

**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. 3rd 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. 3rd 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[®]
We Make It *Happen*[™]

Transcript of Hearing

Date: March 22, 2022

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

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?

Transcript of Hearing
Conducted on March 22, 2022

141

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