
15 purchasing. The kind of narrow piece that runs  
16 all the way up to Main Street, it includes the  
17 driveways and the adjacent parking lot on the east  
18 side, but the depiction in the memo related to  
19 what the City is planning for the future fire  
20 station doesn't really show anything or indicate  
21 anything going on with that. Do you know what's  
22 going on with that?

23 MR. COLBY: And that layout that's been  
24 provided is only preliminary. There hasn't been

1 detailed site planning yet, but the thought was if  
2 there are extra areas of the site that are surplus  
3 and not needed for parking or use by the police  
4 station that they would be opportunities for storm  
5 water detention facilities because the City has  
6 existing storm water issues within this area that  
7 could be improved through some detention facilities  
8 on this parcel.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: As an example, would it  
10 be separate facilities, or is it something where  
11 they would extend or combine with the one behind  
12 O'Reilly Auto?

13 MR. COLBY: That possibility exists. That's  
14 something that the City has talked about approaching  
15 the owner to look at doing that. In the event that  
16 that parking you're referring to is to be used for  
17 storm water detention, that would make the most  
18 sense.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: More efficiency  
20 definitely.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So no other  
22 questions?

23 (No response.)

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I'll

Transcript of Valley Shopping Center  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

1 entertain a motion.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: I'd like to make a motion  
3 for approval of the Valley Shopping Center  
4 Resubdivision (Plank Road, LLC) Minor Subdivision  
5 Final Plat subject to any outstanding staff concerns.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll second.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Any  
8 discussion on the motion?

9 (No response.)

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

19 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

1 All right. That concludes Item No. 8 on  
2 our agenda. Thank you. Thanks for waiting.

3 No. 9 is additional business from Plan  
4 Commission members and staff. Anybody have  
5 anything?

6 (No response.)

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Item 10, weekly  
8 development report. Everybody's seen that. It's  
9 a nice piece of information.

10 Meeting announcements. We have a meeting  
11 December 19th, Russ?

12 MR. COLBY: I wanted to make a couple  
13 comments about the upcoming meetings. The  
14 December 19th meeting, at this point we think that  
15 that's going to be canceled. But then the meetings  
16 coming up in January, the Plan Commission meetings  
17 are a week later in the month than they would  
18 normally be because the City Council has moved --  
19 the City Council meeting dates are ahead one week, so  
20 the Plan Commission dates have been moved, as well.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: For that month?

22 MR. COLBY: For that month only. So these  
23 dates that are listed on the agenda, January 9th and  
24 23rd, those are the meeting dates for January.

Transcript of Valley Shopping Center  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

14

1 That does not follow a normal meeting schedule.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Anybody know that  
3 they will or will not be able to attend one of those?

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: January 23rd I will be  
5 out of town.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Planning  
7 and development committee on December 11th, that  
8 meeting will take place?

9 MR. COLBY: Yes. So the items that were  
10 on the Plan Commission agenda tonight will be on  
11 that meeting agenda. Also, we're planning to have  
12 continued discussion regarding the RT design  
13 guidelines which was initially presented to the  
14 committee back in October, I believe. So there  
15 will be -- a follow-up discussion on that topic is  
16 scheduled as well.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I can't  
18 make that date. Tom?

19 MEMBER PIETRYLA: I'll go.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It would be good  
21 to have somebody from here visit that meeting.

22 All right. Any public comment?

23 Mr. Alderman, you're public today. So no comment?

24 Okay.

Transcript of Valley Shopping Center  
Conducted on December 5, 2017

1 I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Motion we adjourn.

3 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Second.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

5 (Ayes heard.)

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This meeting of  
7 the Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

8 (Off the record at 8:17 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case 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 12th day of December, 2017.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois