

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2022**

Members Present: Chair Peter Vargulich  
Laura Macklin-Purdy  
Colleen Wiese  
Zachary Ewoldt  
Laurel Moad  
Karen Hibel

Members Absent: Suzanne Melton  
Jeffrey Funke  
Jennifer Becker

Also Present: Russell Colby, Director of Community Development  
Derek Conley, Director of Economic Development  
Ellen Johnson, Planner  
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner  
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer  
Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

Chairman Vargulich called the roll. A quorum was present.

**3. Pledge of Allegiance**

**4. Presentation of minutes of the March 8, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission**

**Motion was made by Ms. Moad, seconded by Ms. Wiese and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the March 8, 2022 Plan Commission meeting.**

**5. The Burn Effect, 201 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> St. (Ron Anderson)**

Application for Special Use

- a. Public Hearing

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

**Motion was made by Vice Chair Macklin-Purdy and seconded by Ms. Wiese to close the public hearing.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Macklin-Purdy, Wiese, Ewoldt, Moad, Hibel, Vargulich**

**Nays:**

**Absent: Funke, Melton, Becker**

**Motion carried 6-0**

b. Discussion and Recommendation

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

**Motion was made by Vice Chair Macklin-Purdy and seconded by Ms. Wiese to recommend approval of a Special Use for The Burn Effect, 201 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> St., subject to resolution of staff comments.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Macklin-Purdy, Wiese, Ewoldt, Moad, Hibel, Vargulich**

**Nays:**

**Absent: Funke, Melton, Becker**

**Motion carried 6-0**

**6. River East Lofts (STC 216 LLC)**

Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development

Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

a. Public Hearing

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

**Motion was made by Vice Chair Macklin-Purdy and seconded by Ms. Moad to continue the public hearing to April 19, 2022 at 7:00pm.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Moad, Wiese, Ewoldt, Macklin-Purdy, Hibel, Vargulich**

**Nays:**

**Absent: Funke, Melton, Becker**

**Motion carried 6-0**

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

**8. Weekly Development Report**

**9. Meeting Announcements**

c. Plan Commission

Tuesday, April 5, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, April 19, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers  
Tuesday, May 3, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

- d. Planning & Development Committee  
Monday, April 11, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers  
Monday, May 9, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

**12. Public Comment - None**

**13. Adjournment at 9:45 p.m.**



**Planet Depos**<sup>®</sup>  
We Make It *Happen*<sup>™</sup>

---

# Transcript of Hearing

**Date:** March 22, 2022

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

**Email:** [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto: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

HEARING

St. Charles, Illinois

Tuesday, March 22, 2022

7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 441940

Pages: 1 - 145

Transcribed by: Debra McCostlin

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

Hearing held at:

2 East Main Street

St. Charles, Illinois 60174

Pursuant to agreement, before Jacob Faden,  
Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION:

Peter Vargulich, Chair

Laura Macklin-Purdy, Vice Chair

Colleen Wiese

Zachary Ewoldt

Laurel Moad

Karen Hibel

ALSO PRESENT:

Russell Colby, Director of Community Development

Derek Conley, Director of Economic Development

Ellen Johnson, Planner

Rachel Hitzemann, Planner

Monica Hawk, Development Engineer

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

C O N T E N T S

PAGE

Pledge of Allegiance	5
Presentation of minutes 03/08/22	5
The Burn Effect, 201 S. 3rd St. (Ron Anderson)	6
River East Lofts (STC 216 LLC)	18

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 VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Suzanne Melton.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

MEMBER EWOLDT: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laurel Moad.

MEMBER MOAD: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel.

MEMBER HIBEL: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. If everyone would please stand and join me for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

Presentation of the meeting minutes from our March 8th meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So moved.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We have a first and a second. All in favor?

1 (Ayes heard.)

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The motion passes.

5 Item 5, The Burn Effect, 201 South 3rd  
6 Street. This is an application for a special use  
7 submitted by Ron Anderson. This will be divided  
8 into two parts. Part 5(a) is a public hearing.  
9 The role of the Plan Commission is to conduct  
10 public meetings on zoning applications that are  
11 filed with the city. All testimony and evidence  
12 both for and against this application shall be  
13 given under oath.

14 Regarding our procedure, first the  
15 applicant will make a presentation, then we will  
16 take questions from the Commission, followed by  
17 questions from the public. After that, we will  
18 take comments from the public for anyone wishing to  
19 present testimony.

20 When the Plan Commission feels it has  
21 gathered enough evidence to make a recommendation  
22 to the Planning and Development Committee of the  
23 City Council we will close the public hearing. The  
24 Plan Commission will then gather evidence related

1 to our findings of facts, which are in our reports,  
2 and make a recommendation. The applications will  
3 then go before the Planning and Development  
4 Committee of the City Council.

5 Before we begin, anyone who wishes to  
6 offer testimony, or ask questions, or provide  
7 comments will need to be sworn in. So if you could  
8 please stand if you are here for this item. This  
9 is for item 5, not for item 6. We can get you all  
10 at one time. It's okay. All right.

11 (Witnesses sworn.)

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Thank you.  
13 When you're speaking you have to please come up to  
14 the lectern, state your name, spell your last name,  
15 and state your address for our record. We have a  
16 court reporter who needs to keep tab of all these  
17 things for us.

18 Is the applicant ready? Please.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. My name is  
20 Ron Anderson. Anderson, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. My  
21 address is 711 South 4th Street, St. Charles,  
22 Illinois 60174.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If you could please  
24 provide us with a brief overview of your project.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. So what we're  
2 trying to do with The Burn Effect is very similar  
3 to what we're doing in Geneva, Illinois. So we're  
4 trying to bring a little bit more community health  
5 and fitness very simply.

6 So it's going to be in two parts as you  
7 can see on the screen in front of me. The left  
8 side of it is going to be more of a community  
9 center. So what we're going to do is provide a  
10 space that people can do work from home. They can  
11 use our Wi-Fi for free. It's going to be a little  
12 bit of a hangout place as well. We're going to  
13 have no more than 10 to 12 people in that location  
14 ever at one time in that space to the left. We  
15 just want to be able to provide something so that  
16 the community can commune, gather, and kind of  
17 enjoy each other's company outside of working at  
18 their own home. We have been getting a lot of  
19 requests for that.

20 To the right side of that is where you'll  
21 see a lot of the equipment will actually be what's  
22 considered The Burn Effect which is going to be  
23 (indiscernible) exercise type facility. Very  
24 similar to a company that I own in Geneva, Illinois

1 called Finetix, we're a private facility so we  
2 never have classes of more than about 10 or 12  
3 people at one time. We have limited staff at all  
4 times. There will never be more than one or two  
5 staff at any time in this location, and it's very  
6 simple. And we're open from 5:00 a.m. 'til  
7 11 -- 5:00 a.m. 'til 11:00 a.m. and then 4:00 p.m.  
8 'til 8:00 p.m.

9 So the project really is just to  
10 accommodate a need that we have in the area. I  
11 live in St. Charles. We've had a facility like  
12 this for about six years in Geneva now and people  
13 were asking if we could do pretty much the same  
14 thing in St. Charles. So this is our concept for  
15 doing that.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any questions by  
17 commissioners?

18 MEMBER MOAD: I have one.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Sure.

20 MEMBER MOAD: In the summary that we  
21 received it indicated that Saturday hours would be  
22 10:00 a.m. to -- or 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Is  
23 that correct?

24 MR. ANDERSON: We're modifying.

1 (Indiscernible) just a little bit. We're modifying  
2 the hours right now so we're not going to be open  
3 that late. It will still be, you know, at the  
4 latest --

5 MEMBER MOAD: Thank you.

6 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: And is this  
7 pretty much going to be all on-street parking for  
8 your facility?

9 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. Because -- and  
10 we've tested it a few times to the traffic patterns  
11 and all that. The parking works perfectly for what  
12 we have right now right on the street.

13 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: So you're  
14 thinking 10 to 12 people workout and then  
15 additional people would be hanging out?

16 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

17 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Like at the  
18 same time. And what did you say the number would  
19 be in the hangout, how many people in there?

20 MR. ANDERSON: So about 10 to 12. So on  
21 both sides, about 10 to 12 on both sides. They  
22 would be seated more on the left side where they  
23 would be working out on the right side.

24 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. All

1 right. Thanks.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other questions?

3 MEMBER BECKER: In the staff comments it  
4 does say something about you will need to address  
5 the fire alarm system.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

7 MEMBER BECKER: So has that been  
8 addressed or --

9 MR. ANDERSON: That's something I know  
10 the owner of the building and I -- that we're  
11 addressing, yes.

12 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: I just have  
13 one, sorry, one question.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No, go ahead.

15 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY:  
16 (Indiscernible). I know the restroom was based on  
17 the number of employees there. I know they have  
18 just one restroom (indiscernible) no more than five  
19 employees. Does that change based on the use of  
20 the facility or no? It's really just based on the  
21 employee level?

22 MS. JOHNSON: So it is based on the use  
23 (indiscernible). It goes to the number of  
24 employees based on their classification. So it is

1 five employees for their specific use. If the use  
2 was to change to something else later down the road  
3 that would be considered more intensive and they  
4 would potentially need to put in another bathroom.  
5 But for their specific use it falls under that  
6 classification.

7 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Great. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And did that -- just  
10 as a follow up, and that takes into account the  
11 number of users that he's talking about, up to 24  
12 people possibly?

13 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. So it's specific to  
14 the amount of employees, not the number of patrons.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.  
16 Anything else?

17 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Maybe one  
18 question. Is it a retail shop too in the hangout?

19 MR. ANDERSON: So on the left side of it,  
20 yes, and I did -- we were planning -- we are  
21 calling it (indiscernible) but it's going to be  
22 completely all retail, yeah.

23 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. And  
24 that's managed by you --

1 MR. ANDERSON: Correct.

2 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: -- not another  
3 company.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Correct.

5 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

6 MR. ANDERSON: (Indiscernible).

7 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Anything else?  
10 Nothing else? All right. Are there any comments  
11 or questions from the public? This is a public  
12 hearing. No. All right. Seems pretty easy. So  
13 if the Plan Commission feels that we have enough  
14 information to recommend something to the Planning  
15 and Development Committee a motion to close the  
16 public hearing would be in order.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll make that  
18 motion to close the public hearing.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll second.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Second. All right.  
21 And is there any discussion before we have roll  
22 call? No. Okay. All right. So a motion to close  
23 the public hearing.

24 MR. STAROWSKI: I was going to speak.

1 Are you -- don't need me to?

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry?

3 MR. STAROWSKI: I was going to speak  
4 (indiscernible) but you don't need me to or --

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, I'll tell you  
6 what, if it's okay, if you would like to come up  
7 and speak but we are -- we had offered that before  
8 so I wasn't sure if you were just going to pass.

9 MR. STAROSKE: Yeah, I was standing -- I  
10 was standing -- okay. I didn't understand that.  
11 So --

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Please come up.  
13 Please come up.

14 MR. STAROSKE: Sorry about that.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That's all right.  
16 No problem.

17 Mr. STAROSKE: My name is Tom Starowski,  
18 S-T-A-R-O-S-K-E. I live in the Timbers Subdivision  
19 of St. Charles on Bradley Circle, 506. And I've  
20 owned the neighboring property for like 25 years  
21 and actually I'm the owner of this building. So I  
22 purchased this from the former lady that passed  
23 away (indiscernible) years ago and I've had a few  
24 tenants go in and out of there and I know it was

1 commonly known as the pink building for a while and  
2 somebody had an authorization to paint it pink.

3 But I just want to say I think this is a  
4 great use for the building because West Valley  
5 Graphics moved out, kind of a surprise, and then I  
6 did have a smoke shop that really wanted to move in  
7 there and I just didn't think Saint Charles wanted  
8 to have smoke shop sitting over there. So when Rob  
9 approached me with this idea I said this is great  
10 and he proceeded to move in.

11 I said I didn't know if there were any  
12 hurdles or anything, but then through Rob and  
13 Rachel and whatever they said, no, you have to have  
14 a special use, which we weren't aware of. I'm not  
15 sure why it is a special use for this type of use  
16 but I think it's going to be a great fit for it.  
17 And like he says, most of the people will be  
18 parking on the street but there is eight spaces to  
19 this building too which gets shared with the tenant  
20 behind it. So those are off-street parking spaces.  
21 I just wanted to make you aware that there is off-  
22 street parking too. Thank you very much.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sorry for the lack  
24 of protocol on that. That's all right. No one

1 else, is that correct, before we move on? All  
2 right. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

3 All right. So we have a motion to close  
4 the public hearing. I think we'll call role. We  
5 have a motion and a second.

6 All right. Laura Purdy?

7 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese?

9 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt?

11 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laurel Moad?

13 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

15 MEMBER HIBEL: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes. All  
17 right. So Item 6 -- 5(b), excuse me, 5(b). This  
18 is an opportunity for the Plan Commission to  
19 discuss any of the information gathered any further  
20 related to our findings of fact and to discuss our  
21 thoughts on these recommendations, clarifying any  
22 questions that may be asked of staff and/or the  
23 applicant. Is there anything additional that we  
24 need to check in with staff on other than the

1 report which was very thorough as usual? Thank  
2 you. All right. Is there a motion related to this  
3 application?

4 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: I'll make the  
5 recommendation for approval for special use for The  
6 Burn Effect, 201 South 3rd Street, Ron Anderson,  
7 pending any outstanding comments from staff.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Second?

9 (No audible response.)

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.  
11 We have a motion made and seconded and the motion  
12 is to approve The Burn Effect at 201 South 3rd  
13 Street, application for special use submitted by  
14 Ron Anderson, and prior to it being passed along to  
15 Planning and Development Committee resolution of  
16 all staff comments.

17 Roll call. Laura Purdy?

18 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese?

20 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt?

22 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laurel Moad?

24 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

Transcript of Hearing  
Conducted on March 22, 2022

18

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

2 MEMBER HIBEL: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes. Thank  
4 you very much.

5 Next item on the agenda is River East  
6 Lofts, application for special use for PUD and  
7 preliminary plan PUD submitted by STC 216, LLC.  
8 This is a public hearing item also and so the same  
9 procedure outlined as previously. Before we begin  
10 we would ask that all people here that would like  
11 to provide testimony for and against or provide  
12 comments, would you please stand and be sworn in?

13 (Witnesses sworn.)

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you very much.  
15 Again, when you are speaking please come up to the  
16 lectern, provide your name, spell your last name,  
17 and state your address for our record. If the  
18 applicant is ready, if you could please proceed.

19 MR. HURST: My name is Curtis Hurst. I  
20 live at 700 North 3rd Avenue in Saint Charles,  
21 Illinois. Good evening. First, we would like to  
22 thank everyone on the commissions, both the  
23 Historic Commission, Plan Commission as well, and  
24 the community for the input on this project. We

1 believe that the concept for due process over the  
2 course of the last months was an efficient tool for  
3 receiving feedback to be incorporated into our plan  
4 and we appreciate that opportunity.

5 I'd like to take a minute to summarize  
6 the purpose of the PUD. We're requesting three  
7 variances (indiscernible) of city-owned right-of-  
8 way. We'll go into depth on these variances  
9 throughout the presentation but I think it's  
10 important to begin by noting that the PUD doesn't  
11 meaningfully impact the ultimate use of the land as  
12 conceived by the concept plan. (Indiscernible)  
13 what we consider to be the final outcome.

14 What I mean by this is the current zoning  
15 ordinance allows for the redevelopment of the site  
16 into two 40,000 square foot 50 tall buildings  
17 separated by a party wall. You can have mixed use  
18 retail on the first floor and an office and  
19 multi -- and housing on subsequent floors, and the  
20 comprehensive plan specifically describes and  
21 encourages that use.

22 We acquired the property with the  
23 intention of executing that vision as established  
24 in the comprehensive plan and the requested

1 variance allows us to exercise this with greater  
2 flexibility necessary to incorporate the feedback  
3 from the concept review process and delivery of  
4 what we consider to be the best version of that  
5 use. The next few slides represent the  
6 architecture which has been significantly revised  
7 based on feedback during this concept review.

8 (Video played.)

9 MR. HURST: This is a rendering from a  
10 perspective looking south to the north. So  
11 approaching from the south it shows proposed  
12 developments that would appear driving north into  
13 the city from Riverside Avenue. From this  
14 perspective you can see how the fifth floor  
15 stairsteps down tapering the architecture into the  
16 open space.

17 The development is end capped with the  
18 opportunity for significant landscaping, sculptural  
19 art, signage element, all resulting in an actual  
20 gateway into the downtown area. The tapering of  
21 this elevation guides you into the heart of the  
22 city from the south and blends downtown into the  
23 adjacent residential zoning from the north.

24 This is the perspective looking west. It

1 highlights what we believe to be a significant  
2 activation of the recreational opportunities down  
3 the river due to retail use on the first floor as  
4 well as the enhanced pedestrian connectivity  
5 provided through the open space and crosswalk.  
6 That's all to the south in the open space in the  
7 (indiscernible). It also provides a better view of  
8 the stair stepped south elevation.

9 In addition to the tapering, the  
10 building -- in addition to tapering the building  
11 down and open space on this block, landscaping is  
12 provided at the street level to screen the portion  
13 of the building that directly interacts with the  
14 adjacent residential zoning. The façade is stepped  
15 in and out to solve the massing and the bay windows  
16 complement the historical architecture in town  
17 while adding interest to the building as well.

18 This is looking northeast from the other  
19 side of Riverside Avenue. As you can see, the  
20 fifth floor is stepped back from the street level  
21 façade per design review standards and guidelines,  
22 and the perspective shows how the design diminishes  
23 the visual impact of that additional height. The  
24 perspective further highlights the pedestrian

1 connectivity this development is providing to the  
2 existing trails throughout the city.

3 This is the perspective looking south.  
4 Bay windows and a staggered façade add to the  
5 architectural interest of the elevation. From this  
6 street level perspective you can begin to see how  
7 setting the fifth floor back from the street level  
8 façade diminishes the impact of that additional  
9 height.

10 Based on staff comments we also extended  
11 the architectural elements on the north elevation  
12 to the top of the fourth floor, added limestone  
13 sills and canvas awnings to dress the windows.  
14 It's not on this architecture but it is in the  
15 revised architecture that you'll see later in the  
16 slides.

17 This is what we call the plan view of the  
18 development looking straight down essentially and  
19 it offers additional representation of the vacated  
20 right-of-way that we're requesting. By modifying  
21 the existing intersection, the access from Indiana  
22 onto Riverside has shifted slightly to the south.  
23 In return, the parking opportunities for the  
24 developer are improved, the existing green space is

1 beautified with landscaping, and the pedestrian  
2 walking paths connecting to existing trails are  
3 more fully integrated into downtown. We also have  
4 included some other gateway elements contemplated  
5 by the comprehensive plan.

6 In the landscaping, additional bike  
7 racks, (indiscernible) seating, integration of the  
8 space for gathering, and dog walking, and improved  
9 walkability are benefits that outweigh the impact  
10 of the minor shift in the traffic pattern and  
11 they're also key components of this catalyst site.

12 This is the comprehensive plan that has  
13 been developed by the city. It's been developed  
14 over the years. I believe one of the first  
15 iteration was as far back as 2010. It's been  
16 developed and updated throughout. The most recent  
17 update I believe was in 2020, right?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

19 MR. HURST: The addition of the fifth  
20 floor creates an opportunity to taper the  
21 building's southern elevation. The tiered  
22 elevation is more impactful than the variance  
23 requested and especially with the fifth floor  
24 setback from the street level façade.

1           The additional height allows for a more  
2 condensed building design that promotes walkability  
3 and open space. Our proposed gross floor area,  
4 about 57,767 square feet, is less than the current  
5 zoning ordinances allow which is 80,000 square feet  
6 on this site with two buildings connected by a  
7 party wall, which is essentially what is shown  
8 there in that picture.

9           Consolidating the development into one  
10 building with the requested variance promotes a  
11 creative approach to site improvements and building  
12 design that results in a distinctive, attractive  
13 development that has a strong sense of place and  
14 becomes an integral part of the community.

15           The PUD allows us to take a creative  
16 approach to the site. Rather than a row of  
17 buildings spanning two blocks to the convergence of  
18 Riverside Avenue as shown in the picture, with all  
19 the open space oriented to a vacated Riverside  
20 Avenue, rather we condensed the footprint and  
21 structure and it allows the enhancement of the open  
22 space experience without vacating Riverside Avenue  
23 as shown in the picture.

24           Now this -- there's really not a picture

1 up there but we'll leave that up there just so  
2 we're kind of not all over the place. One of the  
3 variances we're requesting is the density variance.  
4 As written, the current zoning ordinance supports  
5 retail on the first floor with some combination of  
6 office and up to 22 residential dwelling units on  
7 the parcels that we own.

8 The PUD application allows up to 38  
9 dwelling units with the total land area proposed  
10 which includes the vacation of the right-of-way to  
11 the south. The vacation and additional land area  
12 applied towards the density of the development was  
13 anticipated in this comprehensive plan, again as  
14 shown in the picture there. They show the larger  
15 building and then the green space that he's  
16 highlighting there is occupied by a building in the  
17 concept plan.

18 The density ordinance considers dwelling  
19 units which is not the best measurement of a  
20 development's impact on city resources especially  
21 as it pertains to multi-family housing. When  
22 considering the impact of a residential development  
23 you need to consider the number of residents added.  
24 So applying the population factors in the park and

1 land cash worksheets that the city uses, if you  
2 take our proposed 27 one-bedroom and 16 two-bedroom  
3 units and apply their metric to that you end up  
4 with 65 residents. The land area that we own would  
5 support the square footage required to have 22  
6 large three-bedroom units in addition to some  
7 office space and retail on the first floor. The  
8 population factor of the development of 22 three-  
9 bedroom units would be 67 residents.

10 So that's why I would say it's important  
11 to consider that because it's really -- the current  
12 zoned ordinance without any variance of density  
13 would allow 65 -- 67 residents and we're proposing  
14 what the land cash donation would be is 65  
15 residents. If you add offices included in that  
16 use, which would be likely because the way the  
17 residents would end up as permitted in the current  
18 zoning ordinance, that would even create more  
19 pressure on the impacted area from a personal  
20 standpoint.

21 In the context of this PUD our land area  
22 would support 37.7 dwelling units. That includes  
23 vacating the parcel on the side. The comprehensive  
24 plan anticipated a similar density by vacating and

1 redeveloping the existing green space and Indiana.  
2 The conforming use of similar development with 22  
3 residents and the balance of space as office use  
4 would create a heavier burden on parking and  
5 traffic. By taking a creative and comprehensive  
6 look at the density ordinance, our proposed PUD  
7 will better add to the diversity of available  
8 (indiscernible) options within the city while  
9 having less impact on the city resources than a  
10 conforming use including parking, infrastructure,  
11 and school zone traffic.

12 One of the other things that we're  
13 requesting is vacating Indiana and the dedication  
14 of the right-of-way to the south. The vacation of  
15 Indiana allows us to create a more cohesive open  
16 space experience than currently exists by enhancing  
17 the pedestrian connectivity in the neighborhood to  
18 the pedestrian facilities, river, and downtown,  
19 adding bike racks, (indiscernible) seating, and  
20 beautifying the green space through landscaping and  
21 a gateway element. Our vision is to work with the  
22 city and the art council to find an iconic  
23 structural art piece and signage to become a symbol  
24 of the southern gateway to downtown. Connecting

1 existing trails to parks, residents, and businesses  
2 is a critical component of improving walkability of  
3 downtown. These are essential goals of the  
4 comprehensive plan for this site.

5 The additional land area reduces the  
6 density variance. This was anticipated by the  
7 comprehensive plan to be accomplished by  
8 constructing a separate building, but our PUD  
9 allows the creative flexibility to execute the  
10 mixed-use envisioned while improving open space and  
11 walkability as compared to the comprehensive plan.

12 And the concept review, we received  
13 negative feedback regarding the closure of Indiana,  
14 but a third-party traffic study concluded that the  
15 volumes would be readily accommodated withing the  
16 adjacent roadway network and identifying this  
17 street as an AB class closure by IDOT standards.  
18 What that means, it will have little to no impact  
19 when you close that street and it can be absorbed  
20 by the surrounding streets.

21 We have revised our plan to reduce the  
22 impact of this vacation. The net effect of this  
23 access to Riverside is merely shifted to the south  
24 with little or no traffic delays as defined by IDOT

1 and a safer interaction onto and off of Riverside  
2 Avenue. That provides for stacking. It's a very  
3 similar entrance onto and off of Riverside than as  
4 it would currently exist.

5 By vacating this right-of-way the city  
6 gains a beautified open space, as shown in the  
7 picture, pedestrian connectivity, and a gateway  
8 element while passing the burden of the  
9 construction and maintenance of that cost to the  
10 landowner. Significant drainage and utility  
11 easements will burden the open space beyond the  
12 opportunity for future development.

13 And in addition, using the PUD as a  
14 vehicle guarantees that that space will be used as  
15 described and there's no future development  
16 possible without another public hearing process and  
17 approvals from the city. And we left the gateway  
18 element in the right-of-way so that the city  
19 can -- it's not part of the vacation so that the  
20 city can control that experience. That will show  
21 up on the plat in the package.

22 There are numerous studies -- and this is  
23 coming -- we're addressing this because it's coming  
24 in some of the comments that we've received from

1 (indiscernible). There are numerous studies  
2 including that there's no evidence that multi-  
3 family developments negatively affect the sales  
4 prices of single family homes within an impact  
5 area. In fact, these types of developments  
6 typically have a positive impact on single family  
7 neighborhoods as found in a study commissioned by  
8 the Partnership for Housing Affordability as  
9 conducted by George Mason University Center for  
10 Regional Analysis.

11 A separate study conducted by researchers  
12 at the University of Washington College of Built  
13 Environments shows that contrary to popular belief  
14 there's a positive association between higher  
15 density and the value of single family residential  
16 properties. The researchers found that not only  
17 did the value of single family residential  
18 properties increase with density of surrounding  
19 development, but the quality of neighborhoods as  
20 defined by access to other land uses such as parks  
21 increased with density as well.

22 This land will ultimately be redeveloped  
23 into some version of the use anticipated by the  
24 comprehensive plan. This PUD allows for creative

1 flexibility for the development to maximize the  
2 open green spaces, connectivity to downtown, and  
3 walkability to the to the area. And again, these  
4 are key contributors to the values noted in the  
5 cites.

6 As far as maintenance, the building will  
7 be professionally maintained like many other  
8 buildings in downtown. We will maintain the open  
9 spaces and -- the open and green spaces which  
10 shifts the financial burden to the residents of the  
11 development.

12 The trash will be housed inside an  
13 enclosed parking structure, not visible from 2nd  
14 Avenue. We think that's an improvement from the  
15 existing condition. Trash service would occur at  
16 regular intervals as it does in the neighborhood in  
17 any other commercial development.

18 A development strictly conforming to the  
19 current zoning ordinance would have similar  
20 requirements and none of the variance in this PUD  
21 would have any impact on maintenance or operation  
22 required to operate the development. Every  
23 consideration will be given to the new and existing  
24 residents with regard to this project.

1           For infrastructure, one of the major  
2 concerns that was raised during the concept review  
3 as well was the proposed development impact on  
4 existing utility infrastructure. Working with the  
5 city staff, a third-party study by Trotter &  
6 Associates was commissioned. (Indiscernible)  
7 impact to the existing infrastructure and  
8 accounting for plans by the city to upgrade the  
9 system already underway the study recommended two  
10 things. One was the specific location and size for  
11 the sanitary connection and that's our engineering.  
12 And the other was an extensive upgrade to the water  
13 main in the area that includes upsizing existing  
14 piping and looping the main to provide the required  
15 flow rates.

16           Both of those recommendations and  
17 upgrades have been included in our (indiscernible)  
18 with no request of financial participation from the  
19 city. This is a good opportunity to point out that  
20 developments like these are vehicles that provide  
21 resources needed for a city to continue to pursue  
22 upgrades and improvements for critical  
23 infrastructure.

24           Parking. We acknowledge that at times

1 parking is hard in downtown and I understand the  
2 neighborhood's concerns. It's aligned interest to  
3 be able to provide on-site parking that  
4 accommodates the new residents within the  
5 development. That's why as part of the vacation we  
6 added additional parking and annexed the existing  
7 parking. And it's important to note that a version  
8 of this development is possible within the current  
9 zoning ordinances with no parking variances since  
10 it is in the (indiscernible).

11 Since parking will be impacted regardless  
12 of the result of this PUD, we think it is important  
13 to address this concern in conjunction with the  
14 proposal. We're open to options that will reduce  
15 the impact of the development on the neighborhood  
16 such as closing off northbound access from  
17 Riverside to 2nd Avenue as recommended by the staff  
18 after seeing this rendering so that it slows the  
19 traffic and it discourages -- really the reason  
20 that people are going up 2nd Avenue is to avoid the  
21 light at Riverside. So it's creating traffic going  
22 up 2nd Avenue that's not necessarily going to those  
23 residences. But if we close that off and force  
24 them to turn right at the next intersection which

1 is there then that slows everything down a bit and  
2 discourages that traffic.

3 The other thing that can be done, because  
4 Southside and Riverside and Illinois, which is on  
5 this picture, I'm sorry, 2nd Avenue and Illinois,  
6 has no left turns and that was to discourage that  
7 through traffic trying to avoid Riverside Avenue.  
8 And so the traffic study says that there is, and  
9 they pointed this out, that there's no reason you  
10 cannot remove that and the visibility is adequate  
11 to be able to take away that no left turn. So that  
12 would improve the flow for the residents, again  
13 because the goal is to slow down the traffic that's  
14 cutting through there.

15 Another thing that could be done is to  
16 change the intersection light to a different  
17 interval so that it may be a little bit faster so  
18 that you discourage that through traffic.

19 A couple of letters received point to the  
20 1st Street development as an example where parking  
21 was addressed in conjunction with the new  
22 development. What they don't talk about in that  
23 letter is in addition to the land that was conveyed  
24 there was a significant TIF proffer of \$30 million

1 plus or minus -- I don't have the specific amount  
2 but we can say that amount -- in financial  
3 assistance was provided by the city to the  
4 developer to improve the infrastructure including  
5 parking as part of that development.

6 Our ATM parcel and the building further  
7 north -- and the buildings further north along  
8 Riverside, which is the Arcada, the Riverside  
9 building, which is Pollyanna Flagship, BMO, those  
10 are all in that 1st Street TIF district created to  
11 provide that assistance which would make them  
12 eligible to receive funding but no investment was  
13 made on the east side of the river for that and  
14 there's no more funding available in that TIF in  
15 order to do that at this point. So a parking study  
16 is somewhat moot without the revenue to respond to  
17 it and one of the better opportunities to improve  
18 upon the existing infrastructure is to foster  
19 development that would provide the necessary  
20 financial resources.

21 We have been and remain committed to  
22 working with the city to find a long-term solution  
23 for existing parking conditions. In fact, we're  
24 currently working with the city to create the

1 opportunity for a parking structure shown on the  
2 comprehensive plan that's directly by the Pollyanna  
3 building -- if you want to put that up, it's shown  
4 there -- by transferring ownership of a parcel that  
5 we own directly behind Pollyanna so that the city  
6 has the continuity of land in order to make that  
7 parking deck a reality. So that is what we are  
8 doing with the city at this point. We're close to  
9 having that plat finalized so that they can own the  
10 land that is behind Pollyanna.

11 The third-party traffic study concluded  
12 that the amount of site-generated traffic from the  
13 proposed development without discounting some  
14 residents that use alternative modes to travel to  
15 and from work or the former site use is expected to  
16 have minimal effects on the operations of the  
17 external street network.

18 This site is within the 1st Street TIF  
19 district. I'm not sure (indiscernible). It's  
20 current tax space, annual taxes, is \$13,000 a year.  
21 The new development will generate new taxes we're  
22 estimating to be \$245,000 a year. That results in  
23 an (indiscernible), as they call it, exceeding  
24 \$200,000 a year, which by definition of the TIF Act

1 goes directly to the city since this is in the TIF  
2 district. Developments like this are a critical  
3 component to creating the resources necessary to  
4 address the existing infrastructure issues. That's  
5 the purpose of the TIF and we think that that's a  
6 significant opportunity for the city.

7 I guess at this point we're opening  
8 questions. I know that's kind of dry. I apologize  
9 for that. I just wanted to make sure that I got  
10 all the points out that we have been thinking about  
11 and address the residents' concerns. It's always  
12 difficult to do that in ad lib form but we wanted  
13 to make sure we got it out there and open it up for  
14 a conversation and questions.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Thank you  
16 guys very much. Thank you. Any initial thoughts  
17 and questions please?

18 MEMBER MOAD: I have a question. In the  
19 deed the land behind Pollyanna --

20 MR. HURST: Yes.

21 MEMBER MOAD: -- to the city, is it  
22 essentially, if you would, a land -- would it  
23 become a land swap for the conveyance of Indiana  
24 Avenue and the right-of-way triangle versus that

1 piece of land behind Pollyanna?

2 MR. HURST: They're totally separated.  
3 Those two are not connected. So that's great. So  
4 no is the answer. We're doing the Pollyanna land  
5 swap. If you understand that parcel, it's kind of  
6 hard to describe with this picture, but there's  
7 basically three parcels: one directly behind the  
8 Flagship, one directly behind Pollyanna, and one on  
9 the west side or the south side of Pollyanna. So  
10 we own the parcel in the middle and so effectively  
11 it landlocks the connection of the two city lines.

12 MEMBER MOAD: Okay.

13 MR. HURST: So we're swapping out front  
14 line --

15 MEMBER MOAD: The Pollyanna lot.

16 MR. HURST: -- the Pollyanna lot for the  
17 rear lot --

18 MEMBER MOAD: Got it.

19 MR. HURST: -- so that we can improve the  
20 patio experience for Pollyanna and at the same time  
21 create the continuity to develop that parking deck,  
22 which we've (indiscernible) in -- so most  
23 particularly, we started that process -- you know,  
24 it takes time sometimes -- we started that process

1 over a year ago and that was independent of what we  
2 were doing here --

3 MEMBER MOAD: Okay.

4 MR. HURST: -- because we think -- we've  
5 always thought that parking is critically low  
6 particularly on the east side and we've been trying  
7 to address that for quite some time.

8 MEMBER MOAD: Thank you.

9 MEMBER EWOLDT: So I have a question  
10 regarding -- I know that BMO HM is rather new and I  
11 see that still in the plans.

12 MR. HURST: Yeah.

13 MEMBER EWOLDT: Based on staff comments,  
14 is there enough space to account for that parking  
15 lot and a drive-thru lane to actually utilize that  
16 ATM?

17 MR. HURST: Yes. The engineers have done  
18 all the turning radius studies and it's intended to  
19 be one-way traffic. It might look like two-way  
20 traffic through there but we're going to control  
21 the direction with a sign at the front entrance  
22 there. So there will be one way in and one way  
23 out.

24 MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay.

1 MR. HURST: I think what confused that  
2 was the change from angle to head-in parking and so  
3 typically you have two-way parking but we're going  
4 to control one-way -- or one-way drive.

5 MR. EWOLDT: Okay. Thank you for that.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I just want to  
7 acknowledge for all of our residents who are here  
8 that the city received 12 or so, 14 letters  
9 regarding this project, and I just wanted to let  
10 everyone know that we up here have received them as  
11 well as staff and have all read them as it relates  
12 to this project tonight.

13 And if I could just take a moment, I'll  
14 just note that we received one from Robert Carter  
15 on March 8th, Janet Wilson on March 9th, Catherine  
16 Collins on March 10th, Suzi Myers on the 14th, Bob  
17 and Catherine Kershner on the 15th, Greg Taylor on  
18 the 17th, Martha Gass -- there was a letter from  
19 3/16, Martha Gass, letter to Historic Preservation,  
20 and Martha Gass, a study on shadows, on the 12th.  
21 We also received a letter from Sue Peterson on  
22 January 8th, Jo Krieger on March 20th, Bob  
23 Rasmussen on the 21st, Marilyn Shulski on the 21st,  
24 and Dan and Maria O'Neil on the 22nd.

1           So again, we have received all of these  
2           and read them but you are certainly all welcome to  
3           provide your comments and thoughts tonight also.

4           VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Oh, I just  
5           have a quick comment. One of the staff comments  
6           was eliminating the no turning left at the  
7           intersection of Illinois and 2nd.

8           MR. HURST: Yes.

9           VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: And one of  
10          their comments was that given the building -- and I  
11          think you may have touched on this -- that there  
12          might be some sight visibility issues. Honestly, I  
13          mean I want you to comment on that, but as somebody  
14          who worked right there for years, I illegally  
15          turned left all the time and there was no problem.  
16          Sorry. But could you comment on the sight  
17          visibility there and your thoughts on that?

18          MR. HURST: The traffic study -- we have  
19          an updated traffic study as well. Did that make it  
20          (indiscernible)? Yeah, it's on the -- it's not on  
21          this slide but there's a traffic study and a  
22          visibility, excuse me, the sight triangles proved  
23          that there was adequate visibility and that they  
24          wanted to activate the left turn there.

1 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: I mean it  
2 looks like it from the (indiscernible).

3 MR. HURST: It is. So there would  
4 be -- that could be activated by that standard if  
5 the city thought they wanted to do that. And we  
6 would be open to that as well as the closure of  
7 this little knuckle over here.

8 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. And  
9 then can you explain one more time about the  
10 existing (indiscernible) lane coming off of  
11 northbound Riverside Avenue and how that would  
12 be -- is that what we're seeing right here?

13 MR. HURST: Correct.

14 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Versus --

15 MR. HURST: Currently Indiana goes  
16 straight through and there's no pork chop here so  
17 traffic can flow in and out.

18 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Got you. Got  
19 you.

20 MR. HURST: And that intersection, it was  
21 difficult and unsafe to enter Riverside going north  
22 --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Previously.

24 MR. HURST: -- from 2nd Avenue and so by

1 adding a pork chop we've kind of slowed traffic  
2 down at 2nd Avenue and then oriented the traffic 90  
3 degrees to Riverside. So they have the same access  
4 condition that they had coming off of Indiana.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Currently, you  
6 enter Riverside. Currently, there at  
7 Riverside -- see where the pork chop is at south,  
8 that you have to navigate if you want to turn right  
9 to go northbound on Riverside from 2nd Avenue.  
10 That's the discussion point where it's unsafe  
11 because you have to crane your neck around to try  
12 and see what's coming from the north.

13 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Well, that's  
14 no different than what's a couple of blocks --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: South.

16 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: -- south.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.

18 (Cross-talking.)

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That condition  
20 exists there as well.

21 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Yeah.

22 Correct.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what we're  
24 trying to do is replace Indiana with the new

1 configuration --

2 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: To make it  
3 more --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- albeit slightly  
5 to the south by 100 feet plus or minus so that you  
6 can have a safe condition to go onto Riverside  
7 Avenue --

8 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- or come off of  
10 Riverside Avenue as well.

11 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Thank you.

12 MEMBER WIESE: I have a quick question on  
13 the retail component. I know you mentioned  
14 (indiscernible) a bike shop, the potential for  
15 access to possibly canoeing, (indiscernible). Is  
16 that still in the plans and do you envision one  
17 seat of a retail in that or is that -- will there  
18 be multiple retailers in there?

19 MR. HURST: That's currently under  
20 contract, as Rob would say it, to Sammy's Bikes.

21 MEMBER WIESE: It is. Okay. I couldn't  
22 remember if I saw it in here or if that was  
23 something else. So that is still --

24 MR. HURST: And the intended use would be

1 one (indiscernible).

2 MEMBER WIESE: One. Okay.

3 MR. HURST: And one use.

4 MEMBER WIESE: And are you thinking that  
5 then with the proximity and what I saw with some of  
6 the walkways that are providing access to the river  
7 that there would be a point to be able to utilize  
8 the river (indiscernible) at that point as well?

9 MR. HURST: Yes. And our goal is to work  
10 with Active River Corridor Committee and get that  
11 river activated as well so that you can use the  
12 crosswalk. It gives the bicycle and walkability  
13 much more robust and access to the river as well.

14 MEMBER WIESE: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. HURST: It's an important component  
16 of the connectivity of downtown. It's all a part  
17 of the comprehensive plan and how they kind of  
18 expect to use that so we think it's a great use.

19 MEMBER WIESE: Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: I mean  
21 currently there's isn't any real access on the east  
22 side of the river except for the (indiscernible).  
23 So --

24 MR. HURST: They're currently working on

1 a plan. When the city upgrades the lift station to  
2 the south they're going to create some kind of  
3 access point where the lift -- Riverside Park can  
4 have river access where the lift station used to be  
5 and then we want to work with them to just kind of  
6 continue that riverfront improvement north along  
7 the entire walk to the bridge there.

8 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: That's  
9 wonderful. Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Can I just ask,  
11 related to your traffic study --

12 MR. HURST: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- I don't know if  
14 they have dealt with pedestrian flow at all in that  
15 or is it just based on vehicular movements?

16 MR. HURST: No, it's vehicular movements.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

18 MR. HURST: We don't have any additional  
19 walkability studies or anything like that

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right. I  
21 guess I wonder -- I understand you're looking at  
22 this additional crosswalk, if you will, that will  
23 end up being south of Illinois and kind of aligned  
24 with Indiana Avenue, but if there's no pedestrian

1     signalization added that would help cross people  
2     how is that going to really be overly safe from the  
3     standpoint -- I mean understanding these things  
4     happen but I mean the city has looked at the  
5     current riverwalk on the west side where it crosses  
6     Illinois and looked at studies and there's geometry  
7     issues and sight line issues there that aren't  
8     obviously duplicated here.

9             But still the idea is if you don't  
10    provide some level of pedestrian activation to help  
11    identify the cars that they should slow down or  
12    whatever that is then how is that really very safe  
13    to encourage people to cross there? I mean  
14    especially when you have a traffic light directly  
15    to the north or, albeit somewhat inconvenient, you  
16    go to the south down to Prairie. Why would  
17    encouraging that be helpful?

18            MR. HURST: First, we're going to work  
19    with staff to get the correct sign that you're  
20    going to be required by any development to have on  
21    a crosswalk. I don't think that this condition is  
22    then dissimilar to this condition right here. That  
23    is not a signalized pedestrian crosswalk. It's  
24    been there for a long time. It's well utilized to

1 get on and off the Piano Bridge and it's  
2 (indiscernible).

3 Our vision is that the more we activate  
4 the pedestrian activities then the more it becomes  
5 known as a pedestrian street. When you go to 3rd  
6 Street, you know, they don't have anything other  
7 than a sign indicating that it's a pedestrian  
8 crosswalk at every crosswalk. Some of them are  
9 signalized obviously, but people know that it's a  
10 highly trafficked pedestrian thoroughfare and they  
11 drop to 20 miles an hour and they're paying  
12 attention, and that would be the vision that would  
13 happen with Riverside as well.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. I  
15 understand.

16 MR. HURST: We're just -- I'm using  
17 comparable -- you know. The condition exists. You  
18 know, the comments come up. You know, it's not  
19 necessarily related to an intersection but it is  
20 still a condition that exists in different areas.  
21 One that I can point out is Northbound 25. It's  
22 kind of -- it has a flashing light for pedestrians  
23 to bring your attention to it because it's on 25,  
24 it's an area you wouldn't expect it. I use the

1 flashing light because that's the term in my house  
2 but I notice the flashing light. So there's lots  
3 of ways to activate pedestrian crossing.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Agreed.

5 MR. HURST: I mean there's conditions  
6 like that going south on Riverside as well where  
7 there's a mid-block crossing that's connecting to  
8 important sections of the trail.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. And when  
10 you go down 25 by the public works facility there  
11 it's hit or miss on who decides to recognize that  
12 pedestrians are there or bicyclists or whatever is  
13 there and --

14 MR. HURST: I'm particularly associated  
15 with that one because I bicycle that a lot and  
16 you've got to pay attention.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself also. I  
18 assume they're not stopping. But still, if we're  
19 going to invite people to cross I think making sure  
20 that we have as many opportunities to help drivers  
21 identify that is a positive and of paramount  
22 importance also.

23 MR. HURST: And we will work with staff  
24 on that because our original plan on that for those

1 reasons included, you know, for lack of a better  
2 description, a speed bump, albeit a larger one.  
3 They have issues with that from a standpoint of  
4 does that help slow traffic down. Whether it's  
5 snow plows or fire trucks or those types of things,  
6 it always creates some sort of a problem with  
7 those. But we definitely can work with staff to  
8 make sure that we activate that from a pedestrian  
9 standpoint because that's been brought up in the  
10 staff comments as well.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Question just  
12 related to retail that was asked, parking. It  
13 appeared based on the staff report that there's,  
14 you know, 30 spaces required related to that and  
15 there's the broader topic that you've touched on  
16 really that the parking and how it translates in  
17 the neighborhood and just the area in general.

18 But it's possible that you would, for one  
19 reason or another, have turned that retail space  
20 into something like a restaurant or a higher  
21 parking requirement and if you did and you had 7500  
22 square feet you go from 30 to 75 spaces. And how  
23 would you propose that that be addressed since  
24 there's no guarantee that any one tenant stays for

1 20 years or something like that?

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I think the  
3 only thing -- the only way we can address  
4 the -- because it's a city-wide parking concern and  
5 we really are -- and we have a vested interest in  
6 the community as well for many reasons, ourselves  
7 as we live, it's our backyard, I want to walk  
8 outside and find a parking spot. Those are all the  
9 same concerns that the residents had we had for  
10 both ourselves and our businesses and that's why  
11 we're working with the city as best we can, which  
12 is the lot behind Pollyanna.

13 We know that the city is actively  
14 engaging now a parking study for the overall city  
15 as well and those should relieve -- you know, the  
16 folks -- the big part acknowledged by everybody in  
17 the room that a big part of the problem is that the  
18 people that come to the buildings further north or  
19 elsewhere in the city are finding their way down  
20 because those parking lots are overwhelmed. So you  
21 have to relieve that pressure and the way to  
22 relieve that pressure is with new additions, pay  
23 for that with new development, so it's a stair step  
24 effect.

1                   So we're hoping that, you know, we can  
2 get that accomplished and that should relieve the  
3 pressure in, you know, anticipation of whatever the  
4 needs would be here now or in the future. We think  
5 that there's an opportunity to add at least 100  
6 spots to Pollyanna depending on how they configure  
7 it, more if you wanted to go up higher.

8                   CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure. Yeah. It's  
9 just math at that point.

10                  MR. HURST: Right.

11                  CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It is.

12                  VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: No.

13                  CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, money aside,  
14 it's still math because of the sloped panels and  
15 everything.

16                  VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: The only  
17 comment I wanted to make that actually as I I've  
18 been sitting here and you've been talking about the  
19 bike ability, the walk ability, having lived in  
20 Boulder for a few years, in that city it is known  
21 as a bike ability, walk ability, and it's  
22 learned -- as someone that moved from Chicago to  
23 that place you learn very quickly that, you know,  
24 pedestrians come first and you were watching for

1       them.

2                   And what I will say about this is that I  
3       think this whole concept in this area of being able  
4       to increase the bike ability and walk ability,  
5       creating these additional pedestrian walkways is  
6       going to increase a learned behavior for our city  
7       in which I know we all want more bike ability and  
8       walk ability. We have the river. I think we all  
9       agree that it's perhaps underutilized. We want to  
10      see more connected bike trails. We have beautiful  
11      parks and open land and I do like that this is  
12      going to create a learned behavior.

13                  As you said, it's also going to slow the  
14      traffic down in this area which I think is a  
15      benefit to the neighborhood and myself living in  
16      that neighborhood. That whole area is wonky in  
17      terms of the way you get from Riverside from any  
18      point coming from that area. So anything that we  
19      do to improve and (indiscernible) many times. I  
20      mean there are a couple different wonky places to  
21      turn onto that drive that are blind spots or  
22      dangerous.

23                  So I will say hearing residents' concerns  
24      about the driving, I do think that that's something

1 that we should consider and think about because I  
2 like increasing the walk ability and bike ability  
3 in this town and I want to increase better driving  
4 behavior and I think this is a step in the right  
5 direction for that and it really just kind of came  
6 to me as you presented this in thinking about these  
7 crosswalks.

8 And I'm assuming with the one that we  
9 have up there where you're showing the different  
10 color, while it isn't a natural crosswalk with the  
11 configuration like a normal crosswalk, that's the  
12 intended, and that perhaps what there is -- and I  
13 don't know if that's something we can do with  
14 staff, if there would be like a flashing light or  
15 something that is there, even if it's not  
16 permanent, that increases people's knowledge that  
17 this -- they're entering a pedestrian friendly zone  
18 from that point throughout the rest of the city.  
19 You know, up by Arcada over to the west side of the  
20 river. So that's something I just wanted to get on  
21 the record because I think it does from a whole  
22 city standpoint help everyone in the city.

23 MR. HURST: Yeah, and we appreciate the  
24 comment and to that point working with staff to

1 ensure that the right signs is to everybody's  
2 benefit but we also have a significant amount of  
3 work in the infrastructure (indiscernible) is  
4 basically what we're talking about. So there is  
5 going to be some work that's done so we're going to  
6 have an opportunity to make sure that we address  
7 (indiscernible) signage, all of that. So we're  
8 definitely going to want to increase that  
9 visibility.

10 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. Thank  
11 you.

12 MEMBER WIESE: I'd just like to add  
13 another comment. There were some concerns -- a  
14 couple -- I feel like I lose a year, like 2020  
15 being like -- I guess it was probably two, two-and-  
16 a-half years ago with ALE and parking and we did  
17 our own study and, with the help of another  
18 developer, took pictures of the parking garage on  
19 1st Street, and it was never utilized, especially  
20 on the top floor.

21 So it's also a knowledge transfer of  
22 getting people to realize that maybe parking isn't  
23 going to be right outside the door, and maybe you  
24 do have to walk, and there's nothing wrong with

1 utilizing the parking structure that is across the  
2 river and it's only, you know, a four minute walk.  
3 So it's just a change of attitude, it's a change of  
4 mindset, and I just wanted to get that on record  
5 because I think that's really important as we start  
6 to look at the growth of St. Charles and as a  
7 whole.

8 MR. HURST: It goes hand-in-hand with the  
9 walkability.

10 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

11 MR. HURST: The easier it is to access  
12 the parking that may not be at your doorstep the  
13 more likely you are to use it. I live downtown. I  
14 do not have a reserved parking stall in the parking  
15 lot that we own at the house and so I end up at  
16 times getting flung into the municipal center  
17 parking lot, sometimes the chamber center parking  
18 lot, sometimes Pollyanna parking lot, sometimes  
19 street parking, and it's just something that I've  
20 kind of grown accustomed to living downtown. It's  
21 part of, you know, the suburban experience.

22 MEMBER WIESE: Yeah.

23 MR. HURST: I'd also like to point out  
24 one of the things that at least we've done as a

1 business not related to this specifically but  
2 directly related to parking because this is about  
3 changed behaviors, right?

4 MEMBER WIESE: Right.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And so we added  
6 valet to -- and we're sharing that expense between  
7 businesses that we can influence on that. So  
8 they're reducing the cost and adding value to the  
9 customer by paying a monthly fee and so that allows  
10 that valet service to relieve the pressure on that  
11 local area because valet's charge for taking that  
12 car, like you say, somewhere that the customer may  
13 not know is logistically further away. So there's  
14 a lot of behavior changes that you can do to  
15 hopefully relieve that.

16 MR. HURST: In the meantime.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, in the  
18 meantime.

19 MEMBER WIESE: In the meantime.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

21 MEMBER EWOLDT: So I have a couple more  
22 questions. The first being, you know, you were  
23 talking about first floor retail, office,  
24 something. How would the design of the site

1 accommodate deliveries for that business? Like a  
2 delivery. So like if a restaurant takes out a  
3 commercial retail business, how will they get like  
4 their deliveries for inventory? Where do you  
5 envision that process happening with like a box  
6 truck?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. More than  
8 likely, you know, coming from both Riverside and  
9 2nd Avenue. But more than likely 2nd Avenue.

10 MR. HURST: That's the beauty of this use  
11 as well. It's not going to be high impact from a  
12 delivery perspective like a restaurant would be  
13 where they're taking deliveries, you know, four and  
14 five times in a day. He's going to have a delivery  
15 (indiscernible).

16 MEMBER EWOLDT: All right. And then, you  
17 know, as it is currently the open space is  
18 underutilized. I mean it sits there, I mean, in  
19 kind of a no man's land --

20 MR. HURST: Sure.

21 MEMBER EWOLDT: -- and this would be an  
22 improvement, kind of drawing it into kind of like a  
23 plaza style. How do you foresee residents and  
24 tenants of the building kind of utilizing that

1 space though? I mean I see it looks like there's  
2 some sort of patio. Is that (indiscernible) of  
3 this viewpoint?

4 MR. HURST: So we don't imagine any  
5 change from a public to a private use. I mean  
6 (indiscernible). You know, we own the parking lot  
7 that is currently the ATM lot. That's a private  
8 parking lot. We own the parking lot behind BMO.  
9 It's used by everybody that wants to use it. This  
10 will be very similar. We're not going to strict  
11 that use. If they abuse it we're going to have to  
12 rethink about that, but that would be the same  
13 condition as if it were a public use. There's  
14 never going to be a change to what it is. Maybe a  
15 little bit of landscaping change. But because of  
16 the easements and PUD process and all of that it's  
17 not going to get reconfigured. It's going to be,  
18 you know, done as a green space now and into the  
19 future.

20 MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay.

21 MR. HURST: And we will be responsible  
22 for the maintenance of it which is, you know, one  
23 of the advantages.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Walk your dog,

1 have a picnic, do whatever you'd like to do out  
2 there. Use this for access to the riverside. Use  
3 the bike racks. The only section that will become  
4 private is inside of this fence line here.

5 MR. HURST: That's correct.

6 MEMBER EWOLDT: And is that for the first  
7 floor business or is that for the tenants?

8 MR. HURST: That's for the first floor  
9 business.

10 MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible)  
12 but as you can see we've provided ample room for  
13 the connectivity (indiscernible) to the riverside  
14 for the pedestrian as well as using it for bike  
15 racks and all of that. That will be open to the  
16 public.

17 MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If I could just add,  
19 whether it's on this plan or for a site plan, if  
20 I'm coming down 3rd there, coming down Indiana and  
21 wanting to walk across to the river and do it in a  
22 straight line fashion, if you will, versus going  
23 down and crossing by the Piano Bridge or going up  
24 to the north and going the other way, how would

1 that be accomplished given the ramps and the stairs  
2 and things that you have in there right now in the  
3 design?

4 MR. HURST: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Because it seems a  
6 little (indiscernible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's some  
8 difficulty with the site grading. It falls down to  
9 the river as all properties on this side of the  
10 river do.

11 MR. HURST: That's why we provided the,  
12 as you see, the crosswalk at 2nd Avenue on the  
13 right side of what is Indiana. It goes into the,  
14 you know, the (indiscernible) parking area so that  
15 there is an activity to the building sidewalk and  
16 then you would turn left and that is a handicap  
17 ramp, an ADA accessible ramp, that gets down to the  
18 open pathway where the bike racks are.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

20 MR. HURST: So it's no different than  
21 navigating through any other city block but it's  
22 all provided for on an ADA basis.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay. So the  
24 curved area, the upper curved area --

1 MR. HURST: This? That's a -- that area  
2 there that he's pointing to is going to be  
3 reasonably level with Riverside Avenue.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Riverside Ave. So -  
5 -

6 MR. HURST: And there's a handicap ramp,  
7 an ADA ramp, that goes down the sidewalk and back  
8 down to that area. Yeah, you kind of -- yeah,  
9 that's the --

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So the upper area  
11 where the umbrella tables are shown now -- or what  
12 looks like umbrella tables.

13 MR. HURST: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So that  
15 --

16 MR. HURST: Those are in an elevated area  
17 at a similar grade to 2nd Avenue currently.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So those  
19 would really be related to the retailer?

20 MR. HURST: Correct. That's how it  
21 relates to the retailer, correct.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is the  
24 minimum ramp length --

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- for ADA  
3 accessibility. That's the only reason for that.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Okay. No,  
5 I -- yeah, again, just math, just elevation,  
6 maximum slope, et cetera. So okay. All right.  
7 And so with that it looks like it -- I guess I see  
8 a lot of -- and not that it's the worst surface  
9 ever but I see a lot of concrete but in some of the  
10 other illustrations there's some sense of texture  
11 or color that might be pavers. So where are you  
12 guys headed with that?

13 MR. HURST: Well, it will likely be  
14 pavers. I would say it's 100 percent going to be  
15 pavers. We're working through right now -- we have  
16 to provide for compensatory storage. It might be  
17 required to be pavers. It's permanent pavers so we  
18 make sure that we've got the right drainage and  
19 (indiscernible). You know, we're actually  
20 (indiscernible) engineering standpoint. Because  
21 it's a redevelopment and we're impacting less than  
22 5,000 square feet of the impervious we're going to  
23 be exempt from some of those but it doesn't mean  
24 that we're not going to have to provide some

1 storage. So it's likely going to be in the form of  
2 (indiscernible). So we're open to that being  
3 pavers just as it will be a better looking product  
4 although there's some great, you know, stained  
5 concrete, colored concrete products out there, but  
6 we definitely want to enhance the look as best we  
7 can.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. And as I  
9 was looking at some of the cross sections that you  
10 were doing on 2nd and on Riverside, I guess the  
11 ones on Riverside as well as what I'm seeing in the  
12 site plan on C300 seem to me that the existing  
13 footprint of the building that's there obviously is  
14 being enlarged. But specifically related to  
15 Riverside Avenue, it's being enlarged towards the  
16 street, if you will, which is causing you to  
17 propose to do some rework of the street. Not  
18 necessarily narrowing it to be un-useful, but you  
19 are modifying the street, but then you're also, to  
20 address the grade since the finished floor of the  
21 retail is kind of tied into 2nd, not tied into  
22 Riverside, it looks like you're then also having a  
23 ramp that you come down from the building and then  
24 sort of push right.

1           So I guess at the end of the day it looks  
2 to me that you're pushing into the right-of-way,  
3 taking some right-of-way, but from an appearance  
4 standpoint as you drive along Riverside, from a  
5 streetscape or, you know, what we call gateway  
6 landscaping standpoint I would say the street is  
7 not winning because you're basically having a ramp  
8 and then a two-foot wide little landscape bed next  
9 to it and then a six or seven or eight-foot wide  
10 sidewalk and then the street.

11           And I -- and I guess I'm finding that  
12 less than -- much less than desirable and wondering  
13 is there any way to look at in boarding or not  
14 expanding the retail towards Riverside so that the  
15 ramp and everything can be pulled back so that  
16 there is an opportunity at the street level as  
17 people walk to have some impact for landscaping?

18           MR. HURST: The ramp is not necessarily  
19 related to the elevation of the second floor or to  
20 2nd Avenue directly. It's related to the FPE which  
21 is the flood protection elevation dictated by Kane  
22 County. So we have to raise -- because we're the  
23 only significant development, we have to  
24 raise -- we have to do one of two things, either

1 flood proof the entrances, which is cost  
2 prohibitive and design wise it doesn't work as  
3 well, or raise your entrances of the FPE and that's  
4 what that ramp is doing is it's getting you from  
5 Riverside Avenue to the FPE. So now we have an  
6 entrance and a patio area in the front which is  
7 used for the retail space.

8 We didn't really increase the footprint  
9 of the building further than where it is now or  
10 beyond what would be the existing lot line, if I  
11 understand it correctly. We went backwards because  
12 our original design, if you recall, had parking in  
13 the street on Riverside Avenue, angled parking, and  
14 we narrowed down Riverside Avenue as a result of  
15 that for not only the parking but also because we  
16 wanted to -- our attempt here was to reduce the  
17 speed by narrowing the street, and the comments  
18 that we got were that we didn't want the parking on  
19 that so we kind of backed into what the current  
20 number or the current width is now at 24 feet which  
21 is a little less than what the existing condition  
22 is.

23 So it wasn't so much related to the  
24 footprint of the building. And so that left

1 (indiscernible) width to fit in a public park or a  
2 public sidewalk, because that is public the way  
3 it's drawn now. I think it's a six or seven-foot  
4 wide public walk, and then the planting, and then  
5 the ramp, and then the building. And so we haven't  
6 finalized 100 percent of that and one of the key  
7 components will be the landscaping component so  
8 that we can kind of figure out what the best  
9 balance of all of those three components -- or  
10 those components are.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not an  
12 atypical commission either in the downtown where  
13 you see zero lot lines for the city to create  
14 license agreement to allow for ADA ramps up to  
15 buildings and it may be an existing condition on an  
16 old building or a condition like this where we're  
17 forced to elevate the building to get above the  
18 flood plain but since we're going through the  
19 process of the PUD we thought it would be better to  
20 just do the vacationing rather than a license  
21 agreement that's going to be perpetual anyways  
22 given the liability and all of that.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. I  
24 appreciate your response. I still think that at

1 the end of the day the street scape loses and so  
2 you have moved the building façade forward to where  
3 it's the lot line or what was the original lot  
4 line.

5 MR. HURST: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So you're moving the  
7 lot line anyways but if you go back to existing  
8 conditions, the building is probably set back from  
9 the lot line eight or ten feet. So you've pushed  
10 towards it and in effect caused --

11 MR. HURST: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- understanding you  
13 need to be above the flood elevation but in effect  
14 you're causing the condition that's designed right  
15 now by moving the façade forward.

16 MR. HURST: Right. And the addition of  
17 the ramp required (indiscernible).

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. Correct. So  
19 I would just ask that that the appearance along  
20 there, since that does represent a pretty  
21 substantial length --

22 MR. HURST: Sure.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- you know, that  
24 treatment as I -- if I remember correctly, of that

1 block you probably have several hundred feet --

2 MR. HURST: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- between the  
4 walkout, the ramp down, and then pushing the  
5 sidewalk, you know, towards the street and  
6 everything, there's several hundred feet. And if  
7 we're talking 20 or 30 feet or 40 feet, that's one  
8 thing, but you're talking several hundred feet of  
9 which if we're talking about a gateway appearance  
10 into the city --

11 MR. HURST: Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- you're all of a  
13 sudden losing several hundred feet of that as it  
14 relates to a façade. So I would -- I think that  
15 that could be, if you will, re-looked at again --

16 MR. HURST: Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- understanding it  
18 impacts potentially your total square footage -

19 MR. HURST: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- for the retailer.  
21 But there might be something of tradeoff there.

22 MR. HURST: We -- and (indiscernible)  
23 conversation with the engineers as well and the  
24 ramp is currently, I forget the exact width of it,

1 but it was generous at the beginning and we can re-  
2 think that ramp width so that we can make sure that  
3 we're providing for the need of the ramp but also  
4 balancing it with how much landscaping is out there  
5 as well as the public walk. The public walk has a  
6 minimum requirement and we have to meet that  
7 minimum requirement.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

9 MR. HURST: And so we're trying to  
10 balance those three components --

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

12 MR. HURST: -- to make sure that we  
13 maximize because we, again, have a vested interest  
14 in what the street scape looks like as well.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Well, and I  
16 think that -- you know, the term is pedestrian  
17 level of service --

18 MR. HURST: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- in the world of  
20 urban design and I think that when a public  
21 sidewalk is directly adjacent to a curb the  
22 pedestrian level of service is substantially less  
23 than desirable versus if you can have the curb, a  
24 parkway zone, and then the pedestrian --

1 MR. HURST: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- since they're not  
3 protected by parking. It's one thing when you have  
4 a sidewalk next to a curb --

5 MR. HURST: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- but there's a  
7 parking, you know, parallel parking or angled  
8 parking that's different.

9 MR. HURST: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: But when you have  
11 moving traffic next to a curb --

12 MR. HURST: Next to a curb.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- that is from a  
14 safety or from a comfort standpoint pedestrians  
15 don't feel as comfortable.

16 MR. HURST: We'll definitely work with  
17 staff to figure out what the right combination of  
18 that is, whether it's moving the landscaping  
19 component out to the curbs as opposed to where it  
20 is now is an option, winding both the landscaping  
21 and the curb with the smaller ramp as well. So we  
22 can go through that process. And that front  
23 component of the building, we can step that back if  
24 it's something that, you know, we really need to

1 make sure that that meets the conditions of  
2 (indiscernible).

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. I would also  
4 say that the -- while there is varying opinions on  
5 the architecture and how that's turned out, I will  
6 have to say that I really like what you guys have  
7 accomplished thus far on this change. I think the  
8 stepping of the building --

9 MR. HURST: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- material changes  
11 have been very positive from my perspective and so  
12 I think that there is a lot to be identified there  
13 that the building has come a long way from what you  
14 originally proposed and so I genuinely appreciate  
15 that. I would have to say probably the -- the  
16 weakest elevation is probably the north one and  
17 mostly at the street level because you have a solid  
18 wall and so if you're walking along there it's just  
19 kind of a -- not that masonry is a bad material but  
20 it's a solid wall of masonry --

21 MR. HURST: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- and you have some  
23 punched openings on the east and west related to  
24 the parking area --

1 MR. HURST: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- and if maybe  
3 something like that could be added, even if it's  
4 maybe not the same height, but if those were added  
5 it would help from the standpoint of -- you know,  
6 from a visual penetration to the building at that  
7 level.

8 MR. HURST: That's easy to add. I mean,  
9 like I said, the staff made some comments about  
10 that elevation. That's why we added -- you know,  
11 the gray section, if you will, does step out and so  
12 normally it stopped with the third floor previously  
13 and now it has gone up to the fourth floor, top of  
14 the fourth floor, and then limestone stills give us  
15 a little more blend than it is now and we added  
16 awnings and we can certainly add some  
17 (indiscernible) or openings on that north side  
18 there. Even if they're a faux opening partly  
19 because we want to have some (indiscernible). We  
20 can put glass just like, you know, we have on the  
21 east and west.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We also have some  
23 (indiscernible) issues on this elevation.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The  
2 (indiscernible) is part of what's driving  
3 this -- along with the lot line driving this  
4 elevation (indiscernible).

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah, in the far  
6 corner.

7 MR. HURST: For the east side.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: In the far corner.

9 MR. HURST: For the east side.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you had  
11 punchouts here, that would work.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah, on the far  
13 corner you have the secondary stair access coming  
14 down, understood, and that's a part of it. I mean  
15 totally get that.

16 MR. HURST: Just to break up the  
17 blandness of it.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I think  
19 there's -- sort of the public has questioned and  
20 commented about the mass of the building as it  
21 relates to the shadow in some study. I think it  
22 came up in the comments related to staff. But the  
23 one that was provided is kind of, if you will,  
24 picking the best case scenario from the standpoint

1 of summer, you know, highest angle of the sun, and  
2 being in July and everything, and I think it would  
3 be valuable to be able to, especially for  
4 your -- you know, probably more so for the  
5 afternoon hours versus the morning hours since the  
6 shadow is flipped into the river versus in the  
7 afternoon it's going to be pushed to the east,  
8 which is certainly a concern of the residents, to  
9 maybe look at some studies that are in May, April,  
10 September, because I think that it could change.

11 Not only the length of the shadows will  
12 change but it also might help people just  
13 understand the orientation because the sun angle is  
14 actually going to drop closer towards the horizon  
15 so the push of the shadow is actually going to be  
16 more northward rather than more eastward or more  
17 westward.

18 MR. HURST: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: But I think helping  
20 people understand that would be helpful and if you  
21 got the model setup, which it looks like you do --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We added the  
23 spring and fall.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

1 MR. HURST: And we can continue to update  
2 the shadows.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

4 MR. HURST: They've got it built this way  
5 correctly. It's easy for them to add any hours or  
6 --

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Time of year. Time  
8 of year.

9 MR. HURST: -- times of year requested.  
10 We've got the winter solstice here, fall equinox.  
11 We're spring equinox now.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And then I would  
13 also say something that also might help from a  
14 massing standpoint or from how people perceive it  
15 would also be if you would consider rotating the  
16 second through fifth floors parallel to Riverside  
17 to bring that mass -- instead of paralleling over  
18 onto second, to rotate it against Riverside so  
19 thought the shadow now is pushed more to the north  
20 because of rotating the building, which it really  
21 was causing the bigger shadows anyway, if you  
22 follow what I'm talking about.

23 MR. HURST: No, I lost you a little bit  
24 on that.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So instead -- right  
2 now you have the second and fifth floor -- second  
3 through five floors paralleling to 2nd, right.

4 MR. HURST: Sure. Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So  
6 instead of there, rotate that and turn it towards  
7 Riverside. So instead of having the building close  
8 to 2nd Street, have the building -- the upper  
9 floors closer to Riverside. So it's just covering  
10 a different part of your northern parking.

11 MR. HURST: Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Might cause to have  
13 to relocate your ATM --

14 MR. HURST: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- kind of thing.

16 MR. HURST: You're talking about the  
17 north end of the --

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Yeah. So  
19 you're just kind of rotating that. It doesn't  
20 change to how you're massing it. It doesn't change  
21 that part of it. It just takes it and turns it.  
22 Because I was looking at your architectural floor  
23 plan and looking at your civil site plan and right  
24 now the columns -- the location of the columns to

1 make your 19 or 20 spaces underneath the building,  
2 they're not together.

3 MR. HURST: No, they're not. We haven't  
4 refined that yet until we get to a point where we  
5 get to the structural engineering and civil  
6 engineering, making sure everything lines up.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So I'm just -- you  
8 know, because sometimes that column placement will  
9 impact your parking and how that works out. So --

10 MR. HURST: I think my general response  
11 to that is that if we look at the study, the shadow  
12 studies pensively throughout the year and not just  
13 July of course and we add those up, I don't think  
14 it's that impactful where the building is located  
15 now based on the studies that we're presenting  
16 here. And you can look up the March --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The spring  
18 equinox.

19 MR. HURST: This is the spring equinox.  
20 So the one at 9:00 a.m., if you look at that, the  
21 shadow is going to the west because of the location  
22 of the sun. And so the little bit darker shade is  
23 throughout the whole thing so that's not really  
24 reflecting any shadow. Then if you look at

1 everything else throughout the day and even getting  
2 to 6:00 p.m. there, again we can keep moving that  
3 time frame as well, it is impacting that first one  
4 or two homes that are right here.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

6 MR. HURST: But if you get much beyond  
7 there it's really not going all the way up the  
8 hill. Again, we're willing to run this study by  
9 the hour, by the day, 365 days, but we're not  
10 convinced that that will be real impactful on the  
11 shadows themselves where changing the architecture  
12 would even make -- you know, I don't know that  
13 changing that section of the building would impact  
14 that very much is probably the best way to say it.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

16 MR. HURST: But we'll run the shadow  
17 studies as many opportunities as we can just to  
18 kind of go through those iterations.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

20 MEMBER WIESE: I just have one quick  
21 clarification or question. The triangular open  
22 area where you had mentioned the gateway portion.  
23 Is that something -- I know you touched on it. Is  
24 that something you guys are going to construct or

1 you're leaving it for the city to do because I do  
2 know that the city has talked about different  
3 gateway locations throughout looking at east entry  
4 access, north, all around to kind of make it a  
5 little bit more consistent so there's a look and  
6 feel when you do enter. So, yeah, that front  
7 circle part, is that something you are leaving with  
8 the city to do but you're -- or you're just going  
9 to (indiscernible) to it?

10 MR. HURST: That's one of the comments  
11 that came up in the staff meeting because we had  
12 originally had that addition as part of the  
13 vacation as instructed and so now with  
14 conversations about the city would like to control  
15 it. We're certainly open to us constructing it,  
16 them maintaining it, whatever formula works in  
17 there. If they want to maintain it -- to me, when  
18 they said they want to control it then that means  
19 that they want to define what that is rather than  
20 us defining what that is. If they want -- surely  
21 we can work with the city to define what that is  
22 and construct it as part of our overall  
23 development.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At the very least

1 we're going to be required to restore it to a  
2 certain level of finish and if it makes sense for  
3 them to have us include some hardscaping or  
4 something like that in there they'll  
5 (indiscernible) ability to create a nice monument  
6 effect feel with that.

7 MEMBER WIESE: Now I mean I was actually  
8 happy to see that the city had addressed this  
9 comprehensively in terms of this being a catalyst  
10 site and not just looking at -- I mean this was  
11 prior to you guys, you know, improving this, but  
12 looked at this triangular area because I do think  
13 that's one thing that I'm liking to see that the  
14 city is start doing is instead of piecemealing  
15 everything where groupings make sense and we're  
16 looking at things holistically and comprehensively  
17 and so -- and that someone made this comment I  
18 think earlier -- this is space. All right. And I  
19 think you did too, Zach. This space is so much  
20 better utilized than what is sitting there right  
21 now in terms of public access use beautification.  
22 So I was glad to see that the city actually put all  
23 of this together and that you are taking advantage  
24 of that in terms of (indiscernible). I know

1 there's a land swap. I know that it's not just,  
2 hey, do this, but comprehensively as a city plan  
3 and as a catalyst site I think it makes sense.

4 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: I think what  
5 you're referring to is we've been presented with a  
6 couple of options for monument signage throughout  
7 some of the projects that have been presented to us  
8 --

9 MEMBER WIESE: Right.

10 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: -- and I think  
11 that -- well, I made the comment that I think it  
12 should be consistent instead of different  
13 developers making different monument signs and I  
14 think --

15 MEMBER WIESE: Right. But I mean I'm  
16 just talking about as a whole that the land that  
17 the city is looking at actually came all the way  
18 down to this point --

19 VICE CHAIR MACKLIN-PURDY: Yeah.

20 MEMBER WIESE: -- in their comprehensive  
21 plan outside of what you are developing or not  
22 developing and looked at it (indiscernible) a  
23 little bit. So I just kind of wanted to get  
24 clarification on that, so thank you.

1                   CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Is there  
2 any other comments right now from Plan Commission  
3 or questions? All right. All right. Then thank  
4 you very much. I'd like to open it to our public  
5 to provide comments or questions. And please come  
6 on up.

7                   MR. RASMUSSEN: Thank you. Bob  
8 Rasmussen, R-A-S-M-U-S-S-E-N, 10 Illinois Street,  
9 St. Charles. First and foremost, River East has  
10 done a tremendous job working on this development.  
11 I think what they've come back with today is going  
12 to be an improvement of what we saw last July, but  
13 I do still have some concerns I'd like to address  
14 tonight. You should all have my memo from  
15 yesterday that I sent to Community Development  
16 addressing several concerns.

17                   When you look at the comprehensive plan,  
18 I think it's great to look at it comprehensively,  
19 and without parking this building doesn't work. So  
20 the garage that was proposed in that plan is kind  
21 of difficult. I built the garage on the west side  
22 of the river so it's pretty limited on what that  
23 garage can do. It can be two stories like the one  
24 we built behind Brunch Café, but it can't be

1 anymore than that because you would have to put in  
2 a helix like we have in the other garage in the  
3 (indiscernible), the five-story garage. The helix  
4 would take half of that parking away. So think of  
5 it long-term. We are somewhat limited. So you  
6 have to remember that when you look at the overall  
7 parking situation.

8           Laura mentioned that people will walk  
9 another four minutes. They won't. I've been  
10 around long enough. I did the parking sites and I  
11 think the only person here (indiscernible) develop  
12 the parking garages on that side, they were only  
13 meant to accommodate what we built on the west side  
14 of the river. So if we start to think that we can  
15 utilize those garages for things on the east side,  
16 we're mistaken as a city.

17           So please look at that sincerely because  
18 there's more buildings to be built. Building 8  
19 that the Hursts proposed to build. Building 6 that  
20 sits there in the old vacant parking lot by the  
21 Blue Moose. So we have to keep separate and people  
22 just won't walk that far.

23           If you all recall, we put a parking lot  
24 where right now the park is on the river. Back in

1 the day we asked could we spend some public money  
2 to do that because people wouldn't go  
3 (indiscernible) parking garage to go to  
4 restaurants. I thought it was the biggest waste of  
5 public money we ever spent and I believe to this  
6 day it still was. So we couldn't even educate  
7 people to go in the parking garage to the  
8 restaurants adjacent. So enough about the west  
9 side of the river.

10 East side of the river there's some  
11 parking opportunities that I think we could  
12 address. Parking is my biggest concern. I live in  
13 the Sterling building. I watch it every  
14 Friday/Saturday. We have been in a Covid pandemic  
15 situation. We're not fully open. There are two  
16 more bars opening on the east side yet can't park.  
17 It's black and white. It's not possible. I sit on  
18 my balcony and I watch cars circle, and circle, and  
19 circle, and some leave, most go to the  
20 neighborhoods. I'm guessing (indiscernible) the  
21 neighbors.

22 I also own Heritage Square two blocks to  
23 the north. Every time we have an event or festival  
24 my parking lot fills up and (indiscernible) open

1 stands there and tickets and tows people. It's  
2 going to happen on a more regular basis which will  
3 greatly impact my development, which has been very  
4 successful for 15 years now, and I don't want to  
5 see that be diminished by improperly developing  
6 this particular site.

7 Staying on parking for a little bit. We  
8 have a huge opportunity to do this right and I  
9 think the building is in the ballpark. I'll  
10 comment a little bit on that in a few minutes. Why  
11 are we not considering underground parking? Every  
12 single building I built on the west side of the  
13 river is fully parked for the residential component  
14 underground. It's not that difficult.

15 This building could surpass its parking  
16 needs by parking underground. Why have we not  
17 looked at that? It's a simple answer. It's not  
18 cheap but I had to do it on the west side and it  
19 made all the sense in the world. I think everybody  
20 in this room would agree to that. When the  
21 residential people can park inside it's a much  
22 better situation.

23 I also have built and own for sale  
24 residential and for rent residential. I can stand

1 here today and tell you this is going to be a very  
2 difficult building to lease if you can't give them  
3 a parking stall. So what's going to happen if  
4 these 20 or 26 parking stalls in the right-of-way  
5 are deeded and dedicated to the developer and  
6 they're not public, they will get assigned to  
7 individuals. They will have the right to do that.  
8 And if they're assigned to individuals he'll get  
9 his leases signed and it makes sense, but then we  
10 don't have parking for Sammy's Bike Shop. Then we  
11 don't have parking to offset the loss of street  
12 parking from the current residents who already park  
13 there in the street.

14 When I built (indiscernible), two very  
15 successful developments three blocks away, I put  
16 that parking in in the right-of-way. I paid for  
17 it, I built it, I kept it public, and I maintain it  
18 every year. I plow it, asphalt it, whatever it  
19 takes. That is how our (indiscernible) is  
20 developed. So to change that precedence that we've  
21 already created seems odd to me. I don't  
22 understand why we would make that private. So I  
23 would be a big proponent of this parking on 2nd  
24 Avenue to remain public. I like it there. I think

1 Sammy's Bike Shop would use it most every day, but  
2 I think it needs to remain public.

3 When you look at the triangle that's  
4 proposed to be vacated and given to the developer,  
5 I don't see any reason why that can't be retained  
6 as a public space. It looks great. The developers  
7 have done a great job. But we did it throughout  
8 downtown, all of 1st Street. Every bit of public  
9 space is public owned. It's not a great expense to  
10 the city to maintain. We already maintain a ton of  
11 it and I think it should be maintained publicly.

12 When it's public then you can walk down  
13 Indiana with your dog and your dog could use that  
14 park. When it's private, we can't answer that  
15 question today but it is private. So it could be  
16 closed off to general public use and I don't think  
17 we should close any land in our city to the  
18 public's use. I think that's a detriment to our  
19 citizens and we're here to make our citizens better  
20 and this doesn't do that for us.

21 The look is great. The north end of the  
22 building, Peter, I agree with you. I think we need  
23 to do something there. I don't think we have  
24 another building on Illinois Avenue that's that

1 tall and that close to the street. It probably  
2 needs to come back three to five feet and have some  
3 kind of landscape buffer there so it will look a  
4 little better. Illinois Street is the second  
5 highest traffic we have in downtown St. Charles.  
6 It's highly traveled and now you have a five-  
7 story -- brick façade fifth story and you step back  
8 and it's just not a pretty façade.

9 The developer has done a great job on  
10 three sides. I will commend, the building does  
11 look good, but that side is just I think more  
12 visible than any other side because we have more  
13 traffic there than on any of these other streets  
14 surrounding it and it needs to get stepped down a  
15 bit. I think that's important.

16 Let me double check my notes. Again, the  
17 conveyance of property. Once it becomes private  
18 the rules may change so let's just remind that.  
19 The discussion of there could be two 40,000 square  
20 foot buildings built here and we're only building  
21 57,000. We kind of can look at that in many ways  
22 but you can't build two 40,000 square foot  
23 buildings. Good luck parking. Good luck figuring  
24 that out. It won't work.

1           I think the 57,000 square foot is  
2 reasonable. I wish it was four stories as the  
3 comprehensive plan showed and stepped down a little  
4 bit. It makes parking easier. It makes the  
5 massing look better. The square footage would meet  
6 the requirements. The 50-foot would meet the  
7 requirements. There's a lot of things that four  
8 stories would obviously be back in place with what  
9 was originally intended for this (indiscernible)  
10 district and this particular piece of property and  
11 I think that went a long ways to helping the public  
12 understand why this building would be acceptable.

13           The transitional space that this is,  
14 again, look at other examples. Where in town do we  
15 have a five-story building adjacent to single  
16 family residential? We don't. I can't think of  
17 one. And when we did five stories on 1st Street it  
18 was a significant struggle to get that approved.  
19 But we weren't next to single story residential, we  
20 weren't next to existing homes, and therefore the  
21 five stories I believe made more sense.

22           We have to look at the transitional  
23 nature of this property and think about neighboring  
24 properties and residents that have lived there for

1 many years and not really devastating them by  
2 having that tall of a building in that area. I  
3 think the 50-foot mass is a reasonable mass.

4 I heard talk about the 100 spots at  
5 Pollyanna. That can't be added. It won't work.  
6 Russ Colby can probably attest to that. He helped  
7 me design the garage on the west side.

8 Closing 2nd Avenue Northbound. I think  
9 what that would do -- if we ended up doing that,  
10 that would push the traffic to 3rd. It would just  
11 keep pushing it down the street. People who don't  
12 want to go down and hit that stop light want to go  
13 right and head up Illinois. That's where they're  
14 headed. So I don't think that's a great idea. I  
15 think that covered pretty much all my notes. Any  
16 questions for me?

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just as a  
18 clarification. I don't think they were talking  
19 about closing the northbound 2nd Avenue. I think  
20 they were just talking about making the turn, the  
21 right turn to go northbound a little more  
22 challenging from the standpoint of instead of  
23 having the soft turn you had to come up and make a  
24 right-hand turn and --

1 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. That might make  
2 sense, yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just making it not  
4 as easy so that people won't do that.

5 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: They're still going  
7 to do it but maybe some people will just continue  
8 up and go to Illinois and then turn at the light if  
9 you're going that way.

10 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. I'm very opposed  
11 to closing Indiana because this is the only way  
12 back and forth to my complexes without doing the  
13 illegal left-hand turns that Laura and I have both  
14 partaken in. They're going to do that but we  
15 shouldn't. And I was opposed to it but now with  
16 the pork chop in there that the Hursts have put in,  
17 I like what they've done. It makes sense. So I'm  
18 not opposed to that. I'm just very opposed to  
19 giving the land away.

20 I don't know a situation in the city of  
21 St. Charles where government closed the street and  
22 deeded the property to an individual developer. I  
23 don't. I don't know that I've ever experienced  
24 that. Maybe it's time for a change. I don't

1 believe so. I think it's time for us to maintain  
2 our public properties, keep them city-owned, and  
3 keep them where all of the public can use them, not  
4 for the benefit of an individual development.

5 So in closing, I do hope this building  
6 gets built. I think it's a tremendous opportunity  
7 in our town to fix this particular site. Let's  
8 just be very smart about what we're doing.  
9 Spending time, spending effort in a good way.  
10 Thank you for your time.

11 MEMBER BECKER: Can I ask you one  
12 question? Sorry. Your first comment about  
13 underground parking success being on the west side.  
14 Is it close to the river, proximity to the river?  
15 I mean --

16 MR. RASMUSSEN: The building I live in is  
17 the Sterling Bank building.

18 MEMBER BECKER: Oh.

19 MR. RASMUSSEN: It's closer to the river  
20 than this project by a bunch.

21 MEMBER BECKER: Right.

22 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. I think I'm 20  
23 feet from the river where this is probably 50. So  
24 it's not an issue. I've done it multiple times.

1 MEMBER BECKER: Thanks.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Anyone else?

3 MR. SHULSKI: Good evening. Mark  
4 Shulski, S-H-U-L-S-K-I, St. Charles, Illinois, and  
5 I'm here today to read a petition that was filed by  
6 the residents of the area and then I'll go over  
7 that, I'll read it, and then -- so we don't have a  
8 bunch of people saying the same thing. Some of  
9 them are going to come up and talk about the facts  
10 that are stated in here and go over that.

11 So this was just filed recently. It's  
12 your neighbors from the East Side Central Historic  
13 District of St. Charles are asking for your help.  
14 STC 216, LLC, owned by Curt and Conrad Hurst, the  
15 Frontier Development Group, has been in a PUD  
16 proposal to build River East Lofts on the site of  
17 the parking lot of the former Chamber of Commerce  
18 building just off across Illinois Avenue from  
19 Pollyanna Brewing.

20 The massive proposal will take up the  
21 entire city block and then some with first floor  
22 retail and the rest apartments. These are the  
23 facts about the proposal. They want the city of  
24 St. Charles to give them for zero dollars all of

1 Indiana Avenue between 2nd Avenue and Riverside  
2 Avenue, which we oppose, all of the green space off  
3 of Indiana Avenue between 2nd Avenue and Riverside  
4 Avenue, all of the public parking on the east side  
5 of that city. We'll likely get in return zero.  
6 Public property turned over to the developer for  
7 their private use and profit.

8 We are not against development on this  
9 site. None of us think it is attractive right now.  
10 We are not against the style of the building  
11 proposed. We are not against STC, LLC or Frontier  
12 Development. They have done a beautiful job with  
13 their other downtown development projects. But we  
14 are against a handover of our public land, the  
15 street closure, the proposed height, and the  
16 apartment density.

17 So as of now, like I said, the petition  
18 (indiscernible) 135 signatures already happening on  
19 that site, but I'll see -- I'll let other people  
20 come up and talk and then maybe I'll come back if  
21 there's some things not covered (indiscernible).  
22 This is from the residents of the area.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

24 MS. GASS: I was not able to get my

1 thoughts together in time to --

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry. Can we  
3 get your name and address please?

4 MS. GASS: Yes. My name is Martha Gass  
5 and I'm at 211 South 3rd Avenue.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

7 MS. GASS: And so I made some handouts  
8 for you which is what I'm going to present tonight.  
9 It's Martha Gass, G-A-S-S. I also submitted the  
10 letter that's in your packet and page 2 of that  
11 letter I do note a mistake where it should say 60  
12 residential spaces on that line instead of 78.

13 Dear Plan Commissioners, thank you for  
14 your service on this commission and also thank you  
15 Russell Colby for your timely answers to all my  
16 questions. The River East Lofts proposal we see  
17 today is definitely better than what we saw during  
18 the concept plan review. The new plan is more  
19 attractive architecturally and steps back on the  
20 south side. However, the remaining feedback  
21 regarding bulk and scale and unattractive parking  
22 issues are not addressed. It is still in need of  
23 scaling down to both complement our neighborhood  
24 and be more workable for our streets and parking.

1           The first and most obvious objection from  
2 a (indiscernible) perspective is the handover of  
3 the public land and several people have addressed  
4 that already so I'll just skip that.

5           The street closure and reconfiguration of  
6 the triangle are going to send drivers seeking to  
7 avoid delays up to 3rd Avenue. 3rd Avenue already  
8 handles a lot of traffic to and from the Prairie  
9 Street Bridge. Street closures and one-ways have a  
10 negative consequence for surrounding roads and  
11 neighborhoods.

12           In the staff report regarding the parking  
13 table on page 9 -- and Bob was talking about this  
14 too and I think you were asking about this as well.  
15 But I wanted to make sure that everyone saw on page  
16 10 that the 63 total spaces that are in parking lot  
17 B referenced at 60 feet away include approximately  
18 23 spots that are on land owned by Frontier. So  
19 these are the southeast plats 7 and 8 of the city  
20 block 10.

21           The parking agreement between the city  
22 and Frontier expires next April 30th, 2023. And I  
23 understand that the city is talking about a land  
24 swap, that's what Curt was talking about in his

1 presentation, so it would be this lots for the lots  
2 that are directly south of Pollyanna. If this deal  
3 goes through then 16 of the 63 spaces that are  
4 listed there that are going to be roped off for  
5 Pollyanna's successful outdoor business. I salute  
6 Pollyanna's success. I'm just pointing out that  
7 this parking is going to be gone. So it's really  
8 47 spaces instead of 63 spaces, a 25 percent  
9 reduction of what's listed.

10 Also on page 8, the maximum building  
11 height is a little confusing. So here are the  
12 facts. On Riverside Avenue the building height is  
13 sixty-three feet and four-and-three-quarters  
14 inches. On 2nd Avenue the building height is  
15 fifty-nine feet and seven-and-three-quarters  
16 inches. The building address is Riverside Avenue  
17 on all of the plans provided so I think we can  
18 agree that the 2nd Avenue side of the building is  
19 definitely the back. It's where the garbage is  
20 going to be. If we agree on all this, the building  
21 height from the midpoint of the front of the  
22 building is 61 6.4 inches.

23 In the special use application the Hursts  
24 say that the apartments are, quote, currently

1 unrepresented in downtown, unquote. When I  
2 contacted the city I learned that there is no  
3 standard to which underrepresented is compared and  
4 that there's no current condo apartments available  
5 downtown or what their occupancy rate is. So this  
6 is just opinion to try to bolster their case for  
7 more apartments.

8 As a whole, Frontier is not providing us  
9 with a clear picture of the effects on nearby  
10 property. First, the perspectives they provided  
11 are not street level and don't include views of our  
12 neighborhood. So here I'd ask Russell if you could  
13 help me so I could discuss the perspectives. You  
14 can see this one isn't -- he said it's street level  
15 but you're looking at the tree tops on this view.  
16 So this is a down looking perspective so it doesn't  
17 really give you a perspective of how high that  
18 building is to how high the buildings are that are  
19 on the east side of it. And also, it's stepped  
20 pretty far back from the building. This is fully  
21 one block in front of where the building is.

22 This is another perspective that he  
23 talked about. So in this perspective right here  
24 there is a massive Silver Maple tree in our

1 neighborhood and it's replaced with this I guess  
2 replacement tree. Anyway, it's not the tree that's  
3 there. So this view again is from several hundred  
4 feet in the air it looks to me so you're not  
5 getting -- you're looking down on everything.  
6 You're not getting a perspective of how tall that  
7 building is compared to what our houses are, which  
8 are shown also just from the top.

9 I requested the city to obtain a  
10 perspective that shows the scale of this building  
11 compared to our neighborhood which is right across  
12 the street. So now I'd ask you, Kurt, to please  
13 provide a perspective of what the person would see  
14 if they're standing here -- standing down here at  
15 the corner of 2nd Avenue and Riverside Avenue and  
16 looking northerly up 2nd Avenue and include the  
17 houses on the east side and the entire development  
18 on the west side and include for comparison that  
19 Silver Maple tree so that we can really get -- it's  
20 the only thing that we have that's really tall  
21 right now to compare, okay, that's how tall that is  
22 in our neighborhood, how tall is this building  
23 compared to that?

24 The next thing that I want to point out

1 is their east/west view and in this view I wanted  
2 to point out that they have a notation over here on  
3 the right NTS which means not to scale. So this  
4 one also doesn't give you a good perspective of  
5 what's going on with the height of their building  
6 here. It does give you some numbers though to the  
7 relative height, not the relative height, the  
8 height of the center line of the streets. So it  
9 does show the height two blocks up the hill.

10 So going two blocks up now to, not 3rd  
11 Avenue, 4th Avenue. This is 717. And that's just  
12 one-and-a-half feet higher than the top of the  
13 second floor of their building. Okay. The top of  
14 the building is another thirty-three-and-a-half  
15 feet above 4th Avenue. I'm just trying to give you  
16 some perspectives that they didn't provide.

17 Okay. The next thing is the shadow  
18 study, which I was really happy to see that they  
19 provided a simulation. Taking a look at the shadow  
20 study that I provided you can just see -- here's  
21 that Silver Maple that I'm talking about and here's  
22 the sun. Here's the house behind ours and then  
23 their building will be back here. So this  
24 is -- we're not going to be seeing the sun at 4:30

1 on March 12th. And I wanted to say that the time  
2 we're not going to be able to see the sun, it's  
3 going to be 17 percent. It's going to take out 17  
4 percent of the daylight that we would be able to  
5 see that day.

6 On the last page of your handout I gave  
7 you a -- this is an attempt to provide some more  
8 shadow information for you. I'm not going to walk  
9 you through all the math and everything, but we  
10 did -- another neighbor and I were looking at this  
11 for what the angle of the sun is and how big the  
12 building is and when we're going to start seeing  
13 the shadow on our buildings, but I wanted to see if  
14 you could get some information that actually gives  
15 you the impact.

16 The point of a shadow study was to give  
17 you the impact of what it's going to be on the  
18 neighbors who are next to the building and the  
19 impact is really going to be how much of our  
20 daylight is going to be now obscured by the  
21 building. Okay. And I also provided what their  
22 PUD request, 61.5 feet, the CBD-1 zoning at 50  
23 feet, and then if they put in a three-story  
24 building which most of -- everyone in our

1 neighborhood feels like a three-story building  
2 would be very compatible with the neighborhood and  
3 it's also what has been successfully developed on  
4 entire city blocks nearby us, to what Bob was  
5 talking about. So in comparison, a three-story  
6 building to their building, you're going to almost  
7 double the amount of sunlight that we're going to  
8 have, half the impact of the shadow.

9           And then they also talk -- they  
10 also -- like I said, they changed the height on the  
11 application from 63 feet, which they said in the  
12 concept phase, to 59 feet and 8 inches on the  
13 proposal to make it look like they decreased the  
14 height of the building. But like I said to you,  
15 this hasn't changed. They just decided to  
16 reference a different zero in their second  
17 application. The first time they presented the  
18 worst case scenario and the second time they  
19 presented the best case scenario up on 2nd Avenue.  
20 It's like shopping. \$9.99 just seems better than  
21 \$10.

22           The building proposed in the concept plan  
23 is the exact same, both on Riverside and on 2nd  
24 Avenue. As a result of these obscurities we

1 neighbors have tried to demonstrate with facts and  
2 photos how (indiscernible) trying to present here.  
3 If it were a good fit for the neighborhood there  
4 would be no need to avoid providing these different  
5 perspectives on slides.

6 So I think you were talking about the  
7 ATM, can it be incorporated into the side of the  
8 building. Right now it's on the city fronting  
9 corner of this development and it's pretty  
10 unsightly and overly bright. I don't know how many  
11 of you have seen it at night.

12 Now the developers stated in both their  
13 concept review and on the PUD application that you  
14 could build two individual 40,000 square foot  
15 buildings on the site with the current zoning  
16 ordinances. (Indiscernible) brought this plan up  
17 at public meetings including today. Between the  
18 concept plan and this plan the only scaling back he  
19 did was 10 percent on the gross floor area and ten  
20 percent on dwelling units.

21 Given this fact I started wondering how  
22 bad would two buildings be for our neighborhood and  
23 the answer is it would probably look better than  
24 this. So I urge you not to be afraid of the

1 alternative. After the Historic Preservation  
2 Commission meeting he also said he could just sell  
3 the lots and let another developer put up, quote,  
4 two ugly buildings, and I urge you not to be afraid  
5 of this alternative either, although I do feel like  
6 we can work something that is a nice alternative  
7 with this developer.

8           If it were two buildings the number of  
9 dwelling units allowed is one per 1,000 square feet  
10 of the lot. The lot is listed at 21,400 square  
11 feet. So if they built two buildings and stayed  
12 within the code they could build 21 apartments  
13 which is less than half of what they want to go in  
14 with the PUD. Each building would be a maximum of  
15 50 feet tall which would be more than 20 percent  
16 shorter than the PUD, sixty-one feet six inches.  
17 And the sites are in the historic district so the  
18 architecture from any developer would again have to  
19 go through the Historic Commission for appropriate  
20 (indiscernible) and attractiveness to the  
21 neighborhood.

22           What would these look like, like the  
23 Hursts were pointing out? They would look like  
24 building 16 in the comprehensive plan in the

1 downtown redeveloping concept except that the lot  
2 is actually larger so within 40,000 square feet  
3 they could actually accomplish the step backs if  
4 they built directly to the lot plans the way  
5 they're showing it here. They wouldn't be able to  
6 build these two at 40,000 square feet because these  
7 buildings shown are larger than 40,000 square feet  
8 each.

9           So on the business side the practice  
10 would be very large (indiscernible). They would be  
11 1600 to 1800 square feet (indiscernible). And Curt  
12 said he would probably put in second floor offices  
13 which would be another 20,000 square feet of  
14 offices. Again, we have a lot of office space  
15 available in downtown right now and trend is toward  
16 working from home. So frankly, even though the  
17 two-building alternative would be more expensive in  
18 the business case for the Hursts, it would be  
19 better for the neighborhood in terms of scale and  
20 density.

21           The Hursts have emphasized how they need  
22 the PUD to make their development financially  
23 viable. They're seasoned developers. Let's ask  
24 why would a seasoned developer buy a property that

1 they can't make financially viable unless they ask  
2 for large variances that they may not be granted?  
3 If the variance were for 25 apartments instead of  
4 21 maybe they would think, okay, that's a  
5 reasonable risk. If the height had to be one foot  
6 taller than allowed, maybe they would take that  
7 risk. But here they are asking us to believe that  
8 they bought the property knowing they would have to  
9 ask for an additional floor and twice as many  
10 apartments as would be allowed. If they did buy  
11 the property knowing this that's their mistake and  
12 there's no obligation or even reason for the city  
13 or the citizens of St. Charles to make up the  
14 financial difference to them.

15           At the end of the (indiscernible) review  
16 plan as submitted to Russell Colby over 100  
17 signatures on the petition asking for these  
18 attributes: two stories with the architecture that  
19 matches the neighborhood, a density ratio  
20 consistent with city ordinances and guidelines,  
21 sufficient parking for all the residents plus  
22 guests, no retail, a ban on ever having a  
23 restaurant or a bar inside the development, no  
24 closure of Indiana Avenue, no (indiscernible) of

1 the triangle park on Riverside south of Indiana, no  
2 width reduction of Riverside Avenue. Given that  
3 none of these are attributes of the PUD I'd like to  
4 ask Russell please make the petitions a part of the  
5 public record.

6 This is a public hearing for a reason.  
7 When you ask for variances you must prove your  
8 case. We all are able to provide feedback on how  
9 the variances are going to affect us. So  
10 commissioners, please examine the facts of their  
11 case. They want the public land for zero dollars  
12 in return, they want the city to deal with all the  
13 excess parking needs that the development is going  
14 to cause, and they want the excess height so they  
15 can put in many more apartments.

16 Commissioners, the Hursts did not talk to  
17 any of the neighbors about this PUD. They didn't  
18 ask us what we could support or what we would  
19 rather see. We showed up at the public hearings to  
20 provide our input. We thanked them for the nice  
21 work they've done with their other nearby  
22 developments. We told them we're not against  
23 development on this site. We asked them to scale  
24 this back, to take it down to three floors, and to

1 improve the parking situation. They did improve  
2 the architecture but they haven't shortened the  
3 building at all and they decreased even more the  
4 parking they provide. They really didn't listen.

5 So now we plead with you to listen to us.  
6 Listen when we tell you that the impact on our  
7 nearby properties is negative. Many of us have  
8 lived in this neighborhood for 20, 30, 40 years.  
9 At least one of us has lived here for 80 years.  
10 This isn't just where we live. This is our  
11 neighborhood. These aren't just our houses. These  
12 are our homes. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you very much.

14 MR. ALTERGOTT: My name is Robert  
15 Altergott, A-L-T-E-R-G-O-T-T. I live at 317  
16 Indiana Avenue, just up the street. I took the  
17 time yesterday to call on the people in the east  
18 side neighborhood of this project. Talking with  
19 these people I showed them info that I got from the  
20 internet. (Indiscernible) said that my numbers  
21 might not be exact. I gave her a copy of my flyer  
22 and I'm a little bit off on the height but it's  
23 over 50 feet. So the one I have here is -- these  
24 are the facts about their proposal.

1           They want the city to give them for free  
2 all of Indiana Avenue between 2nd Avenue and  
3 Riverside Avenue, which they will close all the  
4 green space off of Indiana Avenue between 2nd  
5 Avenue and Riverside Avenue, all of the public  
6 parking on the east side of the city lot. They  
7 want variance in the city ordinance to put up a 63-  
8 foot high building, that's too high, and they are  
9 only allowed 50 feet by your ordinance. They want  
10 43 apartments and they are only allowed 21. They  
11 want to eliminate nine parking places and replace  
12 them at another location, not this one, and they  
13 want a 57,767 square foot building and they're only  
14 allowed 40,000.

15           So (indiscernible) that they signed.  
16 This petition is for the River East Lofts of  
17 Frontier Development Group to stay within the  
18 current city ordinance and for the city not to give  
19 up public property for closed streets. I have 20  
20 signatures on this. I would also like to  
21 say -- I'll read the signatures in a minute, but I  
22 would also like to say with the crosswalk, I walk  
23 down there all the time and I'm going to tell you  
24 that crosswalk isn't a full block from the stop

1 lights.

2 So you're going to have -- with the  
3 timing on the stop lights people are anxious to get  
4 across Illinois because the timing is way different  
5 from what Illinois gets and what Riverside Drive  
6 gets. So you're going to have these people  
7 accelerating to get to where they want to go from  
8 Illinois Street stop light. Now you've got a  
9 crosswalk about a block way. Okay. You think  
10 there isn't going to be an accident there?

11 And besides, when we have an event people  
12 are constantly crowding and they get the police to  
13 help the people get across Riverside Drive by  
14 Illinois and now you're giving another place where  
15 people are going to be crossing so you're traffic  
16 is going to pass one into the next one and your  
17 going to have a car stopping for people and a guy  
18 behind him hitting him and whether he winds up in a  
19 pedestrian or not you're going to have a problem.  
20 Okay. Just to let you know, it's not a full block  
21 between the edge of Indiana and Illinois on that  
22 section (indiscernible). So I just wanted to  
23 mention it because I didn't see it with all the  
24 rest of this (indiscernible).

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If you can just  
2 provide it to staff. They are seated over there.  
3 But thank you very much. Thank you.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Hi. Greg Taylor.  
5 (Indiscernible). First off, I'd just like to start  
6 off to say I'm not any kind of development person  
7 at all. I'm just against this development as its  
8 proposed right now in the PUD. Secondly, to avoid  
9 any appearance of a conflict of interest I ask  
10 Commission Member Weise to recuse herself from this  
11 vote because -- given the fact that there's a chair  
12 for the citizens for Lori Vitek Committee, combined  
13 with the fact that Mayor Vitek received a campaign  
14 contribution from Frontier, and combined with the  
15 fact that Candidate Vitek had campaign posters on  
16 display in Frontier's buildings.

17 So to avoid any appearance of a conflict  
18 of interest I ask you to recuse yourself from this  
19 vote. If you don't want to answer, that's fine.  
20 It's just a direct question. You don't have to  
21 answer me. (Indiscernible). It's just my request.  
22 I think it's a fair request (indiscernible)  
23 proposal.

24 Okay. Dear Plan Commission Members, I'm

1 asking you to make a recommendation to the city  
2 council that the proposed River East project would  
3 cut back in size and scope so that the additional  
4 parking load and other negative aspects of this  
5 project do not adversely effect the neighborhood  
6 residents' property values and our quality of life.

7           The River East Lofts project unchanged  
8 will make an already difficult parking situation  
9 dreadful. Currently, whenever there's an event  
10 downtown, a show at The Arcada, and nearly on every  
11 weekend night -- downtown every weekend night  
12 streets are filled with parked cars of people  
13 attending these events. Where are all the cars  
14 associated with a 43-unit apartment building going  
15 to find spaces when there are not enough spaces  
16 now? This is not just a one-time event. This  
17 happens every weekend. If there's not Covid  
18 restrictions and if the weather is nice our streets  
19 fill up with parking now. If there's a show,  
20 forget it, at the Arcada.

21           If this project were not located in CB-1  
22 the required parking spots proposed with this  
23 building that it would have to provide between 90  
24 and 135. That's according to city ordinance

1 17.24.14. So the 90 is the low end estimate using  
2 floor space of 1,000 based on retail space. The  
3 high end estimate uses ten spaces required for  
4 1,000 square feet of retail space.

5 And to your point, it's not inconceivable  
6 that this space on the first floor is going to turn  
7 into a restaurant. Given the current success of  
8 what's happening downtown it's very perceivable  
9 that that space will be a restaurant or a bar and  
10 the load that this development would place on the  
11 area is 135 vehicles more than what we have right  
12 now.

13 This project provides a negative 3,  
14 negative 3 net effect to the current inventory of  
15 parking spaces that we have now. If this goes in  
16 as a plan we'll have less parking than what we have  
17 now and there will be a need for somewhere north of  
18 100 additional cars. It just doesn't work. The  
19 proposed plan has 52 spaces, 28 in the lot, 24  
20 running east of the building. Currently, we have  
21 53 spaces, 37 in the lot, 11 running east of the  
22 building. What wasn't included in Russell's  
23 original plan was the five spaces that run along  
24 that green triangle park. As you saw, sometimes

1 there six spaces there. And the two spaces that  
2 are on Indiana Avenue directly south of the  
3 building. Okay. And I've seen six along the green  
4 space and three directly south of there. So really  
5 you're talking negative three and negative five to  
6 the current inventory of parking spaces. There's  
7 a -- I have a mistake in my report. I put down  
8 negative one because I forgot about two spaces on  
9 Indiana Avenue south of the current building.

10 In the PUD it states the project is  
11 within -- is in line with the desired intent of the  
12 comprehensive plan. What's not mentioned in the  
13 application is that this -- is that the  
14 comprehensive plan also states redevelopment of  
15 this site could vary depending upon the city's  
16 ability to address transportation. The  
17 comprehensive plan stated that transportation and  
18 parking is going to be an issue with this site.  
19 That's on page 91, paragraph 2.

20 Additionally, in the comprehensive plan  
21 when they talk about parking space, the city should  
22 continue to provide parking strategically in all  
23 areas of downtown and carefully monitor the plan to  
24 ensure that both current and future needs are met.

1 Now here is where it gets interesting. The parking  
2 needs of each site should be taken into account as  
3 each site is being considered for development.

4 Page 89, comprehensive plan.

5 Additionally, on page 86 of the  
6 comprehensive plan with regards to the city, quote,  
7 Better managed parking capacity and access  
8 throughout downtown especially as new development  
9 comes online in the comprehensive plan. Lastly,  
10 regarding how this project is not consistent with  
11 the comprehensive plan, the example depicted in the  
12 plan as a potential development is a four-story  
13 building. It's not a five-story building.

14 The facts regarding parking related to  
15 this proposed project are this. The area in the  
16 neighborhood surrounding this proposed project are  
17 already challenged parking issues regularly. The  
18 proposed development will result in less parking  
19 than we currently have now. The proposed  
20 development will place a large additional load on  
21 parking spaces in the area, somewhere north of 100,  
22 and the comprehensive plan advises the city to  
23 monitor and ensure that the current future parking  
24 needs are met before each site is developed. Those

1 are facts related to parking.

2 After taking the above facts into  
3 consideration the logical conclusion is that the  
4 River East Lofts project does not adequately  
5 address current and future parking needs as the  
6 comprehensive plan instructs the city to ensure.  
7 It's also clear to me that this project would  
8 result in a large additional flow of cars into our  
9 neighborhood streets seeking parking which will be  
10 a constant eyesore, hassle to navigate, and  
11 negatively effect our current residents' property  
12 values and quality of life.

13 And it's not just us. These  
14 additional -- this project, if it goes in like it  
15 is now, it's going to choke downtown businesses  
16 too. I mean who wants to walk three or four blocks  
17 to get a beer at Pollyanna or five blocks to get a  
18 meal at the (indiscernible)? And for that matter,  
19 who wants to walk four blocks to their apartment  
20 complex? I don't think anybody will. I don't  
21 think a lot of people would want to do that. And  
22 that is why the authors of the comprehensive plan  
23 directed the city to monitor and manage parking  
24 especially as new development comes online. Again,

1 that's page 86. The comprehensive plan does not  
2 instruct the city to react to parking needs after  
3 the development occurs and after the harm has been  
4 done.

5           The size of the River East Lofts building  
6 will dwarf our residential homes and property  
7 values. Who wants to live in the shadows of a  
8 five-story building? I don't. That's why I'm  
9 here. And I'll bet most of you wouldn't want to  
10 either. Who wants to look at a five-story brick  
11 wall constantly for their westerly view? I don't  
12 and I'll bet most of you wouldn't want to either.  
13 So this isn't going to be a positive thing for our  
14 neighborhood.

15           A lot of people talked about the shadow  
16 study already so I'm going to pass my point on the  
17 shadow study. Inserted into my letter is a picture  
18 from our dining room window and so if this goes in  
19 unchanged, we have a solid brick wall and we can't  
20 see the sky. And it's not just us, other members  
21 in the neighborhood will have similar brick wall  
22 views depending upon their directional relationship  
23 to the building and/or have an ugly view with  
24 garbage containers and power generators which are

1 planned to be located on the northeast side of the  
2 apartment complex.

3 The massive scale of this building  
4 dwarfing the current structures located in the area  
5 is shadows cast by this building onto the  
6 neighborhood and a constant westward view of a  
7 brick wall for many current residents and property  
8 owners will additionally erode the property values  
9 for many that live in the neighborhood and be  
10 injurious to the enjoyment of our own residents.

11 I'm trying not to hit a point some other  
12 people made, but other local bidders  
13 have -- builders, excuse me, have developed entire  
14 city blocks utilizing three stories. So I'm  
15 speaking of course of Heritage Square and also that  
16 condo complex between 5th and 6th and Indiana, a  
17 height of three stories. So with that being the  
18 case it makes me skeptical that a five-story  
19 complex is needed to make this project financially  
20 viable as Curt claimed during a pleasant  
21 conversation with me and other residents after the  
22 neighbor -- after the Historic Preservation  
23 Committee. I just don't buy that it has to be five  
24 stories to make it financially feasible.

1           It seems that much of your work on this  
2           committee is to render judgments of recommendations  
3           based on opinions from not much experience common  
4           sense. During discussions regarding this project  
5           with family, friends, strangers, petition signees,  
6           coworkers, the consensus was nearly 100 percent  
7           that this proposed project will be harmful to our  
8           neighborhood. The River East Lofts will decrease  
9           our property values, decrease the quality of life  
10          for several current, long-term residents living  
11          near the proposed building because of the parking  
12          (indiscernible) and because of the issues related  
13          to its mass that we've already talked about.

14                 These adverse effects are direct  
15          violations of two special use PUD application  
16          requirements: 3B, sufficient infrastructure, and  
17          3C, effect on nearby property. As a result I ask  
18          you to make a recommendation to the city council  
19          that this development be scaled back to a three-  
20          story building that would better blend with the  
21          residential neighborhood and will allow the 52  
22          spaces identified in the PUD to satisfy the  
23          majority of the additional parking load.

24                 If it was a three-story building, okay,

1 the additional parking load would be 65.5. So if  
2 we just built the first three stories of the  
3 building proposed in the PUD the additional load  
4 would calculate to 65.5 and that calculation is in  
5 my letter, the 7,500 divided by 1000 times 4 and  
6 the 18 one-bedroom apartment times 1.2 and the two-  
7 bedroom apartments times 1.7. You sum that up and  
8 it's 65.5.

9 I just want to call out that those first  
10 three floors, you know, it has 26 apartment units.  
11 26. The most someone should put in there is 21  
12 apartment buildings. So already we've got a five  
13 apartment deviation from what's allowed by code.  
14 So almost a 24 percent deviation in just the first  
15 three floors of this building.

16 A three-story building of this height  
17 deviates one floor lower from the project depicted  
18 in the comprehensive plan. The PUD project  
19 deviates one floor higher than the comprehensive  
20 plan. The three-story building allows the city to  
21 better manage the parking load, eliminates the  
22 shadow concerns, helps lessen the density issue,  
23 and will add to the benefit of the existing  
24 neighborhood (indiscernible) to the neighborhood's

1 expense.

2 So I close my letter on that paragraph  
3 because I want to highlight why a three-story  
4 building -- three-story mixed use building is more  
5 compliant -- a three-story mixed use building is  
6 more compliant to the comprehensive plan than the  
7 PUD five-story building. Both buildings deviate by  
8 one floor from the comprehensive plan. The PUD  
9 building wants you to deal with the parking issues  
10 sometime in the future and will destroy the  
11 intimate scale and focus of our neighborhood. In  
12 contrast, a three-story mixed use building allows  
13 the city to practically manage transportation and  
14 parking issues while also maintaining the intimate  
15 scale and focus of the area all of which the  
16 comprehensive plan instructs the city to do.

17 Simply put, a three-story building is  
18 more compliant and in line with the comprehensive  
19 plan than the PUD building and a three-story  
20 building is more compliant to the current city  
21 pulse too. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

23 MR. PRUCHER: Hello. My name is Tom  
24 Prucher, P as in Peter, R-U-C-H-E-R. I live at 747

1 Westfield Drive in St. Charles. I live near  
2 (indiscernible) School. So I'm not really a  
3 neighbor but I think (indiscernible). I do drive  
4 to the library. I drive down Illinois. And I  
5 drive past the development between 5th and 6th  
6 Street and what I recall years ago there was a  
7 developer that made a proposal for that site but he  
8 was asked to come back with another proposal and  
9 what we have on that site is buildings built to  
10 scale for the neighborhood. Now this particular  
11 development is commercial, not appropriate to build  
12 single family residences, but I believe that we  
13 should respect the height. Many people don't like  
14 to have tall buildings next to the river and that  
15 is kind of an eyesore and even from my south  
16 looking north view that we see from 100 feet in the  
17 air, the building is not to scale for the city, not  
18 just the neighborhood. And that's about all I have  
19 to say.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you very much.

21 MR. PRUCHER: Thank you.

22 MR. SWENDSEN: Good evening. My name is  
23 Dan Swendsen, S-W-E-N-D-S-E-N, and I live at 504  
24 South 3rd Avenue and that's the significant part

1 that I'd like to represent tonight. The home I  
2 live in is really the southern terminus of South  
3 3rd Avenue. It's where it connects with Riverside  
4 Drive, just to give you an idea of where that's at.

5 The central issue being discussed here  
6 tonight it seems is in part as the current parking  
7 situation for downtown St. Charles is this, we get  
8 parking on South 3rd Avenue frequently on Friday  
9 and Saturday nights all the way in the southern  
10 terminus of South 3rd Avenue in front of my house.  
11 You put another 100 cars into that mix, I don't  
12 know where they're going to go.

13 As it is now, a lot of traffic comes off  
14 Prairie Street Bridge. Instead of continuing north  
15 on Riverside it goes north on South 3rd. It  
16 becomes then to me a public safety issue when  
17 you've got the entire street from one to another  
18 parked full of cars on one end on one side. These  
19 are narrow residential streets. This is not a  
20 (indiscernible) like structure like Prairie Street  
21 or Oak Street on the west side of the river. When  
22 you park on one side it only leaves one rider lane  
23 open going north or south on those streets. So if  
24 you put more cars into the neighborhood and you got

1 more traffic going on that street it seems a major  
2 public safety to me that should be addressed.

3 And the other point I'd like to touch on,  
4 if I heard the developers right this evening, one  
5 proposal they're putting forward as a solution is  
6 to build another parking deck behind the Pollyanna  
7 Brewery. That's city expense I'm assuming or  
8 taxpayer expense. We're using taxpayer dollars to  
9 solve a builder's problem does not seem like a good  
10 idea to me. So again, I just want to point out how  
11 serious the parking situation in the neighborhood  
12 is at it exists today without putting additional  
13 stress on it. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

15 MR. WATTS: Hi Commissioners. I'm Al  
16 Watts, Community Engagement Director for  
17 Preservation Partners of the Fox Valley. It's  
18 W-A-T-T-S. This is our executive director, Kelsey  
19 Shipton. I just want to thank you for your time  
20 today. I know you've been sitting here for quite a  
21 while. I also want to thank the Hursts for their  
22 investment in downtown St. Charles. I really  
23 appreciate that.

24 For those that don't know our

1 organization, we champion a sense of place for St.  
2 Charles (indiscernible). We're a non-profit  
3 organization that champions this sense of space or  
4 sense of place through education, local history,  
5 and local architecture. So I'm going to talk a  
6 little bit about the history of this plot, this  
7 land, this piece of land, and then Kelsey is going  
8 to talk some about how the historic preservation  
9 ordinance helps with maintaining some sense of  
10 place.

11 So the structure that's currently there  
12 at 216 South Riverside Avenue was originally  
13 constructed sometime between 1912 and 1923. The  
14 building first served as a receiving plant for the  
15 Bowman Dairy Company. Now dairy cattle were  
16 plentiful in Fox Valley at that time and there were  
17 several dairy processing plants in St. Charles  
18 itself and also along down the Fox River. Farmers  
19 would bring their milk here to be collected and it  
20 would be then delivered by milkmen, because there  
21 were milkmen back then that did that, to residents  
22 or to creameries for processing.

23 In 1937 the Riverview Dairy, which was  
24 founded by a St. Charles resident Joseph Port (ph)

1 in 1890, purchased the Bowman Receiving Plant, and  
2 according to the St. Charles (indiscernible) it was  
3 updated and possibly expanded. It ran that  
4 creamery there until 1969 when they sold it to  
5 Fantastic Flavors which made ice cream for a few  
6 years there and they moved out in 1975. The  
7 building was sold to several other businesses  
8 including (indiscernible) headquarters and of  
9 course the St. Charles Chamber of Commerce.

10 I'm not talking necessarily about this  
11 building as being a significant structure that, you  
12 know, isn't needing to be torn down or something  
13 like that, but what we are talking about is -- just  
14 wanted to explain what the history of that is. The  
15 building's architecture that's there, it's  
16 considered vernacular because it doesn't have any  
17 distinctive style, but the building's needs and  
18 it's historic significance representing the St.  
19 Charles dairy industry has led the historic  
20 preservation commission to list that building as a  
21 contributing building to the St. Charles historic  
22 district. I'm going to have Kelsey --

23 MS. SHIPTON: And for the record, my name  
24 is Kelsey Shipton. I'm executive director for

1 Preservation Partners of the Fox Valley. And it's  
2 spelled S-H-I-P-T-O-N. And we're located at 8  
3 Indiana Street but I'm a resident in St. Charles  
4 and I live at 1112 S. 12th Avenue.

5 And the Preservation Commission has  
6 already provided comment and given their  
7 recommendation but we wanted to remind the  
8 commission this evening that preservation -- or  
9 that the importance of this site in relation to the  
10 historic district and the neighboring neighborhood  
11 as well.

12 So the purpose of the preservation  
13 of -- I'm sorry. The purpose of historic  
14 preservation in a municipality is to preserve a  
15 community's sense of place, which I believe the  
16 Hurst's referenced in their presentation as well,  
17 is to provide a sense of place based on history.  
18 But it's also meant to enhance resident's quality  
19 of life. So when a city effectively upholds its  
20 preservation ordinance it continues the continued  
21 vitality of the community as a place people want to  
22 live, and work, and play

23 So the project before you is in -- is  
24 located within the established historic district

1 but it's also located adjacent to a neighborhood  
2 that nevertheless shares the historic character  
3 identified in that district. So the ordinance  
4 describes the purpose as follows: To make citizens  
5 aware and appreciative of the history of the city,  
6 to identify and preserve historic areas, to protect  
7 and increase property values in historic areas, to  
8 encourage the use of city buildings, and to provide  
9 economic benefits to citizens. So following the  
10 ordinance creates a balance between need specific  
11 projects and to improve -- and the city's drive to  
12 improve the citizens' quality of life. There's a  
13 point to this, I promise.

14           The Secretary of the Interior stands for  
15 rehabilitation or guidelines to help achieve this  
16 balance. So Standard 9 states that new  
17 construction will be compatible with historical  
18 materials, features, size, scale and proportion,  
19 and massing to protect the integrity of the  
20 property and its environment.

21           Purportedly the St. Charles Preservation  
22 Ordinance also talks about general -- their  
23 architectural and aesthetic guidelines, describes  
24 how a project's height and relationship to

1 surrounding buildings, massing and space, scale of  
2 the project and architectural details should be  
3 compatible with surrounding structures. New  
4 construction that meets these guidelines are  
5 buildings that enhance our historic district and  
6 our neighborhoods and maintain that sense of place  
7 while still increasing economic benefits for the  
8 city and for its residents.

9           So every good development also holds the  
10 potential to set a precedent for new construction  
11 in other historic areas of the city. What is done  
12 at one site can be a case in point for future  
13 developments very easily creating the snowball  
14 effect that carries the community in a direction  
15 that it didn't necessarily anticipate. And  
16 historic preservation is simply another check in  
17 the system to checks and balances that has been  
18 established to support sense of place and quality  
19 of life.

20           But a city can't be so restrictive that  
21 it makes new construction or rehabilitation  
22 economically infeasible for the property owners.  
23 Growth and change are vital to the quality of life  
24 in St. Charles and to a sense of place. So one of

1 the decisions before the commission this evening  
2 proposed -- is whether this proposed project as  
3 presented is indeed a positive change that doesn't  
4 detract from the sense of place of the city that  
5 our residents and visitors have come to know and  
6 love. And it's a little bit of a different take on  
7 this project than what we've been hearing this  
8 evening, but when considering new projects within  
9 or adjacent to these historic districts we think  
10 there's certain things that should be very  
11 seriously considered. So thank you very much for  
12 your time and thank you again to the Hursts for  
13 their investment in St. Charles.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other residents?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a few points  
17 I just kind of wanted to highlight. I know it's  
18 getting late so I'm going to zoom through this  
19 quick. One of the factors that we're looking at is  
20 there's a lot of discussions about, you know,  
21 developing this and infrastructure and I have a lot  
22 of experience not in retail -- or construction  
23 experience but more production/manufacturing  
24 facilities and I can tell you if you don't have the

1 infrastructure in place when you put a plan in  
2 you're going to have a lot of unhappy people and a  
3 lot of unhappy customers.

4 If you think about that, and I think  
5 everyone's in agreement, infrastructure is not in  
6 place to support the additional traffic and people  
7 in that area. People are going to come -- you  
8 know, residents aren't going to be happy, visitors  
9 aren't going to be happy, you know, and it's  
10 just -- it creates a bad situation where if you  
11 plan ahead and you put the infrastructure in place  
12 and then do the development it's going to be a lot  
13 smoother and a more enjoyable experience for  
14 everybody.

15 But looking at that also, you know, some  
16 of the talk, I hadn't heard of it before, the term  
17 learned behavior. I mean that's not a solution to  
18 a problem. That's a hope that people are going to  
19 adjust and work to the situation, not this is a way  
20 that we'll solve this problem. So, you know, you  
21 have to look at that as kind of a thing as well.  
22 It's not a solution if you're hoping and I can tell  
23 you most of learned behavior will be the opposite  
24 of what you want.

1           You think people are going to slow down?  
2       No. They're going to find ways to cut up other  
3       roads or drive faster or drive through there. I  
4       mean look at -- I mean look at our children and  
5       look at the people when they drop off kids at  
6       school. It's like a mad house in those places. I  
7       mean they're not adjusting to it. So I  
8       don't -- you know, what do you think they're going  
9       to drive by an apartment complex and think  
10      differently?

11           And then also, you know, one of the  
12      things I think that's a key point that I just want  
13      to mention is the city didn't change the standards  
14      and regulations on this property for buildings in  
15      the area. So they come in and the developer buys a  
16      property and he knows the conditions he has to  
17      meet. He knows what he has to do to make the  
18      property at best, you know, viable for an  
19      investment.

20           But he comes in -- you know, if you're  
21      going to agree to, okay, we're going to let them  
22      exceed the height, we're going to let them exceed  
23      the density requirements, it's just setting a bad  
24      precedent for, one, I think it would -- if I was a

1 developer that worked with the city on prior  
2 projects and worked with the city to stay within  
3 the standards of the regulations of the city I'd be  
4 pretty offended by it.

5           And then second, now if I'm a developer  
6 looking at new property I'm going to think, well,  
7 you know, it's fair game now to do whatever I want.  
8 So the standards -- and how are you going to refute  
9 that? Because you say, well, we gave an adjustment  
10 there but we're not going to give an adjustment to  
11 you? So, you know, it just sets a bad precedent  
12 that I think that you just have to be aware of.

13           And then, you know, there's a lot of  
14 discussion about that triangular park area and  
15 stuff and you can see from the overhead view that  
16 they're basically taking half of the public area.  
17 So if you -- yeah, right there. You can  
18 see -- look at that, it's filled with parking  
19 spaces and concrete versus what's there right now.  
20 So you talk about people picnicking or walking  
21 their dogs or whatever. We just took half that  
22 space away from them and you can't say that, well,  
23 that's going to give them a public space because  
24 it's public right now. Anyone can walk down there

1 and use it and people do. So that doesn't really  
2 mean anything. It actually detracts from it.

3 So, you know, but to me, I don't  
4 understand and maybe I'm missing something with  
5 city politics but he doesn't own that land. So I  
6 don't even know why we're having a discussion about  
7 that. That's the city public property. It's not  
8 his land. He didn't buy that. So why it's even  
9 part of the proposal is still -- I'm a little  
10 perplexed by it but, you know, it is what it is.

11 And then finally I think just as a  
12 closing point, he went through his presentation and  
13 made the modifications and really didn't change  
14 much as far as some of the areas that were  
15 addressed previously, but I think a key point that  
16 really stood out to me is in all the views he  
17 showed there was never a view -- when he showed the  
18 view looking west it was a bird's eye view. There  
19 was not ever a street view looking west from that  
20 area that actually that the residents here are  
21 going to see. So in closing that's all I want to  
22 say. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just wanted to

1 add the one gentleman came up and talked about how  
2 the -- when the cars parked on the side you  
3 basically got one lane of traffic. So just now it  
4 doesn't really, but I was thinking about is what if  
5 we get two inches of snow and the law says you have  
6 to take your vehicle off the street so the plows  
7 can get through? Where are all these cars going to  
8 be parking when that's supposed to happen? And the  
9 other thing is, when the plows get done they don't  
10 always plow the streets against the curb so now  
11 you've got people that are parking a foot, two feet  
12 away from the curb making it all more narrow. So  
13 your traffic is definitely going to have a problem  
14 in the winter time and I just wanted to bring that  
15 up.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

17 MR. TROAST: Hi. I'm Ron Troast,  
18 T-R-O-A-S-T, 931 Alice Court in St. Charles. Just  
19 a question. You know, parking space seems to be  
20 the big problem, the big concern. Doesn't a  
21 certain percentage of those spaces have to be  
22 handicap spaces and wouldn't that ultimately reduce  
23 their total or has that already been considered?

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I believe it's been

1 considered. But, yes, a certain percentage does  
2 have to be handicap.

3 MS. THORNTON: I actually have a  
4 question. Diane Thornton,  
5 T as in Tom, H-O-R-N-T-O-N, or as I say,  
6 (indiscernible). I actually have a question.  
7 There was a brief discussion of getting people  
8 across the street to enjoy the river, maybe having  
9 a place to rent kayaks and things. Where would  
10 that be and where would people park for that?  
11 Because there is another parking -- you know, if  
12 you make that attractive to people, people who  
13 don't just live in the apartments or live in the  
14 neighborhood, they're going to want to drive there  
15 and walk along before they go to dinner.

16 Plus, we just lost our downtown, our very  
17 valuable downtown grocery store. They're going to  
18 need cars to get to their groceries. I'm very  
19 sorry that Blue Goose closed. I liked walking  
20 there from (indiscernible). It's a very nice walk.  
21 So those are some more things to talk about or to  
22 think about is, you know, you want to beautify it,  
23 you want to encourage people to use that, but how  
24 are they going to get there, where are they going

1 to park? So there's another (indiscernible).

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you. Anyone  
3 else tonight? No. All right.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I got one.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. No problem.

6 MR. SHULSKI: (Indiscernible) builder's  
7 building and maybe it will do some good. I'm  
8 against the whole thing.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry. Could  
10 you introduce yourself?

11 MR. SHULSKI: I'm Anton Shulski, 304  
12 South 2nd Avenue.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

14 MR. SHULSKI: I'm against the whole  
15 thing. Okay. I'm going on 90. Give me a few more  
16 years to see the river. Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you. Are we  
18 all good now for tonight? For tonight. Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you want more?

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll email you.  
22 Let's call it a night.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Thank  
24 you. Thank you. Well, I appreciate everyone's

1 input. Also thank you to our petitioner for  
2 bringing this project forward and looking to  
3 advance it one more time and I think that  
4 there's -- I have one quick question for staff.  
5 There was a traffic report and a landscape plan.  
6 These things were being evaluated. Has  
7 our -- specifically, has our traffic  
8 consultant -- the city's traffic consultant created  
9 a memo in review of the petitioner's traffic study?

10 MR. COLBY: No, it has not been reviewed  
11 yet.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Has not been  
13 reviewed. Okay. All right. And I know that there  
14 was a few other things that have come in and some  
15 responses or some late submittals that we've had a  
16 general feeling to look over. I think given the  
17 public comment and still the number of questions  
18 and some amended staff reports that are not  
19 available, I would like to suggest that we continue  
20 the public hearing to a date when we have some more  
21 reports and possibly have had a chance to receive  
22 some additional things back from the applicant. Is  
23 that something that our Plan Commission members  
24 would be open to?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am comfortable  
2 with that, yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes. Okay. All  
5 right. Then I'm going to suggest that for tonight  
6 we are going to continue the public hearing and you  
7 will be notified via the website or other  
8 mechanisms.

9 MR. COLBY: Yes. We need to -- if the  
10 public hearing is going to be continued, it needs  
11 to be continued to a specific date and place. So  
12 it would need to be one of the scheduled meetings  
13 of the plan commission.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. And -- well,  
15 let's see. We have the 4th, is that right, or the  
16 5th of April and then there's -- will be whatever  
17 the -- 19th of April. So I think  
18 realistically -- can we have two projects from the  
19 east side that will be on the agenda currently,  
20 yes?

21 MR. COLBY: Correct.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So then why  
23 don't we continue this until the 19th I think is  
24 the second one in April. Is that correct, Russ?

1 MR. COLBY: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So we'll  
3 continue this to the 19th of April. Unless I'm  
4 missing it, it will be in this room beginning at  
5 7:00 p.m. will be the meeting and maybe we'll have  
6 other agenda items also.

7 MR. COLBY: Yeah. We will need a motion  
8 to continue the public hearing.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll make that  
11 motion to continue the public hearing to April  
12 19th.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll second.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Roll  
15 call. Laura? Yes. Colleen?

16 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach?

18 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laurel?

20 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen?

22 MEMBER HIBEL: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And a logistical

1 question. It's supposed to go to the planning and  
2 development committee on -- which would be April  
3 19th or something, the city council.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No?

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No, it will come  
7 back here.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It will come back  
9 here for --

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And then it will  
12 be -- so it's still pending?

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes. We have  
14 to -- the process would be to complete the public  
15 hearing then to do part B, okay, which would be our  
16 discussion and a recommendation to the Planning and  
17 Development Committee.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got it. Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So it will be back  
20 here on the 19th of April.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay? All right.  
23 Thank you again for everybody's time, effort, and  
24 input. Thank you very much.

1                   Let's see. We have a meeting on the 5th.  
2 Thank you very much and -- and a motion to adjourn?

3                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I make a motion to  
4 adjourn.

5                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

6                   CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. St.  
7 Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 9:35.

8                   (Off the record at 9:35 p.m.)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

2 I, JACOB FADEN, the officer before whom  
3 the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby  
4 certify that said proceedings were electronically  
5 recorded by me; and that I am neither counsel for,  
6 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to  
7 this case and have no interest, financial or  
8 otherwise, in its outcome.

9 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
10 my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 29th day  
11 of March, 2022.

12 *Jacob Adam Faden*  
13 \_\_\_\_\_

14 Jacob Faden, Notary Public  
15 for the State 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

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, DEBRA MCCOSTLIN, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the recorded proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability from the audio recording and supporting information; 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.



\_\_\_\_\_

DEBRA MCCOSTLIN

MARCH 29, 2022