

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Tim Kessler
James Holderfield
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tom Schuetz
Jeffrey Funke
Dan Frio
Peter Vargulich

Members Absent: Tom Pretz

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Chris Bong, Development Engineering Division Manager
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Vice Chairman Kessler called the roll. A quorum was present.

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC)

Application for Map Amendment
Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Vargulich, and unanimously passed by voice vote to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Funke, Frio, Purdy, Wallace, Kessler

Nays:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, March 21, 2017
Page 2

Absent: Pretz
Motion carried: 8-0

MEETING

- 5. Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC)**
Application for Map Amendment
Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Schuetz to recommend approval of the Application for Map Amendment for Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC).

Roll Call Vote:
Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Funke, Frio, Purdy, Wallace, Kessler
Nays:
Absent: Pretz
Motion carried: 8-0

Motion was made Vice Chairman Kessler to recommend denial of the Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development for Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC). There was no second; motion failed.

Motion was made by Ms. Purdy and seconded by Mr. Frio to recommend approval of the Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development and Application for PUD Preliminary Plan for Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC), subject to resolution of outstanding staff comments and with a suggestion that the developer consider connection to a future north/south roadway.

Roll Call Vote:
Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Purdy, Wallace, Funke, Frio, Vargulich
Nays: Kessler
Absent: Pretz
Motion carried: 7-1

- 6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff**

- 7. Weekly Development Report**

- 8. Meeting Announcements**

- a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, April 4, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, April 10, 2017-Joint Meeting with Planning & Development Committee,
5:45pm Council Committee Room

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, March 21, 2017

Page 3

Tuesday, April 18, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, May 2, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, April 10, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, May 8, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment at 8:55 p.m.



Planet Depos[®]
We Make It *Happen*[™]

Transcript of Hearing

Date: March 21, 2017

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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: :
Application for Map :
Amendment, Special Use for :
PUD, and PUD Preliminary :
Plan, Prairie Winds of :
St. Charles. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, March 21, 2017
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 126915
Pages: 1 - 112
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, 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

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand

14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State

15 of Illinois.

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

PRESENT:

TODD WALLACE, Chairman

TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

DAN FRIO, Member

JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

TOM SCHUETZ, Member

PETER VARGULICH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering Manager

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on March 21, 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: The City of St. Charles
Plan Commission will come to order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

MEMBER FRIO: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And I'm
sorry. We have a new member, so I --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Did I pronounce it
correctly?

MEMBER VARGULICH: Close enough. Vargulich.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Vargulich. Okay.
4 Welcome. If I can just put you on the spot for a
5 second to just say a couple of words about yourself,
6 what your background is, how long you've been in
7 St. Charles.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: I've been a resident of
9 St. Charles about 23 years. My professional
10 background is in planning and grid design and
11 landscape architecture, and I've been practicing for
12 about 30 years.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Welcome.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thanks.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Presentation
16 of minutes of the March 7th, 2017, meeting of the
17 Plan Commission.

18 Is there a motion to approve?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded. All
22 in favor.

23 (Ayes heard.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It passes unanimously.

3 Item 4 on our agenda is Prairie Winds of
4 St. Charles, Prairie Winds, LLC. We have three
5 applications -- one for a map amendment, one for a
6 special use for planned unit development, and one
7 for a PUD preliminary plan.

8 We're now entering the public hearing
9 portion of our meeting; and for those of you who
10 have not been here before, welcome.

11 The Plan Commission is tasked by the City
12 Council to conduct public hearings for applications
13 that come before it. Basically our role is, for any
14 application, to gather information and to make a
15 recommendation to the City Council's Planning and
16 Development Committee for approval or denial of an
17 application, and that's what we're doing here
18 tonight.

19 In a minute, the applicant will make a
20 statement in support of the application and will
21 present evidence as to why it should be approved.

22 After that, members of the Plan Commission
23 will ask questions. Any member of the audience who
24 wishes to ask any questions may do so or to give any

1 statements either for or against the application;
2 and then in the end, if the Plan Commission feels
3 that it has enough information to make a
4 recommendation, then we will close the public
5 hearing; and Item 5, fortuitously, is an action item
6 on the same application.

7 So if the public hearing is closed, then we
8 will move, and we will take action on this
9 application tonight and make a recommendation to
10 City Council.

11 Any questions on the procedure?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then at this time
14 if anyone wishes to offer any testimony, including
15 asking any questions or making any comments, you
16 need to be sworn in. If you could raise your right
17 hand.

18 (Witnesses duly sworn.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. And as a
20 note, we have a court reporter here in the room.
21 Although she is very talented, she is not talented
22 enough to do multiple voices at the same time. So I
23 would just ask that you wait to be recognized by me
24 before speaking. And anyone who is speaking,

1 please, come to the lectern, state your name, spell
2 your last name, and also state your address for the
3 record, and that goes for asking questions or making
4 comments as well.

5 All right. Anything before we go to the
6 applicant? Anything from staff?

7 Okay. Is the applicant ready?

8 MR. RATZER: Yes. Thank you. Jeffrey
9 Ratzler. 47W210 U.S. Highway 30, Big Rock 60511.
10 R-a-t-z-e-r.

11 Jeff Ratzler, again, representing the
12 developer Prairie Winds, LLC. It's nice being back
13 here tonight in front of you folks.

14 Following our concept review meetings with
15 both your Commission as well as the Planning and
16 Development Committee, we took the feedback we
17 received from those and produced a plan here tonight
18 that I think will be a great asset and a great
19 addition to the City of St. Charles and its housing
20 market.

21 The property itself is going to consist of
22 250 units. That hasn't changed since we met. All
23 of them will have attached direct-access garages.
24 All will have high finishes, condo quality, as well

1 as an extensive amenity package for use by the
2 residents.

3 We have the required equity to do this deal
4 in our hands, and we also have two or three lenders
5 actually very excited about the deal, two of which
6 have offices here in St. Charles and are very
7 interested in doing something locally.

8 We plan on building this property in one
9 phase. We expect to start groundbreaking
10 approximately May 1st, and the first buildings will
11 be delivered -- or the first building -- excuse
12 me -- will be constructed beginning at the end of
13 this year with all COs in hand, hopefully, by
14 October 1st, 2018.

15 You have my presentation, I guess, on the
16 screens is what you all are looking at and all the
17 engineering and everything that we've been tasked to
18 provide. However, if there's any questions that you
19 have that I can't answer, I have you outnumbered
20 tonight.

21 I have two members of V3 Engineering who did
22 our civil work, and as you know, did the work on
23 your CVS here in town, including the traffic
24 engineer.

1 I have my architect from Humphreys &
2 Partners; and in 2016 alone, they designed over
3 25,000 apartment units.

4 I also have with us here members from VLK
5 Law Firm here based in St. Charles to answer any
6 technical questions about the application as well as
7 Dan Olson from Watermark Engineering who helped us
8 in designing the landscape plan.

9 Short of that, I don't have any help.

10 Let's see. That's basically all I have as
11 an opening. I guess the bottom line here is after
12 answering your questions, I'm going to ask you folks
13 respectfully to approve us -- recommend us to go to
14 the Planning and Development Committee, which is
15 meeting on April 10, and that is our goal and our
16 target.

17 I asked Russ to put up the site plan because
18 in an effort to get off on the right foot, we did a
19 lot of work over the weekend in reading through the
20 feedback from the staff, and I did want to point out
21 that the staff has posed some questions to you that
22 I think I can answer and some clarifications that
23 I'd like to make.

24 So if I could just point you all -- do you

1 see what I'm seeing? Okay. So you'll see here
2 these little yellow lines are sidewalks, and they
3 all wrap around and connect and eventually go to our
4 clubhouse. Well, the staff suggested that the
5 sidewalk path, the network, if you will, should
6 incorporate the northern portion of the property and
7 those apartment buildings up there.

8 I totally agree, and we have already tasked
9 the civil engineer and the architect to do the site
10 plan over for submission to the Planning and
11 Development Committee. So that would be here and
12 here, all the way around, coming here, and
13 connecting to this one. Okay. So we agree with
14 that.

15 I also want to point out that in the
16 planning and development meeting, we got a comment,
17 constructive, from Maureen Lewis, and she suggested
18 that we connect our property in some format via
19 sidewalks basically to the Lowe's sidewalk here,
20 enabling people to walk from our entrance,
21 connecting all through a sidewalk, and then crossing
22 the street to Geneva Commons or going into the
23 Lowe's parking lot. We did add that on her
24 recommendation.

1 The one thing I want to say that will be
2 changed in the final plan is this emergency entrance
3 only. We had a lot of feedback both pro and con
4 from your Commission as well as the Planning and
5 Development Committee, and the feedback was
6 extremely mixed. Some people were for it. Some
7 people thought it was unnecessary. Some people
8 thought it would create a nice access to Randall
9 Road. Some people thought it would be a detriment
10 to our residents.

11 At the end of the day, we've made the
12 conclusion that it's not beneficial to this property
13 or the neighborhood. There's three reasons for
14 that.

15 One is we really don't want to encourage
16 people from coming through a shopping center to
17 avoid a traffic light here by speeding through this
18 property, that will have a few speed bumps, but
19 still is mostly two- and three-bedrooms and will
20 have a lot of children playing on it. It's not
21 beneficial to the residents who would be living here
22 to have this be a pseudo bypass of the
23 traffic-controlled exit on the ends of the Lowe's
24 and Meijer's parking lot.

1 The second reason we don't want it is
2 because as much as landscaping can do, it is an
3 absolutely unsightly exit for our residents. We're
4 providing a class A property, great amenities, great
5 landscaping, a nice water feature; and I don't think
6 my residents would want to exit the property here,
7 face the back of two shopping centers, the Lowe's
8 and the Meijer's, seeing their dumpsters as well as
9 the semi-tractor trailers there.

10 The third reason, which we knew about but we
11 were trying to work around it came -- if you read
12 through the staff report, we have some retaining
13 walls that are required up here, down here, and over
14 here. And part of the reason for that is the
15 tremendous slope from the northeast corner to the
16 southwest.

17 The staff in their comments said it would be
18 beneficial to the site if we could reduce both the
19 size or the amount of retaining walls that we have.
20 We totally agree. By getting rid of this emergency
21 entrance here, this cut-through, our engineers have
22 told us that we have at least a better chance of
23 lowering, not eliminating, but lowering the size of
24 the retaining walls here and here.

1 As a whole, we'd like to do away with this
2 exit; and if you're kind enough to recommend this
3 project, we'd like you to do so without requiring
4 that cut-through. I don't think it's beneficial.

5 Thank you for hearing my spiel, if you will,
6 and if you have any questions for me, or the
7 audience or anybody.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I could ask a
9 couple questions to start out.

10 So in the report, the staff report, that
11 emergency entrance only, you talk about if it could
12 possibly be a pass-through that people can go to to
13 use as access to Randall instead of -- according to
14 the staff report, it's limited to emergency vehicles
15 only. It will be gated. So it wouldn't be able to
16 be accessed.

17 MR. RATZER: Well, here's the problem. We
18 don't want -- we were also told that you guys don't
19 want gates.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, this is not a
21 gated community. This is a gate to stop traffic.

22 MR. RATZER: Well, right.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's not the same
24 thing as a gated entrance.

1 MR. RATZER: Absolutely different.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's not the same
3 thing.

4 MR. RATZER: I understand.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So why
6 wouldn't you do that?

7 MR. RATZER: For the second and third
8 reasons. The second reason is I don't think my
9 customers, my residents would want to exit through
10 that. It's not made for --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's emergency
12 though. It's not for traffic.

13 MR. RATZER: No, no, no. What it was was an
14 emergency entrance. If you want an emergency
15 entrance there, then my residences wouldn't go
16 through, and I don't have a problem with that. But
17 it does belie the fact that on the third issue, the
18 grading is fouled up.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What is?

20 MR. RATZER: The grading on the property
21 gets fouled up by that cut-through. So if I didn't
22 have that cut-through, I have a better chance of
23 lowering the retaining walls here. As I mentioned,
24 we have retaining walls here and here, along with

1 the north, but that's not as affected by this.

2 This cut-through causes us a steeper grade
3 to the property; and as such, I have higher
4 retaining walls here and here. I'm trying to
5 eliminate both for cost measures, aesthetic
6 measures; and based on the staff review, that they'd
7 prefer we had less retaining walls, so I don't
8 particularly --

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Does that mean that
10 the elevation is such that for that distance from
11 the east side of the property to the west side of
12 the property is going to affect retaining walls? Is
13 the elevation that much different?

14 Chris, do you know?

15 MR. BONG: We'd have to --

16 MR. RATZER: We have the answer.

17 MR. BONG: -- have the engineers look at
18 it, V3.

19 MR. RATZER: We have the answer for you.

20 It's amazing. Right. You've driven past
21 it. It looks flat. When you drive past this site,
22 it looks as flat as can be. But it's a trick on the
23 eyes. 20 feet, it's a big deal.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Chris, maybe you can

1 answer this. Is there any public safety
2 justification for requiring an additional entrance
3 there? I could see if there was just a single
4 entrance, then to have a second emergency entrance
5 but --

6 MR. BONG: Perhaps I'm not the best to
7 answer that. I think maybe somebody from the fire
8 department would be better to answer that.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But what are the chances
10 of a fire department vehicle accessing this property
11 from a parking lot of a private business as opposed
12 to from Bricher Road?

13 MR. COLBY: I can speak to the fire
14 department's review of the plans. They have
15 reviewed these plans. They require a second access,
16 which is provided from Bricher Road. So this access
17 that's being proposed as a connection to Meijer and
18 Lowe's, it shows an emergency access, but it's not
19 required by code or required by the fire department
20 as part of their review.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Then I have
22 another question. First, I want to ask staff
23 because I'm not sure I'm tracking this. I know we
24 talked about this cross easement but the north -- to

1 the property to the north.

2 Is there a cross easement on the west side?
3 I mean, didn't we talk about the cross easement from
4 Bricher running up to the property to the north --
5 run along the north to the west side of the property
6 on the County side, not on this property; is that
7 correct?

8 MR. COLBY: That was discussed during the
9 concept plan, but there is no easement proposed with
10 this current plan.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there an easement
12 proposed --

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Not within this property.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Not within this
15 property.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And on our comprehensive
17 plan, it was drawn for the County.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: For the County.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. It's not drawn on
20 this property anyway, so.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So the feedback -- I
22 guess the question is have you considered putting a
23 cross-access easement on the west end of this
24 property?

1 MR. RATZER: Yes. We're not in favor of it.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What does the staff
3 think about it? Why the question here? I'm going
4 to ask the question. Why the question?

5 MR. RATZER: We've been asking that too.

6 MR. COLBY: Yes. There is a -- as
7 referenced in the staff report, there are references
8 to a north/south roadway in the general vicinity of
9 this property both in the City's comprehensive plan
10 and in the PUD that currently exists over the
11 Bricher Commons parcel.

12 So we raised the question during the concept
13 plan review if that's something that was desirable,
14 and I think generally the feedback was that some
15 type of connection from this property to the north
16 was desirable, but not necessarily a dedicated
17 street through this specific development site.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

19 MR. RATZER: It's called Peck Road.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, that's not the
21 same. Because the property to the north is not
22 the -- you've looked at the regional plan; right?

23 MR. RATZER: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The roadway that

1 they're talking about goes from Bricher to 64 along
2 the west side of the property.

3 MR. RATZER: But you have to get through the
4 fairground.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. But soon, I
6 mean, in the future. We plan for the future, not
7 just for your property.

8 MR. RATZER: No problem.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But at any rate, the
10 cross access that was shown on the comprehensive
11 plan actually runs to the west of this property.

12 Okay. My question then is on this roadway
13 that's on this --

14 MR. RATZER: Where do I go, sir?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right there. Down,
16 down, down. Right there.

17 MR. RATZER: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Could that connect
19 to a possible future roadway running north and
20 south?

21 MR. RATZER: You mean a roadway over here?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. I mean, is
23 that something that can be --

24 MR. RATZER: I guess here's the question. I

1 wouldn't see the point from our perspective because
2 if you have a roadway, would the road stop right
3 here? And then everybody to get to that roadway
4 would come through my property; or as you're kind of
5 envisioning the future, the road would come all the
6 way down to Bricher. Right. So why do I need to
7 connect to it?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because we connect
9 our neighborhoods to all roadways throughout the --
10 the whole point of this conversation is not about an
11 enclosed, you know, subdivision that you go in one
12 way and come out the other.

13 If there are other developments that occur
14 around it, we want all of them to be connected. I
15 mean, that's the whole point of the conversation.

16 So I'm also asking -- I'll ask staff. Is
17 this something that we would have to have included
18 in this particular plan to allow that or --

19 MR. COLBY: If it's something that you would
20 want to require the developer to provide at some
21 point in the future, then it needs to be documented
22 now during the approval of this project.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm having a little
24 bit of a problem; and my problem is that I

1 understand that you have a development that you laid
2 out here. I don't have a problem with the
3 development at all.

4 There has been so much discussion on the
5 concept plan and, now as far as I'm bringing it up
6 again, that we like connectivity, and it seems like
7 you're resisting it for some reason. I'm not sure.

8 But I believe that we should have the
9 ability to connect these roadways if future
10 roadways -- the whole point of a roadway running
11 from Bricher up to 64 along here is the future.
12 It's so that we have traffic flow; and if your
13 residents come out of here to go into there, that's
14 traffic flow. All of our neighborhoods connect.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wait. I understand your
16 point, but the point that I would raise is that this
17 is still one parcel of private property; and if he
18 were coming in here to build a single-family house
19 in the middle with a driveway going to Bricher, and
20 we decided we're going to build a road along the
21 west side, we wouldn't be requiring him to connect
22 to that road.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And you're
24 absolutely right, we wouldn't, but we would have a

1 network of roadways on that property.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They're private roadways.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We wouldn't have
4 residential -- a group of people. There is a
5 population here.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This isn't one
8 family.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But the question is who
10 does it benefit.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think it benefits
12 the community at large and this community.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: At whose cost?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: A connection here?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Because any type of
16 connection, any type of an easement imposes a cost
17 on the property owner.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To have an easement
19 here to build a road? What's it going to cost?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Not to build a road.
21 You're saying to connect to a road that's built on
22 the adjoining property.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah. So that they
24 have the ability to make a connection.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Right. They have the
2 choice to do that in the future if they want to, but
3 I don't think that we can impose that on them.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, I think we can.
5 We can ask for it. I mean, we can't impose it, but
6 we can make it part of our recommendation. We could
7 make it a part of our recommendation.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What would it --

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To allow an easement
10 across that, access easement for a future connection
11 to a north/south roadway.

12 I'm just -- you know, we have subdivisions
13 like this that have a one in and one out. We have
14 them all other town. I think that it's been our
15 policy, at least as long as I've on the Plan
16 Commission and before, that we urge, and we promote,
17 and we encourage cross connections in subdivisions,
18 and I just think it's important --

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I agree.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- to do that.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I agree with encouraging
22 it, but I would disagree if it came to requiring it.
23 Because I think as a private property owner, they
24 have the right. As long as it complies with public

1 safety and they have two entrances and all of the
2 other requirements, I don't think imposing any type
3 of, you know, additional responsibility on them -- I
4 mean I don't know. My opinion is it's overstepping
5 to require them to do that. To encourage them to do
6 that, I think -- I mean, yeah.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that
8 that's -- I don't disagree. I understand your point.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But what I will say
11 is that I find that position is a deviation from our
12 past approach to --

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would agree if we were
14 talking about a property that had already been
15 developed on the perimeter, where if you were
16 building in a pocket in the middle of a development
17 perimeter, then I would agree.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just want you to
19 picture the future. In the planning, picture the
20 future. We have a roadway running north along the
21 west side on the other property, but it runs along
22 here, and we have a piece of grass, and we have a
23 street that ends, and the roadway goes right past
24 the street that ends. That's not good planning.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But the remainder of the
2 property, if I'm not mistaken -- how is the
3 remainder of the property to the north zoned, Russ?

4 MR. COLBY: Currently, it's all zoned for
5 commercial use, but it has the potential to be
6 rezoned similar to this site.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And if you read the
8 comprehensive plan, all three of the uses that are
9 spelled out for this property are spelled out for
10 the property.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: If I may.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: With regard to the
14 connections, and those are kind of who has the right
15 answer is going to be a little harder to distinguish
16 between being a connection with the roadways; but I
17 think the one thing that could be considered by the
18 petitioner, even if they're more inclined to not
19 have a private driveway connect to a public roadway,
20 is a pedestrian connection, if, in fact, there are
21 sidewalks or a bike path.

22 MR. RATZER: On that side?

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: On the west side.

24 MR. RATZER: I agree.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: If there's a sidewalk to
2 allow residents --

3 MR. RATZER: I would do that for a bike path
4 or a pedestrian path.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- to the property
6 without having to go to Bricher to go north and
7 could use -- if, in fact, that roadway is designed
8 with a useable sidewalk or useable bike.

9 MR. RATZER: You could say that it could --
10 if you close that road, and if that road has like
11 side roads or whatever you'd call it, bike path, or
12 pedestrian wings, I would open up that road just for
13 that purpose, yes.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: If you have sidewalks
15 that are in front of the buildings, those would just
16 be extended towards --

17 MR. RATZER: Yeah. Yeah. I'm in.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: And taking that a step
19 further, I think that right now my concern is do you
20 have any sidewalks that are crossing -- I see a lot
21 of vehicular traffic in those zones or where the
22 garages are, is it possible to -- you have these
23 beautiful green spaces. You know, you have these
24 detention ponds. I think the landscaping is a

1 little simplified for my taste, especially on
2 Bricher Road on the east end.

3 And my question is can you, you know, from a
4 sidewalk walking path perspective connect these
5 beautiful, what you're calling detention ponds, but
6 maybe these -- you know, make them lakes or
7 something and create these green spaces with walking
8 paths, bicycle paths. So you can get them away from
9 the traffic, get them away from the cars, so people
10 pulling out of their garages -- you know.

11 Because these sidewalks look so, you know,
12 chopped up right now the way they are, and I wonder
13 from a landscaping perspective if you can connect
14 all these green spaces and the clubhouse and make
15 this more of a pedestrian/bicycle friendly
16 development.

17 MR. RATZER: Okay. Let me try to answer
18 everything. If I forget something, tell me. Okay.

19 So, number one, these detention ponds are
20 going to be full at all times. Okay. So they will
21 be deep enough and our civil engineers from V3 are
22 designing it so they will retain water. So I will
23 have this water feature like you're talking about.

24 Number two, what we're going to do is -- it

1 doesn't really show it clearly. We tried to do it.
2 It just didn't show right. We're going to have a
3 nature trail, not a concrete path, but a nature
4 trail going around the lower, larger detention pond,
5 which will be a very nice feature just to walk
6 around and see the water when it's nice out and
7 whatnot.

8 As far as the bike path idea within the
9 community, to be honest with you, I don't know if I
10 have the room to make bike trails. I am adding, as
11 we mentioned, the sidewalks for the connectivity on
12 the top and for walking.

13 But our concern is kind of what you said,
14 it's not our customers. It's not our residents that
15 I'm worried about driving through our property.
16 It's having a flow of traffic that, you know, they
17 don't care. They're doing a cut-through. Their
18 whole purpose is to go faster. Right. I don't want
19 that through my property. I don't think it's safe
20 for the residents who live there.

21 So I'm not sure if I can accommodate a
22 walking path or a bike path on the site, but I can
23 certainly agree to, if you guys have one, connect.
24 And I would agree to connect there, or if there's

1 any talk -- I heard whispers, I don't know if it's
2 true, that there might be a bike path along Bricher.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Right now you're just
4 providing a sidewalk; right?

5 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: You're providing it on the
7 garage side of the --

8 MR. RATZER: Right here.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. Are you providing any
10 sidewalks in the community?

11 MR. RATZER: Oh, yes, all of these are
12 sidewalks.

13 MEMBER FUNKE: Right. Yeah, but they're
14 pretty chopped up, if you ask me. I mean you're
15 going to have cars. You're going to have cars in
16 the driveway. It's going to be hard to actually use
17 that sidewalk.

18 My point is is it possible to -- you know,
19 you have the front of this building, right, which is
20 not the garage side. It's the front with the
21 landscaping. So can you --

22 MR. RATZER: You've got to show me what
23 you're looking at. If you don't mind, just tell me
24 where to point. So like up here?

1 MEMBER FUNKE: This is the front of the
2 building; correct?

3 MR. RATZER: No. That's the back of the
4 building.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: That's the back. Well, the
6 front being the --

7 MR. RATZER: The non-garage side.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah. The non-garage side.

9 MR. RATZER: Okay. Yeah.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: That's what I mean.

11 MR. RATZER: Agreed.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: You know, where it's more
13 pedestrian friendly. So does it make sense to put a
14 path on that side that is along the side of the
15 detention pond connecting -- I mean, you have great
16 spaces. You have great green spaces. So why not.
17 You know, it's safer for people to walk on. They're
18 not going to use that sidewalk is my point, in my
19 opinion.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are there walking paths
21 in the plans?

22 MR. RATZER: Yes. Around this detention
23 pond. Around this one, yes.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: Do you have plans included

1 that show that?

2 MR. RATZER: A nature trail.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah. Do you have landscape
4 plans that show that?

5 MR. RATZER: I think you have that; right?
6 Yeah, roughly, yeah.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

8 MR. RATZER: And to go back to your first
9 question and I can answer you more firmly about
10 sidewalks. What I don't want this to become is you
11 folks, and likely so, have a lot of landscape
12 requirements in this city, a lot of trees,
13 everything. It's going to be beautiful. With the
14 amenities that I have and the requirements that I
15 have, it's going to be like a park. What I don't
16 want to do is chop it up with a lot of concrete.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

18 MR. RATZER: Okay. I don't know want to
19 make this, you know, a city jungle walking path
20 thing. I want to avoid that. The nature path -- we
21 had originally thought about paving it with tar or
22 more likely concrete, but it's just more concrete.
23 A nature trail with those timbers and things like
24 that that I had at my other property --

1 MEMBER FUNKE: No, I agree with you. It
2 would be nice to see that. It would be nice to see
3 details of that. Because right now this landscape
4 plan overall looks very simple, and I'm just
5 concerned that on, you know, the main stretches
6 that --

7 MR. RATZER: Are you looking at this plan as
8 a possible --

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, I'm going through your
10 landscape drawings. I think you have to two or
11 three of them in there.

12 MR. RATZER: Yeah. We should have three or
13 four landscape drawings.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah.

15 MR. RATZER: And I will say that after
16 getting the staff report -- and we only got it
17 Friday, so bear with me. I'm sure you guys did too.
18 We responded to staff saying that every, you know,
19 deviation, if you will, that had deviations for the
20 amount of trees and the amount of bushes were
21 corrected. Our landscape architect is changing
22 them.

23 So you'll get a new plan that's going to
24 meet every one of the requirements, including what

1 you mentioned originally up front on Bricher.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Just a question for Route
3 38. Is there some -- or, I'm sorry, Bricher Road.

4 MR. RATZER: Better.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is there some reason that
6 you're not connecting, extending the sidewalk all
7 the way across the frontage?

8 MR. RATZER: I don't feel anybody is going
9 to walk to the West.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, but what happens if
11 there is a road that runs north and south. People
12 could walk down Bricher and then have to stop
13 because they can't get from Randall and Bricher all
14 the way over to this new north/south road because
15 the sidewalk doesn't complete in front of your
16 property.

17 MR. RATZER: Put in that -- when you build
18 that road, I'll build that sidewalk.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: Maybe build it now.

20 MR. RATZER: Why? There's no side --
21 there's no road going north and south. You guys
22 have been talking about it forever. There's just no
23 road there.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There was no bridge

1 across Red Gate Road either that was planned in
2 1928, but there is now. There could be in the
3 future, and we're planners.

4 MR. RATZER: Well, I understand, but I mean
5 I don't want to -- I don't want to do something -- I
6 would like to be part of that. I don't want to be
7 the forbearer of all of these tie-ins. Oh, well,
8 look, they did it. Now we're going to do it.
9 Somebody has got to take the first step, and you
10 guys have been talking about this road to the north
11 for 7, 8, 9, 10 years. It's still not there.

12 And frankly, to be totally frank with you
13 guys, if it was that important, somebody from the
14 City would have either bought it from Kane County
15 and connected the road, or somebody would have
16 condemned a small piece of land here. The BEI Group
17 would have been happy to sell it to you or give it
18 to you or trade or barter with you.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You're expressing an
20 opinion. Let me ask you another question. You guys
21 were talking about landscape. Do you plan to meet
22 the landscape review comments? Are you going to
23 meet the requirements of the landscape review?

24 MR. RATZER: We're going to meet half of

1 them.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So you're asking for
3 a deviation.

4 MR. RATZER: Yes, we are.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

6 MR. RATZER: We're going to meet the
7 requirements that call for how many trees, bushes,
8 plants, shrubs, but we're not going to meet the
9 requirement of the width of the planting beds.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Is there going to be
11 a sign at the entrance?

12 MR. RATZER: Yes. And we also in our
13 response said that that sign would meet the
14 landscape requirements as well.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

16 MR. RATZER: One sign at the main entrance,
17 not the second.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are you agreeable to
19 right-turn lanes on Bricher Road as requested by the
20 City of Geneva?

21 MR. RATZER: Not really but --

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

23 MR. RATZER: Well, I'd like to respond to
24 that, if you want to hear why.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

2 MR. RATZER: Do you want to answer this one?

3 MR. REINHOFER: Good evening, Peter

4 Reinhofer with V3 Companies, R-e-i-n-h-o-f-e-r. V3
5 is located at 7325 Janes Avenue. V3 did the traffic
6 engineering, the traffic impact study for the
7 proposed development.

8 We did receive comments from Geneva
9 requesting a right-turn lane north analysis. We
10 received those comments yesterday.

11 We did a preliminary analysis using the
12 Illinois Department of Transportation standards for
13 a right-turn lane north analysis from their Bureau
14 of Design Engineering manual, BDE manual. The
15 projected volumes, right-turn volumes and approach
16 volumes for westbound Bricher Road, based on the
17 IDOT standards, do not meet the warrants for a
18 right-turn lane at either the primary entrance or
19 the secondary entrance.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Staff, I'm
21 curious from the question that was posed in your
22 report. Is it your understanding that Geneva
23 requested the right-turn lanes, or did they request
24 a study?

1 MR. BONG: It appears to me that they
2 requested the lanes; but in addition to that, I
3 think they would request a study as well. But
4 considering there is a right-turn lane at the
5 entrance to the south, I think that's where they're
6 coming from with that comment.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: At which entrance?

8 MR. BONG: There is directly south of
9 Lincoln Square on the Geneva side of Bricher.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a right-turn
11 lane right there?

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, yeah, yeah. I
14 know where it is.

15 MR. RATZER: That's the only one that they
16 have. They have four subdivisions on that road.

17 But here's what I -- to answer your
18 question -- and I just want to show that I did my
19 research to not say no for no reason. I don't think
20 it's warranted, but I don't also think it's a bad
21 amenity for my residents to have a deceleration
22 lane. So I'm willing to put it in at the main
23 entrance.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So --

1 MR. RATZER: So, yes, to half of their
2 request. I'll put it in at the main entrance at our
3 cost. Hopefully, they'll cooperate with us in
4 giving us a permit, but since they want it, they
5 should. So that's what --

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And probably back to
7 staff because there's another question here. I want
8 you to explain the purpose of the question.
9 Intentions regarding plans for the clubhouse. Tell
10 me.

11 MR. COLBY: Yes. At this point, we don't
12 have complete preliminary architectural drawings for
13 the clubhouse. We have a sample of the building
14 architecture, and we know generally what the
15 footprint and size will be based on how it's shown
16 on the plans.

17 So the question would be whether the
18 applicant anticipates having preliminary
19 architectural drawings for the clubhouse prior to
20 City Council approval of the project. Typically, we
21 would have those architectural drawings included.

22 Alternatively, if they're not ready at that
23 time, we can include standards within the PUD
24 ordinance that specify what type of architecture

1 would be required, and most likely it would be
2 something that requires similar appearance to the
3 other buildings within the project. That's
4 something we're looking for clarification on.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So what I'm
6 curious about is -- then we'll ask the question.
7 We'll get a response from the applicant. But if
8 there are not going to be plans prepared prior to
9 City Council approval, then the City Council would
10 impose the standards on the PUD for the construction
11 of that clubhouse.

12 MR. COLBY: Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And would that
14 clubhouse then -- with those standards in place, it
15 would just have to meet the inspection of the
16 building department as spelled out in its
17 requirements; correct?

18 MR. COLBY: At the time of the building
19 permit, we would review those plans against the
20 standards that are included in the ordinance.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So do you
22 intend to have those plans?

23 MR. RATZER: You'll have them before April
24 10th.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All right. I
2 don't have any other questions for you.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'm trying to look
4 for the page with the intended design, that picture
5 of the intended design of the buildings.

6 MR. RATZER: Yes.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Can you pull that up?

8 MR. RATZER: The actual -- like the
9 elevations? Yes. I think I can.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Not that. Where you
11 see the picture of the actual --

12 MR. RATZER: Of the actual, like the
13 building that we're following? I can't get it to
14 move. I'm sorry. I'm not -- let me try again.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: All right.

16 MR. RATZER: It's okay. I know the picture
17 pretty well.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I want the picture of
19 the design.

20 MR. RATZER: It's going now. Here we go.
21 Do you mean of the clubhouse?

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: No, of the buildings.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: The elevation?

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Elevations.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: Page 16. You're on 13. Go
2 down three more.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: There we go.

4 MR. RATZER: Okay.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

6 MR. RATZER: I'm with you.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Building 4.

8 MR. RATZER: Yes.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It is suggested that
10 there be a dormer window installed on the roof
11 there. Is that something that you're going to be --

12 MR. RATZER: Yes. We're actually going to
13 have two. So if you look at the circle -- and stop
14 me if I'm missing what you guys talk about here.

15 So either right here, okay, to break up this
16 expanse as the staff report said, or two smaller
17 ones over each garage, you know, centered there. So
18 this expense will be broken up by something like
19 this. We're going to incorporate a concept where
20 it's not just going to be for show, but it's also
21 going to allow light into the unit as well. One,
22 two, or three.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: Are the buildings all going
24 to be the same color?

1 MR. RATZER: No.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: So how many palettes are you
3 having?

4 MR. RATZER: I'd say three or four, all
5 earth tones. This is a little too bright. This one
6 is a light closer or the other one. That one is a
7 little closer; and also as we marked on the thing,
8 we want to keep it as unique as possible, not like
9 cookie cutter.

10 So some finishes here would be Hardy plank
11 siding, cement siding. Some of it over here would
12 be stucco, not Dryvit as the question. Not EIFS,
13 that is also a question. No. All stucco and then
14 stone, and then the copper is something we're really
15 keen on here.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question on the
17 elevations too. The clubhouse looks like a
18 French -- kind of a French Provincial. It's got
19 round dormers, but the elevations there are --

20 MR. RATZER: It will match this.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, okay.

22 MR. RATZER: That's why we're going to see
23 the elevations, and you'll see that as part of
24 what --

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So the clubhouse won't look
2 like it does on page 18.

3 MR. RATZER: Not in the shapes as you're
4 saying, the round. They'll match the building, but
5 it will look like it as far as what you're seeing as
6 far as a stone look. Okay. The stone would be
7 similar colors to the buildings that we have. Okay.

8 And what we're trying to do -- we're still
9 playing with it. That's why we're just not done
10 with it. We're trying to decide whether we make
11 this -- because we'll have high ceilings like the
12 actual apartment buildings have.

13 So we're trying to decide whether we make it
14 a loft so you have some second-floor rooms, like a
15 game room or a business room, things like that; or
16 if we just, you know, keep, you know, the
17 architecture kind of like you see in height but not
18 use that for extra space. Put everything on one
19 floor. But this will have the health club, the
20 business offices, Internet cafe, as well as an
21 indoor swimming pool.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Back to the
23 elevations on the buildings.

24 MR. RATZER: Okay.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: On the plans it shows
2 35.9, and then you requested up to 42. So what is
3 it going to be? Is that --

4 MR. RATZER: I mean, it's one of those just
5 in cases. We were told just ask for what the worst
6 case could be. Our current plan shows the 35 1/2,
7 that's correct; but, you know, if we need a little
8 bit more, I didn't want to have to come back and ask
9 for questions after the fact. I've seen that
10 happen. It gets a little convoluted.

11 So if this turns out where the trusses that
12 we have to purchase, and they're usually premade
13 trusses, end up being at 36 1/2, you know. So we
14 picked 42 to stay under, I guess, the zoning
15 requirements of certain --

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yeah.

17 MR. RATZER: So that's the only reason for
18 that discrepancy. This is the plan. This is what
19 we intend to build. If it happens to be a foot
20 higher, I don't think we're hurting anything, and I
21 don't want to have to ask for something after you
22 guys will approve everything.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Don't get me wrong, I
24 think it's beautiful.

1 MR. RATZER: No, no. Thank you. I'm just
2 saying that's the reasoning.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have another
4 question on parking, and I thank staff because it
5 made me look at a lot of different things that I
6 maybe would have missed, but it is important, the
7 parking stalls mentioned.

8 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: That they be 9 1/2
10 deep.

11 MR. RATZER: Okay.

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: 9 1/2 wide by 18
13 deep.

14 MR. RATZER: Okay.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And you're asking for
16 a deviation of --

17 MR. RATZER: We just wanted it to be 9 for
18 space concerns. We have plenty of parking. So I'm
19 not -- it's just a matter of -- you know, most
20 commercial places when they're trying to get real
21 tight go 8, 8 1/2. So we didn't want to go 9 1/2
22 and 10. We figured 9 is wide enough to where you're
23 opening a door, and you're not going to bang the
24 door.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: But is that in front
2 of, like, garages so that it could infringe on the
3 sidewalks, if they're not deep enough?

4 MR. RATZER: Not wide enough you're saying?
5 So deep enough -- here's what you have to
6 understand. There was something in the staff report
7 that is correct, and our civil is correcting it.

8 We counted every unit that has a garage,
9 300, and we counted not quite all of them but too
10 many of them to be tandem parking spots. Because of
11 the sidewalks, they would jut out. Those are being
12 eliminated. Okay. Those aren't going to be part of
13 our count. If they want to park there and jut out,
14 we'll have to manage it from a business perspective
15 and not have them do it. But the bottom line is
16 we're not counting that towards parking.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

18 MR. RATZER: Okay. So off of the original
19 site plan, we have lost 50 spaces, which still gives
20 us more than enough on the ratio front, but to your
21 point, some of them are not proper.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

23 MR. RATZER: But I would like to keep that
24 deviation to 9 feet. It's still not going to enable

1 them to park there and have that room, but in some
2 cases it will.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question on trash.

6 Where is the trash located for each building?

7 MR. RATZER: We have a -- we're going to
8 have a small little area where they drop off the
9 trash.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Just one area or are there
11 multiple areas?

12 MR. RATZER: One area.

13 MEMBER FUNKE: Multiple areas?

14 MR. RATZER: One area with multiple dumpsters,
15 multiple --

16 MEMBER FUNKE: For all these units
17 throughout the subdivision?

18 MR. RATZER: Yeah. We collect it twice a
19 week, and we do that at all of our properties. It
20 just depends on the yardage of the dumpster.
21 They'll be big.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: So if you're on --

23 MR. RATZER: It's on the site plan. Right
24 here.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. So if you're on the
2 southeast end, how do you -- you've got to walk your
3 trash all the way over to that area?

4 MR. RATZER: Drive it all the way. If we
5 have a chance, we're going to make a little
6 cut-through here, if there's room, okay, Where they
7 can literally just throw it out their window.

8 This property may call for door-to-door
9 pickup because of the tenants thing, so we may do
10 that. But either way it's going to have to go
11 somewhere, and this is the area that it would go to.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Do you have any plans or any
13 landscaping for that area? Because it seems like
14 this is a large development, and I appreciate the
15 size of the development and what you guys are doing.
16 But my concern would be, you know, the trash and how
17 that gets dealt with.

18 MR. RATZER: Yeah. I mean, just to give you
19 a little background on the company, we own over
20 6,000 apartments.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

22 MR. RATZER: All sizes of 200 to 500, and we
23 basically have the same concept. You know, it's two
24 or three locations sometimes, sometimes one location

1 at the exit where people can drop it off on their
2 way to work.

3 And we even -- like I said, we even do
4 door-to-door in some locations and pick it up, or
5 they just drop it off, and we can get services from
6 either Waste Management or whoever is here, BFI,
7 Waste Management, I'm not sure, and we contract out
8 for them to empty dumpsters as much as possible.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, it would be nice to see
10 a plan to see what the capacity is for all these
11 residences because it is a large development, you
12 know.

13 MR. RATZER: Okay. I can have somebody
14 calculate it. No problem. I will answer this,
15 though, as part of the question. It will be
16 enclosed either with some sort of stonework to match
17 the buildings, I'm 90 percent sure that will be it,
18 but the other option given to me was an opaque-type
19 fencing. But that gets tough because the dumpster
20 trucks --

21 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

22 MR. RATZER: -- come in and tear that fence
23 apart and rip it off as opposed to some sort of nice
24 brick way. So we're playing with it.

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a question.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: When you're talking on
4 the site plan, about the big detention pond --

5 MR. RATZER: This one.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- you say you're
7 talking about a nature path. Is that going to go
8 around the complete circumference of that?

9 MR. RATZER: Yes.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. That's good.

11 MR. RATZER: Yes.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That leads me to making
13 a suggestion, that maybe in the middle of the road
14 there by the side road down in there that was
15 brought up -- this nature path is going around the
16 perimeter of that pond. I would like to suggest,
17 having driven down that road two times today to
18 Bricher Road, it's pretty stark as you drive through
19 there.

20 It would be a nice complement to that whole
21 neighborhood if that treeline that you started up
22 here to the east of the main entrance continued on
23 down to your secondary entrance. I don't know what
24 it would be, the spacing of the trees, but it would

1 make a shield for a little privacy for you on both
2 sides of the road.

3 And it would really, I think, add a little
4 character to Bricher Road as you're traveling. It
5 needs something, and this is a great opportunity to
6 step up and do that.

7 MR. RATZER: I agree with you, and I can
8 also say that that was part of the staff -- they
9 don't miss a thing. So that was part of the staff's
10 recommendation is that one of the things that we
11 were short on the landscape, that we are not asking
12 for a deviation of, it's more trees on the front.

13 So we're going to do that, and if it doesn't
14 provide -- because we want to do the same thing
15 you're intending, and we'll just add some trees. So
16 if the spacing is -- does anybody know what the
17 spacing is off of the top of your head? 50? 50
18 feet. If that doesn't do it through growth and
19 whatnot, we'll do it every 40 feet or every 30 feet.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I can just picture
21 that.

22 MR. RATZER: It would be nice.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It would be a nice
24 setting for the whole roadway.

1 MR. RATZER: Yeah. I agree.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Thank you.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a question maybe
4 more for staff. If we approve a plan, any plan for
5 the south end of this Bricher Commons, what happens
6 to the rest of the property from a development
7 standpoint? There was a drawing within the original
8 PUD which shows a concept plan and some roadways
9 that were shown through and that kind of thing and
10 some uses.

11 But with this, that doesn't exist anymore,
12 and there's been a development at the north end with
13 the storage facility; and so as we're thinking about
14 whether we want to approach this or not, wouldn't
15 that be something that we would also like to see,
16 how that would change?

17 MR. COLBY: Well, the proposal is to amend
18 the PUD for this site only because this is the site
19 that the applicant is purchasing and has control
20 over. So what would be left then for the north
21 portion of this site will be that same plan that
22 exists from the 2006 PUD ordinance that shows that
23 layout and primarily commercial uses and some
24 residential uses.

1 So that plan will no longer be able to be
2 executed in the way it's drawn, but the zoning
3 entitlement will remain for the land uses for that
4 portion of the property.

5 So because it's a PUD, in the future if a
6 developer comes forward, they would need to present
7 a plan for that area. Obviously, that needs to
8 account for the fact that this land change has
9 occurred on the southern part of the site. So
10 that's planning that would have to occur later if
11 there is a developer at the table for that portion
12 of the property.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. I'm not sure I
14 agree with that approach inasmuch as you're asking
15 for a change without identifying for us what happens
16 to the remainder. Maybe the responsibility isn't
17 yours to present that plan, but since you're buying
18 the property from BEI, maybe they should have
19 something that helps us understand what the
20 intention is for the balance of the property and
21 what they have developed so far.

22 MR. RATZER: Well, I can't speak for them,
23 but I've been speaking to them for the last six
24 months. So I can give you at least a little flavor

1 of what I understand.

2 They are not developers. They're landowners
3 everywhere, and they hold this until they sell it.
4 That's typical. So they found us, and we're very
5 interested in buying this, and we've gone down this
6 road. They've sold -- so they didn't build
7 themselves. They sold that piece of land where your
8 storage facility is.

9 Their next objective is to sell the rest of
10 that parcel. They have had -- all I can say is they
11 have a goal of making it -- sell to somebody or some
12 group and some use that will easily comply with what
13 you guys would be looking for. I can tell you that
14 there has been sniffing around are the words used a
15 senior housing person, but they're sniffing around
16 everywhere, and they don't put a lot of credence in
17 that.

18 But they do have -- they're in talks right
19 now with a senior housing developer, not assisted
20 living, and not affordable senior housing. I don't
21 understand the concept really, except it's a
22 subdivision of maybe 55 and older, age restricted.
23 Okay. To where there's duplexes, but they don't
24 have a contract yet, and they don't have -- they

1 didn't call me and say, hey, you're about to have a
2 neighbor. So I don't know exactly, but the goal is
3 to sell it. That's all I can tell you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Well, let's
5 not get too much beyond our scope because we're
6 looking at this application. So I don't want to get
7 too off subject.

8 Unless there's something pressing, I'd like
9 to turn to the audience and see if there are any
10 questions.

11 All right. Any member of the audience have
12 questions? Yes, sir.

13 MR. LAPORTA: Good evening. My name is Jim
14 LaPorta. I live in Lincoln Square in Geneva.
15 Lincoln Square is the development directly to the
16 south of this proposed development, and I have a
17 question, and I have three areas I'd like to
18 comment. L-a-P-o-r-t-a.

19 I had the good fortune of living in
20 St. Charles for seven months while my home was being
21 built in Geneva. Now, I found this community to be
22 a very nice community to live in, excellent parks,
23 schools, police department, fire. It's a very
24 desirable area. You're undertaking a lot of good

1 development in downtown St. Charles. It really is a
2 nice place to live.

3 In the short period of time that I've lived
4 in Lincoln Square, I've learned to understand better
5 traffic patterns on Bricher Road and the area in
6 general. One question that I have is with the
7 detention pond. That is going to butt up to
8 Bricher, and the grading there is such that -- if I
9 can borrow this site plan. The grading is such
10 where I believe this is a high point, and it kind of
11 goes down here. It's low by the clubhouse. It goes
12 this way, and this is all wetland that heads to the
13 west.

14 If this detention pond is not adequate in
15 size to retain water in a heavy downpour, my
16 question is where is this water going to go? Will
17 it go to the west? Will it go over Bricher Road and
18 head into the Lincoln Square subdivision?

19 MR. RATZER: Do you want me to answer that
20 before your other questions?

21 MR. LAPORTA: Well, that's fine. That's my
22 first question, and then I've got three comments.

23 MR. RATZER: Do you want me to answer?

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. You can answer.

1 MR. RATZER: Okay. So he's 100 percent
2 correct. What we have here is we will not -- first
3 of all, the detention pond is going to be sufficient
4 and deep enough to hold the water, but there's
5 always the extreme cases. In the extreme cases, we
6 have negotiated drainage easements right here with
7 our civil engineer. Thank you.

8 MR. FEENSTRA: Ted Feenstra, V3 Companies,
9 7325 Janes Avenue, Woodridge, Illinois.

10 So yeah, the detention pond if it were to
11 fill up and overflow, it would go to the west. So
12 the water has to go to the west through the County
13 property, and that's the way it would go.

14 MR. LAPORTA: Thank you. The reason I ask
15 that question is we have 45, 48 homes in our
16 development; and at the south end, there is a
17 detention pond; and it gets pretty low back there.
18 There's a lot of concrete with the mall, and my
19 concern is that that water does not enter our
20 subdivision because I don't know if the detention
21 pond to the south of our development is adequate
22 enough to handle all that. And would there be a
23 flooding problem for our residents that live
24 adjacent to that pond.

1 The three areas I want to comment on were
2 touched on in a publication I got -- or a
3 presentation with one of your Planning and
4 Development Committee meetings, and I was really
5 impressed when I read that because all my concerns
6 were addressed in that planning document.

7 The first area I'd like to go into is need,
8 the second area I would to like address is traffic
9 and road conditions, and then the third area would
10 be alternative development for this site.

11 Recently I read that the City of St. Charles
12 approved 650 apartments to be built on a location
13 where there was a mall, and it's been vacant for a
14 while. And, you know, I don't know how long it's
15 going to take to fill those 650 units, and I don't
16 know how quickly they will fill up. How quickly
17 they will rent.

18 You read in the literature that millennials
19 are renting. They are not buying. Just the other
20 day, I read an article where millennials are buying
21 again.

22 So you have those 650 units, plus all the
23 other rental properties there are in the City of
24 St. Charles. North Aurora is building a 300-unit

1 development on Orchard which is under construction.
2 The City of Batavia just approved over a 100 units
3 for their downtown area.

4 So I don't know if a needs assessment was
5 done to see how marketable these units will be and
6 whether or not they will rent them and how much that
7 rent will, you know, go for. So that -- you know,
8 that's one comment.

9 As far as traffic and traffic flow, I
10 appreciate the site plan because it makes my comment
11 a lot easier. Is this entrance directly across from
12 Camden, which is the entrance that I use and my
13 neighbors use to get into our development?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

15 MR. LAPORTA: It is. Okay. I drive a
16 minivan; and when I pull out of my subdivision and
17 I'm going east to get to the mall and go to Lowe's
18 or Meijer's or whatever the case might be, even with
19 the best of service trying to get snow removal out,
20 it's slippery, and it takes awhile to enter Bricher
21 Road.

22 It also is an issue when you make a
23 left-hand turn out of my development and want to go
24 toward Peck. The topography is such coming from the

1 east that you can't see the traffic. There's a hill
2 there. And at the speed that traffic is flowing,
3 you know, they move pretty quick, and I'm pulling
4 out of my development, and low and behold there's a
5 car almost right on top of me.

6 The other issue for us is we have a turning
7 lane, a left-hand turning lane there to get into our
8 development. This road narrows down. When you come
9 from the east when you're at Lowe's, you have a
10 right-in lane that goes into Lowe's. You have a
11 left-hand lane that gets into the Geneva Commons,
12 and then there is a center lane sort of that kind
13 of -- you go straight.

14 Well, you know, it's challenging if you're
15 in rush hour to get in that center lane because it
16 narrows. It's a funnel effect. There has been --
17 there's an alleyway or a back alleyway right here
18 behind Lowe's. You have semis pulling in and out of
19 here. Even though this isn't intended as a
20 cut-through, people are cutting through there all
21 the time because they don't want to stop in front of
22 Lowe's with the stop sign. You get hung up by the
23 street light.

24 So I agree with the comment that if you open

1 this entrance up here, this would become a
2 cut-through, especially around the holiday time and
3 they come to this main entrance.

4 Is there plans to put a light here to stop
5 traffic? No? Okay.

6 Whether this apartment complex was going in
7 here or you were going to build commercial
8 development, if you put something directly across
9 from the entrance of our subdivision, that's going
10 to cause some problems and safety concern.

11 Getting out is a problem. The other day I
12 was in the center lane turning left into my
13 subdivision, and I had a car pass me on the
14 right-hand side. There was a car approaching me
15 from the west, and they must have been texting
16 because they were swerving all over the line heading
17 right for me. I hit my horn. They woke up and
18 moved over. At the same time I've got a car passing
19 me on the right-hand side.

20 So I agree with the City of Geneva. This
21 needs to be widened. This is way too narrow here.

22 I would also like to comment that, you know,
23 there is their main entrance. If you put 250 units
24 in here, would it be safe to say you're going to

1 have at least 400 cars? Maybe? Right. So you're
2 going to have heavy traffic coming in and out of
3 here, and this road is not going to be able to
4 handle it.

5 As you continue with your development in
6 this area, more traffic is going to be on this road.
7 So this has to be addressed. Whether this apartment
8 complex goes in here or something else goes in here,
9 if you're going to put an entrance here, what I
10 think might be something you'd want to consider is
11 traffic going to the west could only turn in and
12 make a right-hand turn. Traffic coming out of this
13 development could only make a right-hand turn and go
14 to the west.

15 That would avoid the tightness of this road
16 where you have somebody coming out and make a left
17 if you don't put a stop light, and anybody coming
18 from the west trying to get in here cannot make a
19 left-hand turn. This road is not wide enough to
20 accommodate that. Because if you don't, there's
21 going to be accidents here. There's just -- it's
22 just too difficult of a grade, the traffic is going
23 too fast, and you just can't see as you're coming
24 out of my development.

1 All right. So when Pulte built, Geneva had
2 them put a right-hand turn lane here, which helps
3 because it gets you off that main drag and at least
4 you can slow down and get to the subdivision, but
5 you've got way too much going on here. If anything,
6 they should make this the main entrance and get it
7 away from there. That's another option.

8 But this needs to be addressed because as
9 they're presenting it, I don't believe it's safe for
10 the people living here, for the people who live in
11 my subdivision, or anyone traveling on this road.

12 Okay. So that's the traffic and traffic
13 flow patterns. And then one other point, you know,
14 at holiday time, I knew traffic was going to be
15 crazy. I'm not naive. I bought this house, and
16 there's a big mall with all the restaurants.
17 Everybody goes there.

18 The City of Geneva puts a police officer in
19 front of Garden Market, and they prevent traffic
20 from backing up here because you just can't move
21 here.

22 So you've got a lot of people coming in
23 here, and they only have this way in and this way
24 in. What they need is an exit right here. You need

1 a road taking you off of Bricher to 38 so that
2 traffic can get diverted out of here. And if they
3 don't fund or develop this now, then you need to
4 have some kind of provision to get funded to do it
5 at a later time because if you don't put this road
6 in now, it may or may not happen.

7 All right. And the other part of my comment
8 is that I don't think this is the best use of this
9 property. Yes, these are nice units. The
10 architecture is pretty. They look great, but
11 250 units into this area. That's a lot of people.

12 This was originally developed for
13 commercial/industrial. The grading here is such
14 that, you know, you put these units here, the
15 rooftops, the asphalt, the water has got to go
16 somewhere. You know, maybe 250 is too many, you
17 know, with all the apartments being built right now.

18 Are they going to be able to rent these out?
19 Are they going to build them at one time? Are they
20 going to be vacant for a while? Will they fill
21 them? You know, you have a lot of apartment
22 complexes in St. Charles now. You have the
23 developments that I've mentioned.

24 This might be better -- you know, a better

1 use if you did senior housing, not income
2 restricted, but age restricted, townhomes or condos
3 or duplexes. There's a market here where you have
4 people that live in St. Charles who like the
5 community, would like to stay, don't want to
6 maintain a house anymore. But they don't have much
7 choice as far as buying something that's smaller.

8 This may be better serving the community
9 with that type of development or just leave it, you
10 know, commercial/industrial and go forward that way.

11 So with that, I'd like to say I appreciate
12 the opportunity to get up in front of you and, you
13 know, share my comments with you. Hopefully, I've
14 given you some food for thought. I think my
15 comments are valid and realistic, and I'd really
16 like you to take a look at this.

17 I know you'll do what's right for
18 St. Charles and what's right for your community.
19 Please think long term not short term; and if this
20 does -- if you do decide to approve this, I'm not
21 here to tell you not to, make sure that they do it
22 right. Address the concerns that I have and get it
23 fixed now and prevent problems going forward.

24 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

2 Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question
4 for staff. Bricher Road, is that St. Charles or
5 Geneva, or is it right down the middle?

6 MR. COLBY: It's maintained by the City of
7 Geneva.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The entire road?

9 MR. COLBY: The entire Bricher Road.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's what I
11 thought. Then I also wanted to speak to the
12 comprehensive plan. Just to be clear, the
13 comprehensive plan calls for that. In the west
14 gateway subarea, it recommends residential or
15 office/commercial service uses at the interior and
16 southern end of the property.

17 It actually says that portions of the
18 site -- northern areas of the site, which is Route
19 38, should develop with commercial uses fronting
20 Lincoln Highway with either multi-family,
21 single-family attached, or office and commercial
22 services in the rear and interior of the site.

23 It actually does call for this use, the
24 possibility of this use. I just want to make that

1 clear. That's what our comprehensive plan spells
2 out.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And, Russ, if I'm not
4 mistaken, Bricher Commons allows for up to -- is it
5 34 1/2 acres to be used for residential purposes?

6 MR. COLBY: That's correct. Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And what was the density?
8 Do you recall? Or what would be the total number of
9 units if it was developed as of right now?

10 MR. COLBY: That information is in the PUD
11 ordinance, which is in the packet.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. I think it was like
13 7, 7 1/2.

14 MR. COLBY: Yeah. It suggests a range of
15 250 to 350 units. There was a portion of that that
16 was provided as affordable units.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. All right.

18 Other questions? Yes, sir.

19 MR. HABOUSH: Hi, my name is John Haboush,
20 H-a-b-o-u-s-h. I live in Lincoln Square as well.

21 A couple of quick questions. What is the
22 plan in terms of the cost for rent monthly?

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, you can answer if
24 you want, but it's kind of beyond our review scope.

1 MR. HABOUSH: Oh, okay. So it's not -- the
2 reason for the question was if I'm understanding
3 correctly from the things I read, that 10 percent
4 have to be put aside for affordable housing, aka
5 Section 8.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

7 MR. HABOUSH: No.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Affordable housing is not
9 Section 8, no.

10 MR. HABOUSH: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

12 MR. HABOUSH: So there's no plans for that.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me just stop you for
14 a second. I don't know, Russ or Ellen, if you just
15 want to comment on affordable housing and the
16 affordable housing ordinance.

17 MR. COLBY: Well, with respect to this
18 development, the developers proposed to pay a fee in
19 lieu into the City's housing trust fund, and that's
20 in lieu of providing any affordable units within the
21 project.

22 MR. HABOUSH: That covers it.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

24 MR. HABOUSH: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

2 All right. Other questions?

3 Yes, sir. Were you sworn in at the
4 beginning? I thought you walked in after.

5 MR. MOEHLLENHOFF: No, I did walk in after.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Come on up.

7 MR. MOEHLLENHOFF: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Raise your hand.

9 (Witness duly sworn.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then just
11 state your name, spell your last name and your
12 address.

13 MR. MOEHLLENHOFF: Matt Moehlenhoff,
14 M-o-e-h-l-e-n-h-o-f-f, 2645 Camden Street.

15 I also just wanted to comment on the amount
16 of traffic that flows in and out. Like he said,
17 it's just not at the holiday time. There is
18 literally a police officer parked in front of the
19 Fresh Market so that you cannot turn in there.
20 We're talking about adding how many more units into
21 this street and only making one turn in and out.

22 I understand that there's a secondary
23 entrance, but all these people are still going to
24 flow towards Randall Road. There are many times

1 when you can't even get three cars through the stop
2 light in front of the Fresh Market to get to Randall
3 Road, and now we're going to add this many more to it.

4 Also I thought in your plan you guys
5 mentioned that the development across will be taken
6 into consideration and the density. Lincoln Square
7 has 48 units. This is 250. I don't know what our
8 density ratio breaks out to be versus our acreage
9 versus yours, but the concern just ultimately is the
10 amount of cars flowing in and out of that area.

11 And I would also like to say the trees in
12 front of the pond, great idea, but the reality is
13 that Lincoln Square is a community that is very
14 mixed. I'm a younger homeowner in the area. Moved
15 to Geneva in order to raise a family and start a
16 family.

17 I definitely like the idea of sidewalks. I
18 think they're safe. And the idea that there's not
19 going to be a sidewalk to cross in front of a
20 property seems kind of wrong. I don't understand
21 why you wouldn't want to do that.

22 So, I mean -- and also with the turn lanes,
23 it's very challenging to turn in and out. So with
24 the amount of traffic, I just have a big concern

1 about how that's going to be handled if there's not
2 going to be a road that connects to, I think, it's
3 Lincoln Road behind the community.

4 So thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
6 else? Sir.

7 MR. MEAD: Good evening. My name is John
8 Mead, M-e-a-d. I live at 3308 Ridge Pointe Drive in
9 Geneva.

10 I'm a little bit late to the game. I'm
11 outside the notice area, so I didn't have access to
12 a packet or anything else, but I appreciate the good
13 questions we've heard tonight.

14 I have a couple -- I really appreciate
15 Mr. LaPorta's questions. I agree with almost
16 everything he said, but I won't put you through
17 having to listen to that again.

18 I was under the impression that the
19 March 7th approval for Shodeen on the old mall site
20 included some affordable units and took that to
21 about 690 total units, potentially, for that site.
22 One of my concerns is land use and density. I mean,
23 all these villages want density in the appropriate
24 spots in town; but adding 690 units and 250 has

1 to -- that's almost a 1,000 new residential
2 household units in this area.

3 It's going to affect Randall and 38. It's
4 going to affect Randall and Bricher. It's going to
5 affect Bricher. We'll become a relief valve from
6 folks going north to Route 38, that when that's
7 jammed because of all the traffic, they will start
8 to head west out to Peck to go around that. So
9 there's going to be an effect.

10 If the traffic study didn't take into
11 account the 690 units as complete by Mr. Shodeen,
12 then I think the traffic study probably is falling
13 short in some regards.

14 A couple other things. The Bricher
15 improvement, I echo that strongly, turn lanes,
16 capacity just probably will not be enough and now is
17 the time to address that. So I would encourage you
18 to really beat that up a little bit more.

19 The west connection, didn't hear about that
20 until tonight, but I think if you strongly
21 considered requiring that if a road was built to the
22 west, that the developer should allow his property
23 to be connected through that street. Maybe not at
24 his cost, but allow the County or the City, whoever

1 is putting the road in, to connect to that interior
2 road of his site. That would be a valuable addition
3 to your approval.

4 I'm just looking at my notes here. Sorry.

5 Sidewalks, there's going to be development
6 to the west. I live at Bricher at Peck in the
7 Prairie Ridge subdivision. There's sidewalks all
8 the way along the south side. Eventually, there's
9 going to be development all the way to the court
10 facility and the government facility.

11 Having a sidewalk on both sides of that
12 roadway would make complete sense down the road. So
13 plan for the future. If you move forward for
14 approval, I would encourage you to really be
15 thoughtful about the density. I do think there
16 needs to be sidewalk and pedestrian paths along
17 there because putting bikes or people on the edge of
18 the road is just not a smart thing to encourage.

19 That's really all I had. I appreciate the
20 time and your guys consideration of the development.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

22 I feel compelled to make one additional
23 statement. I know that from time to time when it's
24 come to entrances and traffic flow, one of my

1 biggest examples of poor planning is the entrance
2 into Geneva Commons off of Bricher Road.

3 And I think that, unfortunately, now the
4 residents of Geneva and our Plan Commission are
5 being negatively affected by that planning. And
6 with the City of Geneva coming to us and asking that
7 a development in St. Charles put in right-turn lanes
8 because of the traffic situation that they have
9 created -- I noticed the other day that there are no
10 right-turn lanes into Geneva Commons if you're
11 heading eastbound along Bricher Road.

12 Right in front of Fresh Market, there's no
13 right-turn lane. It goes to two lanes, but there's
14 no right-turn lane, and the next entrance there's no
15 right-turn lane. There is the beginning of a
16 right-turn lane to turn onto Randall Road.

17 So, you know, I understand that there's an
18 issue there. There's definitely a traffic issue,
19 and it's something that, unfortunately, because of
20 some planning mishaps in the past, we're going to
21 have to be dealing with it now and in the future.

22 I do appreciate the developer offering to
23 put in a right-turn lane at the main entrance, and I
24 think that that will help. But at the same time, we

1 are stuck with the situation as it is, and anything
2 the developer puts in this area is going to have
3 issues regarding traffic on Bricher Road.

4 I do hope that the City of Geneva will work
5 to correct the issue that they've made. Yeah. And
6 obviously, you know, they have their own police
7 officer out there trying to correct the issue when
8 it's busy. But I feel like it's unfortunate that
9 we're sitting here having to deal with that problem.

10 So anyway, are there -- yes.

11 MR. RATZER: Can I add a couple of just
12 quick things?

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

14 MR. RATZER: Thank you very much.

15 So just real quick, a feasibility study was
16 just finished yesterday. I didn't have time to
17 print it and send it out. The feasibility study is
18 going to go to Russ, and he can disseminate it to
19 anybody in the next day or two. Okay. I'm just
20 waiting for -- it did not say draft on it, final.

21 The feasibility study says that this town,
22 this area needs over 1,000 apartments to meet the
23 current or upcoming demand from the renter pool; and
24 just brief numbers, there's between 4300 and 13,000

1 people that are being qualified renters for class A
2 apartments. I don't have the details. It literally
3 just came in. But there is a feasibility study that
4 we did.

5 And the reason we did it is I -- I did my
6 own feasibility study. I've been in this business
7 for 25 years. I went to all the apartment complexes
8 in the area, whether they be in Geneva or
9 St. Charles, and nobody can rent me an apartment.
10 They were full. That tells me there's a shortage of
11 apartments.

12 But I specifically remember that Maureen
13 Lewis and another person, another Council woman,
14 maybe it was Rita, were extremely unhappy with
15 Mr. Shodeen not doing a feasibility study, and if he
16 had one, he wouldn't share it with them. I'm not
17 hiding it. I'll send it to you tomorrow or the next
18 day and give it to whoever asks for it. Okay. So
19 there is a need for apartments.

20 The second thing I want to mention real
21 quick is after hearing these folks talk and me
22 trying to save money -- that's what I'm, you know,
23 charged with, to build an efficient property. If I
24 can go up, I'm going to change the site plan and put

1 in that sidewalk. Okay. So I'm doing the
2 right-turn lane on my own volition. I'll do the
3 sidewalk.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which sidewalk?

5 MR. RATZER: The sidewalk that connects our
6 two entrances. I'll take it to my property line,
7 which is basically that roadway. If I can get back
8 there, you'll see it. So it's the one that you
9 asked me about earlier, that I don't think is
10 necessary, but if the people in Geneva want to cross
11 the street and walk to the jail, they can walk to
12 the jail.

13 So right here, guys. This is what you were
14 saying too; right? It would be nice. So I plan on
15 doing it here. It's on my plan. But now I'm going
16 to do it all across. Okay.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And just so I'm
18 clear, that's going all the way from the east
19 property line to the west property line?

20 MR. RATZER: Pretty much. I mean, obviously
21 this is a roadway. So I'm not going to put it
22 there, and I own very little here. It wouldn't make
23 sense to be just 2 feet, 5 feet, whatever this is
24 here. I don't own this wetland area; and really

1 this is the wetland, the darker shade. Underneath
2 the unit mix is actually dry land, but I'm not
3 buying either of these.

4 MEMBER FRIO: Just a question. Across the
5 street --

6 MR. RATZER: Where?

7 MEMBER FRIO: -- on Bricher?

8 MR. RATZER: Down here?

9 MEMBER FRIO: Is there a sidewalk on the
10 public side?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. There's a
12 sidewalk all the way to Peck Road.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: It's actually a bike
14 path.

15 MR. RATZER: Is it?

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah.

17 MR. RATZER: Can we do that? The same
18 thing?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All the way along
20 there.

21 MR. RATZER: Sidewalk. So I'm not -- I'm
22 trying to please as many people as I can and still
23 make this a viable project, so.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, you know, I'd

1 like to make a comment, and, you know, you have an
2 application in for a special use for a planned unit
3 development. A planned unit development is
4 something that we're willing to work with you on,
5 but the one finding that we have to find -- with the
6 findings of fact, the one finding of fact that we
7 have to come to with a special use for a planned
8 unit development is that it's in the public
9 interest. Okay.

10 And this is so that you have an opportunity
11 to deviate from that underlying zoning. So you're
12 getting something. You're getting a deviation, a
13 significant deviation.

14 MR. RATZER: Okay.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So that, you know,
16 you can build what we, I think, agree, and I believe
17 is a good project. I like the project. I'm not
18 concerned that much about the density. I think that
19 the architecture is fine. I understand your idea.

20 But I will tell you that I don't believe
21 we're getting anything out of it. I don't think
22 that it's -- I think you're -- you've got a
23 development here that's enclosed. And I think of
24 the Timbers when I think of this development, and

1 that's a subdivision that you can get in and out of
2 only with one entrance.

3 This is going to be in and out of with two
4 entrances. I agree with some of the comments, the
5 public comment that's been made with the density of
6 this project all entering and exiting on Bricher
7 Road exclusively, and you don't believe that there
8 is going to be any future development or that you
9 have any need to be involved or think about it.

10 But I believe that any roadway that ends at
11 your property line should have the ability to
12 connect to any future development, and I feel very,
13 very strongly about that.

14 And I think that the whole purpose of a
15 planned unit development is so that you can benefit
16 from us letting you deviate from code, but that it's
17 in the public interest. And if I don't see that,
18 I'm going to have a difficult time voting in favor
19 of a special use for a planned unit development.

20 So, you know, those types of comments about,
21 you know, you don't think that there's going to be
22 anything in the future. They have talked about it
23 for years. You don't know what's going to happen
24 anymore than we do, and we're planners; and we think

1 that perhaps if something happened in the future,
2 there would be an ability for some traffic to move
3 out of that subdivision from different directions
4 through other developments.

5 So I think that's important for you to think
6 about when you're proposing a special use for a
7 planned unit development.

8 MR. RATZER: I appreciate your comments, and
9 I appreciate where you're trying to go. But I guess
10 the best example I can give you to my staunch
11 opposition to that at this time doing something now
12 for the future is because I don't know. So, for
13 example, you mentioned something about -- one of the
14 gentlemen mentioned something about what if it's a
15 bike path or a pedestrian path. And I jumped on it
16 because I know what people on bikes look like, and I
17 know what people walking look like. They look like
18 individuals exercising. Hear me out.

19 I am absolutely reticent to give any access
20 today to the neighborhood to the north. Why?
21 Because what if it gets zoned industrial? Now I've
22 given you connectivity, not you, but the City,
23 right, connectivity so that I can have
24 tractor-trailers and semitrucks going in there

1 loading and unloading from the industrial.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That can be
3 mitigated.

4 MR. RATZER: That's not what I want to build
5 an extremely expensive property for so my residents
6 can have tractor-trailers coming through at all
7 hours of the night. It's just an example though --

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

9 MR. RATZER: -- of not what I would call
10 adverse development. If you approve it, it's good.
11 But the bottom line is I should be able to know who
12 is driving through my private property and what
13 types of vehicles they are.

14 So I'm willing to cooperate. I'm willing to
15 get a phone call from you guys saying, hey, we got
16 this deal. What do you think? Could we cut
17 through? Tell me about your deal. Just like I have
18 to come to you now and ask you, you should ask me,
19 do you think this is a good use. Right. I mean,
20 it's only fair. It's private property.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- the right spot
22 for this type of development anywhere. I think it's
23 important that, you know, we give and take here a
24 little bit. As I say, I'm not opposed to the

1 development, but I do believe that if you want a PUD
2 in an area that calls for different types of uses, I
3 mean, the comprehensive plan calls for this as well
4 as some industrial or office as you move north. I
5 mean you know it's there. You know it's zoned.

6 MR. RATZER: That's why I'm leery to give
7 it -- that's why I'm leery.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: I agree with the presenter.
9 I mean, the idea of creating a neighborhood here and
10 not knowing what's going to be to the north or to
11 the west. I mean, you know, I have kids and, you
12 know, there are -- you know, it's hard to find
13 places to ride a bike and to walk. That's why I
14 kind of brought up the whole idea of, you know, the
15 walking path is a nice idea. You know, and create
16 all these green spaces that you create here.

17 And connecting to the west, you don't know
18 what's going to be there, and, you know, this is a
19 community. This is a neighborhood. So kind of
20 having two entrance points, main entrance, I think
21 it's good, just, you know, from an architecture
22 standpoint.

23 MR. RATZER: Okay. So, you know, I'm not
24 trying to fight with you. I'm trying to state my

1 point, and, you know what, frankly, we are giving
2 something to the community. I know money isn't
3 everything, but we're giving a huge tax bill. Okay.

4 Now, what does that do? That goes to the
5 schools. It goes to the parks. It goes to whoever
6 shares in the tax bill. That's a big investment on
7 me to pay those taxes.

8 I'm also doing something where the
9 construction here -- unlike the other one you guys
10 just approved, that was a lot of one bedrooms, and
11 that's cool, that kind of project. My project is
12 family oriented. So I have two- and three-bedrooms.
13 Who am I going to be more servicing? I'm going to
14 be servicing people who want to move into your
15 community for your schools, which as we've talked
16 about, the school enrollment is down.

17 I find that that's a great value that I'm
18 providing. Along with the cash, I'm providing
19 people who want to come and live in St. Charles but
20 don't have what's deemed affordable housing.
21 Because although my rents are fairly high, you don't
22 require a down payment to buy a house with an entry
23 fee in your community. So I do believe that I am
24 providing two valuable things for the St. Charles

1 community.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Yes, sir.

5 MR. MEAD: John Mead again. I want to thank
6 the chairman for bringing up the point about the
7 access to the Geneva Commons. It's actually -- the
8 Commons starts down by Dicks. I'm not sure what
9 that center is called where the Fresh Market is, but
10 Geneva knows it has a problem at that intersection.

11 And that speaks to approving something
12 without requiring something, and I was just thanking
13 you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing up that point about
14 the entrance to the Fresh Market.

15 Geneva knows it has a problem. It can only
16 fix it, because it didn't require turn lanes or
17 anything else, when that owner of that center comes
18 and needs something from the City. So that's why I
19 would encourage you -- like just the entrance to the
20 west, if there's going to be a connector from 38 to
21 Bricher, now is the time to require this development
22 be mandated to connect to it, just like Commissioner
23 Kessler indicated.

24 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

2 Comments?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

5 Anything further from staff?

6 MR. COLBY: (Nonverbal response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else from the
8 applicant?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If Plan Commissioners
11 feel that they have enough information to make an
12 informed recommendation to the City Council, then a
13 motion to close the public hearing will be in order.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Second.

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

18 Okay. This is a motion to close the public
19 hearing only.

20 Tim.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

6 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The public
13 hearing is closed.

14 That moves us on to Item 5 on the agenda,
15 which is Prairie Winds of St. Charles, Prairie
16 Winds, LLC, application for map amendment,
17 application for special use for planned unit
18 development, and application for PUD preliminary
19 plan.

20 Is there a motion?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to make a
22 motion to recommend approval for the application for
23 a map amendment.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Just the one

1 application?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
4 second?

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
7 discussion on the motion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: None. All right.
10 Do you intend to make motions on the other
11 applications?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, we will.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm sure somebody
15 will.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just asking.

17 So this is for approval of the application
18 for map amendment.

19 Tim. I think it's roll call. Sorry.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

5 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Are there any
12 further motions? We still have two applications
13 pending, which is the application for special use
14 for planned unit development and an application for
15 PUD preliminary plan.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Tom, do you want to
17 make the motion?

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: No, I don't.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Well, first,
20 I'm going to make the recommendation. I'm going to
21 recommend -- make a recommendation for denial of the
22 application for special use for a planned unit
23 development.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Did you want to

1 make a cite to any findings of fact --

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- based on that?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, when I read
5 the findings of fact for a special use for a planned
6 unit development, there are criteria that we have to
7 follow to determine -- to make our determination,
8 and the single finding of fact that we have to make
9 is that it's in the public interest.

10 Some of the criteria that we have to
11 consider is that the proposed PUD advances one or
12 more of the purposes of the planned unit development
13 procedure, and the purposes of the PUD process
14 are -- and I'm not going to read them all. There
15 are seven of them. I'm going to read three of them.

16 No. 1 is to promote a creative approach to
17 the site improvements and building design that
18 results in a distinctive, attractive development
19 that has a strong sense of place, yet becomes an
20 integral part of the community. I don't believe
21 that's the case.

22 To create places oriented to the pedestrian
23 that promote physical activity and social
24 interaction, including, but not limited to, walkable

1 neighborhoods, usable open space and recreational
2 facilities for the enjoyment of all.

3 And No. 7 to encourage a collaborative
4 process among developers, neighboring property
5 owners and residents, governmental bodies and the
6 community.

7 I don't believe that this application meets
8 those three criteria to be considered.

9 And in addition, the proposed PUD and PUD
10 preliminary plans conform to the requirements of
11 underlying zoning district or districts in which the
12 PUD is located and to the applicable design review
13 standards contained in Chapter 17.06 except where:
14 Conforming to the requirements would be impractical
15 and the proposed PUD will provide benefits that
16 outweigh those that would have been realized by
17 conforming to the applicable requirements.

18 And I don't believe that it provides
19 benefits that outweigh those that would be realized
20 by conforming to the applicable standards we have as
21 requirements.

22 And then in an addition, the proposed PUD
23 conforms with the standards applicable to the
24 special use, and it says, "See findings of fact,

1 recommendations for special use."

2 And in a special use application, we're
3 required to find in the affirmative of all the
4 findings of fact, and there are six in that case.
5 And there are two of those that don't -- I don't
6 believe this application meets.

7 The effect on development of surrounding
8 property: That the establishment of the special use
9 will not impede the normal and orderly development
10 and improvement of the surrounding property for uses
11 permitted in the district.

12 I believe by confining it to two entrances
13 on Bricher Road, it doesn't meet that requirement.

14 And then secondly, that the effect on the
15 general welfare: That the establishment,
16 maintenance, or operation of the special use will
17 not be detrimental to or endanger the public health,
18 safety, comfort, or general welfare.

19 And I believe, specifically, that having
20 that community with that density that will only
21 enter and exit on Bricher Road causes it not to meet
22 that requirement.

23 So those are the reasons that I don't agree
24 with it and recommend denial.

1 MEMBER FRIO: So what do we do if we want to
2 recommend it?

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I didn't hear your
4 answer.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: First, we vote
6 on it.

7 MEMBER FRIO: Okay. That's what I thought.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Was there a second to the
9 motion? There's a motion for a denial of both the
10 special use for a PUD and the PUD preliminary plan?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. Just the
12 special use.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just the special use.

14 There was a motion for denial that was made
15 by Mr. Kessler. There has to be a second in order
16 to initiate discussion on that motion; otherwise,
17 the motion is moot.

18 All right. Are there any other motions
19 then?

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I would like to
21 recommend approval.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Of?

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Of -- I don't know
24 what all the --

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Special use for planned
2 development.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes. Application for
4 special use for planned unit development.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As well as the other?

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: As well as the
7 application for PUD preliminary plan.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So the motion is
9 for approval of both the remaining applications.

10 Is there a second?

11 MEMBER FRIO: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I heard his first.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's fine.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So it's been
15 moved and seconded. Discussion on that motion?

16 (No response.)

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question. Can we
18 put conditions in there?

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes. That's
20 what I -- can we put conditions in there, Todd?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Well, explain that
22 for us, would you, Russ.

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. The Plan Commission can
24 attach conditions to a recommendation if it's a

1 specific element of the plan, but we would ask that
2 you provide a reason based on the findings that
3 you're attaching to the condition.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So we have a
5 motion. I wanted to talk about the conditions that
6 you're considering.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Well, he asked first.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you, Laura.

9 Well, I'd like to make a proposal that the
10 north/south road -- that the owner of this property
11 would consider -- and I'm not sure how to do that
12 legally or whatever, but consider connecting to a
13 future road and access to those communities.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think that
15 would be -- that's not a condition. That's a
16 recommendation.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So you're suggesting
19 a recommendation.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

21 MEMBER FRIO: At whose cost?

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, there wouldn't be a
23 cost because --

24 MEMBER FRIO: If the road went in, and then

1 he had to kind of take up the recommendation, who is
2 paying for that connection?

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, my understanding
4 is -- I thought the County owned the road or the
5 land or that potential easement. Is there a way to
6 get the County involved?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wait. What's the
9 suggestion?

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That he's open minded to
11 connect to this potential easement for future
12 development so there's a north/south access to the
13 north road.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that basically you
15 want to amend the motion, the recommendation for
16 approval to include --

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- a recommendation that
19 the developer --

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Is open.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To the connection --

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Would consider.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. Would consider and
24 not be closed minded, if you will. I know that's

1 passive.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, we should say not
3 because --

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I know it's not enforceable.
5 We're talking about goodwill.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: I would also like to
8 recommend that we see more landscape details for
9 monument signs on Bricher Road and some detail for
10 the compactor, some analysis on that, some details
11 on that enclosure.

12 And then, you know, you have this idea of
13 all these walking paths. It would be nice to see
14 more detail on how that's incorporated on to this
15 site.

16 MR. RATZER: Do I send that in, and then
17 you'll see it?

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

19 MR. RATZER: I don't know, yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So what I
21 would say is that we can append the motion to
22 include an encouragement for them to consider
23 connection to a north/south connection road and to
24 require that the detailed plans regarding

1 landscaping, the clubhouse -- and what was the other
2 thing?

3 MEMBER FUNKE: That stretch on Bricher Road
4 and then the trash enclosures, he talked about
5 walking paths throughout the site. So it would be
6 nice to see.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So detailed site plans be
8 provided prior to Planning and Development Committee
9 action --

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Exactly.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- or review, rather.

12 All right. So does that take care of
13 everything to appending the motion?

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Not quite.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: During the concept plan
17 testimony, there was a reference to creating a berm
18 with significant planting along the east property
19 line.

20 MR. RATZER: Yes.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: And that is not in the
22 current plans, not even close. I would say that
23 that's something that has not been achieved, not
24 through the concept plan but through the submittal.

1 MR. RATZER: It will be on the next one.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: So could that be a
3 condition?

4 MR. RATZER: Sure.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: Also I'd like to
6 understand the park district relationship and the
7 negotiations at this point.

8 MR. RATZER: I'm sorry. I was making sure
9 we got your berms.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: I understand that you're
11 pursuing a reduction to the park district donation.

12 MR. RATZER: Oh, yes.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. Can you tell us
14 exactly what that is and why.

15 MR. RATZER: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, hold on. Hold on.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah. I'd add that as a
18 condition.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. Because the
20 testimony didn't come up during the course of the
21 public hearing portion. So if it's additional
22 information that we're considering for the purpose
23 of making our recommendation, then it has to be
24 presented during the course of the public hearing

1 in order to allow the applicant and any member of
2 the public who wishes to offer their testimony and
3 opinions relating to it.

4 So, Russ, am I stating that correctly?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes. That's correct. There is
6 information that's provided in the staff report on
7 the status.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Okay.

9 MR. COLBY: And it is an item that's not
10 resolved, but that general description is there and
11 the current information that the City has.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And would you also
14 suggest, Laura, in your recommendation that it's
15 conditional on the resolution of all outstanding
16 staff comments?

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I couldn't hear what
19 you said.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That the
21 recommendation be conditional on resolution of all
22 outstanding staff items, which that includes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that includes all of
24 those things.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So really, I think that
3 if I was going to paraphrase, the existing motion
4 would be to recommend approval of the application
5 for special use for planned unit development and
6 application for PUD preliminary plan subject to the
7 consideration -- future consideration of the
8 applicant in connecting the internal roadways of the
9 property to a potential future north/south road and
10 resolution of outstanding staff comments.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct? Yes?

13 MEMBER FUNKE: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And you seconded it, so
15 do you agree to that?

16 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So that would be
18 the active motion.

19 Yes.

20 MR. RATZER: Can you be a little bit more
21 specific because what I heard everybody's main wish
22 for the future is a north/south connector
23 consideration on the west side of the property.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

1 MR. RATZER: I'm not considering it through
2 the middle of the property --

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just on the west side of
6 the property.

7 MR. RATZER: -- is that fair?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. All right. We
9 have our motion.

10 MR. RATZER: One more last thing?

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12 MR. RATZER: Can I answer to Peter after the
13 meeting, I guess?

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. After we make our
15 recommendation.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: That's fine.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's fine. All right.

18 Anything else? All right.

19 Tim.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

5 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, no.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes
12 by a vote of 7 to 1, and that concludes Item No. 5
13 on our agenda.

14 Item 6 is additional business for Plan
15 Commission members.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do have a
17 question. I do have an issue I want to bring up,
18 and I'm going to have to ask staff about this a
19 little bit.

20 We have in our community a sign ordinance
21 that -- do you know what I'm talking about?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That is completely
23 nonconforming.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It is completely

1 nonconforming, and I want to make sure that it goes
2 on record as being nonconforming.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: What sign?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's on the corner
5 of 14th and Main, west Main Street. I believe
6 that's a CM commercial district on the west side
7 of -- I can't read this map. It's too small. I
8 can't read this.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Which sign?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's on the old Fox
11 Valley Travel.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You mean the blue light
13 special?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. So they have
15 erected a monument sign which complies. They
16 haven't completed it. It requires that it has a
17 foundation under it and it doesn't. It just has two
18 poles. They haven't completed it because it's too
19 early in the plan. They intend to do that.

20 But what they've done is they've parked
21 there, ever since they bought the building, a truck.
22 They have one of their trucks parked there, and it's
23 parked right on Main Street. It's parked across the
24 parking lot, so it's not parked in the parking lot.

1 In the past week, they have installed
2 spotlights on the west side of the truck shining on
3 the truck, and the truck doesn't move. I'm
4 reasonably certain that that's nonconforming.

5 Would you say that would be correct, Russ?

6 MR. COLBY: We have a category under -- in
7 the sign ordinance in Chapter 17.28 of the zoning
8 ordinance a list of types of prohibited signs. One
9 of those category of signs is parked -- signs on
10 parked vehicles.

11 Here's what it states: "No sign shall be
12 displayed on a vehicle parked on an off-street
13 parking or loading yard or in an outdoor motor
14 vehicle display except in the following instances:

15 "One, the sign pertains to the sale, lease,
16 or rental of the vehicle on which it's displayed; or
17 two, the sign is painted or otherwise affixed to a
18 truck, bus, or other vehicle that is used to carry
19 goods or people or provide services at least one day
20 per week as an accessory use of the business
21 identified on the sign.

22 "Signs resting on or attached to vehicles or
23 trailers used as a means to circumvent provisions of
24 this chapter are prohibited."

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, we're touching on all
2 my issues tonight.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I know.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Such as my longstanding
5 disdain for the nonenforcement of our sign
6 ordinance.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I believe that
8 there was also a call made, but there has been no
9 action taken, well over a month ago.

10 Is there some recourse that we should follow
11 or is that --

12 MR. COLBY: Well, I'm not familiar with the
13 enforcement of the specific situation. It's
14 something that I can look into it.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, enforcement
16 would be fine.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. I mean, it deals
18 with other departments within the City, but I mean,
19 we have the same situation on the southeast corner
20 of Randall Road and Route 64 with that sign, the
21 Title Max.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They have not had plants
24 growing under that sign ever.

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: It's all cement, isn't it?

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's two poles.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Originally it was
5 supposed to have plants growing under it, so it
6 would be a foundation sign or a monument sign.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Required to be a
8 monument sign.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's required to be a
10 monument. It never has been.

11 I mean I can if you want me to --

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Make a list.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have made a list.
14 Don't get me started.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This will be in the
16 public record. So we have talked about it. I would
17 urge staff to -- well, follow up as best as you can.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I would say the only
19 reason this falls within our purview is the fact
20 that I remember many hours that we have spent over
21 the years discussing the sign ordinances.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Many hours.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the fact that we
24 spend our time as volunteers putting together sign

1 ordinances that are not being enforced by the people
2 who are paid to do so --

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I agree.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- is offensive to me as
5 a citizen of St. Charles. So maybe that's something
6 that should be discussed at some point in the future.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Russ, will you take
8 this somewhere?

9 MR. COLBY: Yes. I will communicate this
10 information to the building and code enforcement
11 division and try and get some updates on information
12 on the status of these, and I will report to you
13 what I find.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Great. Thank you,
15 Russ. I appreciate it.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thanks, Tim.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You're welcome.

18 How are you feeling? Is your blood pressure
19 going up?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, man.

21 All right. What else? There's got to be
22 something else.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's all the
24 additional business I have.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Weekly development
2 report, meeting announcements. Actually, we have
3 something about signage on our April 4th meeting,
4 don't we?

5 MR. COLBY: We do.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. It's relating to a
7 specific property, but that will be interesting to
8 see where that leads to.

9 So we do have an April 4th meeting. April
10 10th we have a joint meeting prior to the City
11 Council meeting. Prior to the -- specifically,
12 Council meeting or the Planning and Development
13 Committee?

14 MR. COLBY: It's the Planning and
15 Development Committee meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's on the 10th.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. All right. And
19 then April 18th, May 2nd.

20 Are all those meetings a go as of now?

21 MR. COLBY: At this point, we have nothing
22 scheduled for April 18th.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. But April 4th we
24 have the Meijer.

1 MR. COLBY: We do. Yes, and general
2 amendment.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
4 further?

5 All right. Is there a motion to adjourn?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I heard his first. All
9 right. All in favor.

10 (Ayes heard.)

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes
14 unanimously. The St. Charles Plan Commission is
15 adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

16 (Off the record at 8:55 p.m.)

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, Joanne E. Ely, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, 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 28th day of March, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois