

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2017**

Members Present: Tim Kessler
 James Holderfield
 Tom Schuetz
 Peter Vargulich
 Tom Pretz
 Jeff Funke
 Dan Frio

Members Absent: Chairman Todd Wallace
 Laura Macklin-Purdy

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
 Ellen Johnson, Planner
 Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Dev.
 Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

Mr. Frio called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Presentation of minutes of the May 2, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Schuetz, seconded by Mr. Pretz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

4. Appeal of Administrative Design Review Decision – 828 S. 3rd Street (Clark Evans)

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

Motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Mr. Schuetz to deny the Appeal of Administrative Design Review Decision.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Funke, Pretz, Schuetz, Vargulich, Frio

Nays: Kessler, Holderfield

Absent: Wallace, Purdy

Motion carried: 5-2

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, May 16, 2017
Page 2

5. Election of Officers

Motion was made by Mr. Pretz, seconded by Mr. Frio and unanimously passed by voice vote to table this item.

6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

7. Weekly Development Report

8. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, June 6, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, June 20, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, June 12, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment at 7:52PM



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

Transcript of Appeal of Administrative Design Review

Date: May 16, 2017

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Appeal of Administrative :
Design Review Decision, :
828 South 3rd Street. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, May 16, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 126919
Pages: 1 - 44
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand
14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Appeal of Administrative Design Review
Conducted on May 16, 2017

1 PRESENT:

2 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

3 DAN FRIO, Member

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 TOM PRETZ, Member

7 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

8 PETER VARGULICH, Member

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

12 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

13 RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community &

14 Economic Development

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Appeal of Administrative Design Review
Conducted on May 16, 2017

4

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Good evening. This
3 meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission is in
4 session.

5 Roll call, Dan.

6 MEMBER FRIO: Tim Kessler.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Here.

8 MEMBER FRIO: Dan Frio, here.

9 Jeffrey Funke.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

11 MEMBER FRIO: James Holderfield.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

13 MEMBER FRIO: Tom Pretz.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

15 MEMBER FRIO: Tom Schuetz.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

17 MEMBER FRIO: Peter Vargulich.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. No. 3 on our
20 agenda is presentation of the minutes of the
21 May 2nd, 2017, meeting of the Plan Commission.

22 Is there a motion to approve?

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Motion to approve the
24 minutes as written.

1 MEMBER FRIO: Second.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you. All
3 right. That's Item No. 3.

4 Item No. 4 on our agenda is the appeal of
5 the administrative design review decision, 828 South
6 3rd Street, Clark Evans. If you recall that two
7 weeks ago, we met regarding this issue, and there is
8 a decision by the planning and development review of
9 the guidelines and standards for the RT District to
10 deny the application to build, and the applicant,
11 Clark Evans, has appealed that decision.

12 So at the last meeting, we left it that the
13 applicant was going to review his plans and come
14 back to us tonight to talk about any changes.

15 So Mr. Evans.

16 MR. EVANS: Good evening. So the revised
17 drawing -- well, I should say this, the structure as
18 it was two weeks ago, I did listen, and we made a
19 few adaptations to the drawings.

20 One of the Board members asked to define
21 more depth to the unit, and we did so by an
22 approximate 3-foot projection on the patio. The
23 patio -- the structure where people can stand on it,
24 it's just a projection almost like an overhang as we

1 have in front, the front entry.

2 If I scroll down, would the rendering show
3 up?

4 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

5 MR. EVANS: Oh, here it is, and here is the
6 rendering. So there is a projection matching the
7 overhang on the front -- over the front door.

8 Now, I also left, just so you guys can see a
9 better idea -- you have a better idea of the
10 hardware that we would like to keep on the home.
11 Now, I understand that most of you guys probably
12 didn't want to see it; but as you can see, it breaks
13 up the berkel (phonetic) members pretty well as the
14 shutter went through a window.

15 But if it's going to be a no vote because of
16 the hardware, then we'll just take it down and move
17 forward with the project. We're not married to it,
18 but we would like to keep it for sure.

19 The three items that we were -- the
20 discussion last week for the 360, I kind of thought
21 two of the items were already taken care of in a
22 way -- as far as the windows and the 360 concerning
23 the vertical siding we have on all four sides.
24 Maybe I was mistaken.

1 That's all I have for you.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you for
3 that.

4 And let's have some discussion with the Plan
5 Commission.

6 Jim, did you want to talk a little bit
7 about --

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Well, yeah, I do have
9 some comments to make.

10 The first thing I would ask, sir, is that
11 you would consider taking down the hardware. I
12 think this is a new venture for us, container homes.
13 I think the staff and I am glad that you are willing
14 to remove that.

15 I've been very conflicted about this. I've
16 been on the Plan Commission for a few years now, but
17 this has been one that's really bothering me deeply.
18 And I am supportive, but not necessarily with what
19 you might think.

20 I'm having problems with the guidelines that
21 the City has to evaluate your plans; and by that I
22 mean, I think we're looking at a modern house.
23 Let's take container out of the picture. We're
24 looking at a modern house that is not really

1 traditional in terms of a residence.

2 There has been a great deal that's been said
3 about the window placement, and it harkens back to
4 when we think of RT, Residential Traditional, we're
5 talking about Colonial architecture, Cape Cod,
6 Georgian, bungalows all of which has a pretty much
7 symmetrical pattern, and I don't see that that
8 applies to modern architecture. So I'm really very
9 conflicted about that.

10 So, you know, the materials -- here again
11 with modern architecture, materials are different,
12 and everything is asymmetrical. So I don't
13 necessarily support exactly what you've got here,
14 and I cannot deny it. That's the way I feel.

15 I've thought about, you know, what Jeff was
16 talking about modern architecture and all this less
17 is more. This is certainly less is more in this
18 case, but I think it would be difficult with an
19 award-winning modern designed house and still have
20 it meet the guidelines that we're operating under.

21 So I just want to make that point tonight
22 and get it out on the table. I would like to hear
23 what everyone on the Plan Commission thinks about
24 that.

Transcript of Appeal of Administrative Design Review
Conducted on May 16, 2017

9

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thanks, Jim.
2 Tom.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I guess the best word I
4 have is perplexed. I actually read through this
5 last night, I was out of town, and I opened up the
6 APA. Is that what it's called? And there was
7 actually an article with this exact same thing from
8 St. Charles, Missouri.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Come on.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm not kidding.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: That's awesome.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And they had the same
13 challenges that we have in fitting this into a
14 neighborhood, that this does not appear to be
15 harmonious, and I know that's a very general term.

16 So I guess I love the idea. I really truly
17 do. I think it's important that we do bring new and
18 innovative things to St. Charles. However, it seems
19 to me that when you were here last time and possibly
20 now, I've read through all the red printing,
21 et cetera, last night and today, that you did change
22 some things. It still doesn't seem to be very
23 flexible on our recommendations about the 360, and
24 you did change the balcony upstairs which is

1 appreciated.

2 I love the idea. I just am struggling with
3 getting it to fit in the neighborhood, and that's
4 just the honest truth. So similar to what Jim has
5 to say.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thanks.

7 Peter, do you have anything?

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think that the house as
9 designed hasn't really changed very much, some color
10 and a few things. So I'm not really sure how we
11 would describe how Mr. Evans and his architect took
12 into consideration the things we asked for as well
13 as the number of things that staff has recommended.

14 But beyond that, I think that the zoning
15 district asks for a number of things which have not
16 been addressed; and so from my perspective,
17 independent of liking this or disliking it, I can't
18 support this house in its location.

19 I think there are zoning districts in
20 St. Charles that do not have these guidelines; and
21 so he would be welcome to pursue a lot in those
22 locations, and I think that that would be
23 worthwhile. But I don't think in this location
24 that's the right thing.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: As I stated before, you know,
2 I commend you on, you know, trying to be different
3 and trying to do something different. And not to
4 assume -- I mean, you know, we as a people, we're
5 all different. You know, we dress differently. We
6 have different cultures, what have you. Honestly, I
7 think modern architecture complements historic
8 architecture.

9 So that being said, I mean, I like the
10 ideas. I think you're getting close, but I just
11 still think -- you know, you guys put in the 3D.
12 You know, it's looking better. It's better from a
13 three-dimensional standpoint, but it still has some
14 work to do -- a little bit of work to do.

15 So I like where it's going. I like the
16 ideas. You know, it would be nice to see it in
17 context, to see what it would look like with the
18 buildings down the street so we can get an idea of
19 how it's going to fit into the neighborhood.
20 Because right now you're literally just seeing it on
21 its own, you know, in the middle of a field. You
22 know, it's always nice to see buildings in context.

23 So I do applaud you for trying to be
24 different, and, you know, with me being an

1 architect, I think that we do need to do different
2 types of architecture, and we can't just create the
3 same architecture and repeat history. It needs to
4 be different.

5 I think by doing that you're going to
6 complement the buildings next to you, but it would
7 be nice to see what this looks like next to the
8 buildings.

9 From an architecture standpoint, I wish the
10 architect would have taken patterns and things from
11 the neighborhood and install them into this
12 building, whether it's contemporary or whether it's
13 in some detail, so.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: In reference to the request
15 to have your architect present, can you just refresh
16 me on why --

17 MR. EVANS: Well, that's strictly my fault.
18 I didn't give him enough lead time. I was late to
19 the game when I was asking him to be here. So
20 that's strictly my fault.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: I think that would have been
22 very beneficial if, in fact, he was -- he or she was
23 here, especially with some of the architectural
24 aspects here to be able to have that one-on-one

1 conversation.

2 I had another question in reference to the
3 audience here. I see about six people or five. I
4 can't see around, a disadvantage of being short I
5 guess, but can I just ask are you here to just
6 listen? Are you here in favor of this?

7 I just wanted to ask maybe by a show of
8 hands if you're in favor or you're against. If
9 you're in favor, anybody there? Against? Okay.

10 I was just curious. That's all I have.

11 MEMBER FRIO: Well, I apologize I missed the
12 last meeting, but going through all the opposed and
13 all the reasons of everything; to cut to the chase,
14 there is some major areas where you meet the City
15 guidelines, but there's some big ones that you
16 don't. I think they have been addressed throughout
17 here and probably in the last meeting. So I won't
18 go over that, but I think you missed some of the big
19 points, and I'll leave it at that.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think that
21 it's a very interesting item in front of us, and,
22 Tom, I see this article on Shipping Container Homes
23 Pose Challenges for Municipalities. In our recent,
24 most recent May issue of the APA, they talk about

1 the difficulties of placing them.

2 But to cut to the chase, we're here hearing
3 an appeal of a decision to deny the permit based on
4 not meeting certain standards as interpreted by the
5 staff in the standards and guidelines section of our
6 ordinance for the RT District. And Jim brings up a
7 very good point, and that is the belief that perhaps
8 those guidelines are not broad enough to discuss
9 this type of architecture, and perhaps he's right.

10 This isn't a discussion about whether or not
11 we think this type of architecture belongs here.
12 It's a discussion on appeal of the decision that it
13 meets the standards. That's what we're here for.

14 So regardless of where you lay for or
15 against this type of architecture in this RT
16 neighborhood, it's really based on the standards
17 that we agreed to 22 years ago when it came in front
18 of us, the standards. We discussed them, and they
19 were recommended for approval by this Plan
20 Commission and the Planning & Development Committee.

21 So I just want to make sure that we stay
22 focused on the specific reason that we're here. And
23 on page 12 of the staff report are the standards
24 that staff has interpreted as this application not

1 meeting, and it refers to the 360-degree
2 architecture, and I would urge the Plan Commission
3 to kind of review that, if you could.

4 Before we go any further, though, as Tom
5 began, does anybody in the audience -- this isn't a
6 public hearing, but I'd like to give anybody an
7 opportunity to speak if they have something to say.
8 Otherwise, we'll continue on with our meeting.

9 Anybody? Good? Okay.

10 We heard from everybody last week. Sure.
11 Come on up, sir.

12 MR. GRISHAM: My name is Tom Grisham. I
13 live at 935 South 3rd Street in St. Charles, and I
14 was hoping to come here this evening and see more
15 progress on this project.

16 I agree with some of the comments that the
17 planning committee and you gentlemen have stated,
18 but it still doesn't seem to me that it is something
19 that fits into the area where we live.

20 First of all, I was disappointed that I
21 found out about this proposal very late and we
22 didn't receive any notifications in our area that
23 there was something coming up, it was dug out, and
24 there was more of us here last time.

1 But to get directly to the point is I have
2 seen these houses around the country, and I know
3 about St. Charles, Missouri, and it is a modern and
4 I think well thought out program. I would have --
5 and I'm going to give him some pointers, and I'm
6 going to give you some pointers if you are going to
7 go further with this.

8 The house that you see here has a color
9 scheme that doesn't seem to fit the white and the
10 gray houses that are on 3rd Street.

11 The other thing that I've seen people do
12 with these houses is to actually put a false peak at
13 the top of the building and that the windows are
14 more in the same vein as what an older house might
15 be or even a modern house.

16 So I think what's happened is that we don't
17 see here -- unless you have it with you. It's too
18 bad your architect couldn't be here to walk us
19 through this, but there were some schemes up here
20 that showed all four sides, I believe, if that's
21 correct.

22 And have you gentlemen all seen that? Does
23 it look -- you've made some comments about the 360.

24 So I guess my comments are, very simply

1 stated, I'm for modern changes; but as I said the
2 last time, these are usually out in the woods by a
3 lake; but when you come to the city, the houses
4 should look fairly uniform as opposed to this, in my
5 opinion.

6 Thank you for listening to me and giving you
7 some ideas.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

9 Well, I just want to touch on the process
10 moving forward. So we have an appeal in front of us
11 to either uphold or -- the appeal is to uphold the
12 denial or to overturn the denial that was made by
13 staff based on the standards and guidelines and the
14 ordinance regarding construction in the RT districts.

15 And we have the standards. As Plan
16 Commissioners, we're here to follow those standards.
17 If we believe that the interpretation that staff
18 made of that 360-degree standard -- which you can
19 read on page 7 of the staff report, then that could
20 be a reason for overturning the denial.

21 If, in fact, this Plan Commission agrees as
22 a group to uphold the denial, the applicant still --
23 it doesn't mean that the applicant is never going to
24 be able to build this home. It just means that the

1 applicant has to go back with his architect and
2 figure out how he can meet the standard to the
3 agreement of the staff, and then hopefully, it won't
4 get back to the Plan Commission at that point.

5 So those are the things we have in front of
6 us. We can make a decision to uphold the denial, at
7 which point the applicant then has an opportunity to
8 continue working on this plan.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: There's a lot of back and
10 forth here. There's a lot of particular details,
11 et cetera, that I see in front of me.

12 So are you saying if the applicant still is
13 willing to make and meet some of these guidelines --
14 where I'm confused is there's a lot of red on this
15 page, and have any of the guidelines really been met
16 from last time?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, it's a matter
18 of opinion, I mean.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: It's an interpretation.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's an
21 interpretation. That's correct.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So I guess I don't want to
23 spend a lot of time necessarily on it, but I mean
24 can we look at this as far as it meets it or it

1 doesn't on page 12 where most of the 360 is?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's the standard.
3 It's the standard that we're focused on. Guidelines
4 are guidelines. Standards are standards. If it
5 doesn't meet the standards as it's written and
6 interpreted, if we agree with the interpretation of
7 the staff, then we uphold the --

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. I understand that.
9 So we have, number one, the 360. It doesn't meet
10 the standard.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, according to
12 their interpretation.

13 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. So my
14 question is so if we uphold the denial, they're
15 going to go back, and they're going to work on the
16 design with the staff; is that correct?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That is correct.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Then they can get approval
19 from the staff.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's correct.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: And then get the building
22 permit.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That is correct.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. You said it a

1 lot simpler than I was trying to say it.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Sorry.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's good.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So anything
5 from staff?

6 MS. JOHNSON: I would just say, just to
7 clarify, that the only standard in question is
8 regarding the 360-degree architecture and that staff
9 has made three comments that we believe -- how we
10 believe the plan could be changed to meet that
11 standard.

12 The Plan Commission may confirm those
13 comments in the decision, that it doesn't meet the
14 360-degree architecture, or they could modify that
15 decision. And even if you uphold that you don't
16 believe the plan meets the 360-degree architecture,
17 you may -- you're permitted to make changes to the
18 comments regarding how that standard could be met.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So if we do decide
20 to uphold it, we can uphold it in whole as it's
21 written. We can uphold the denial and make changes
22 to those -- or additional comments to the
23 360-degree. All right. Thank you.

24 Anything else from the applicant?

1 MR. EVANS: From what I understand about the
2 360-degree are the three bullets. We have a, b, and
3 c. Materials aren't consistent with the home
4 styles. It was discussed at the last meeting. I'm
5 not sure how we're not meeting that as we have
6 exposed container on all four sides. I'm not sure
7 how that is not being met.

8 The windows are being met. We discussed
9 that last time.

10 So the way I see it we have the container
11 doors, or I should say the hardware on the doors
12 that is not in agreement, from my understanding from
13 the last time we met.

14 Now, one commissioner asked -- talked about
15 adding some depth and, you know, we remedied, you
16 know, that with an extension of the patio. We're
17 not going to offset the containers. We just don't
18 have room for that. We have a pretty deep front
19 yard setback.

20 So I'm just -- you know, I understand that
21 maybe some of you don't like the house. I'm not
22 building this house for you guys. You know,
23 honestly, my dad doesn't like the house, but, you
24 know, my parents don't like modern houses. They're

1 more traditional. So I'm not building it for you
2 guys. I'll guarantee you your kids will probably
3 love to see it.

4 So it's not traditional. The neighborhood
5 is not traditional. The Quik Mart doesn't conform
6 to my neighbor. My house doesn't conform to my
7 neighbor either.

8 So I guess that's all I have to say. Thank
9 you.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just want to ask this
11 question. I asked last time about the price point
12 of this house.

13 MR. EVANS: About the what? Excuse me?

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: The price point you put
15 on this house in the market. Could you tell us what
16 that is again, please?

17 MR. EVANS: I think at the last meeting I
18 said around 600 to 630. I was mistaken when I said
19 that. Relooking at the numbers, it's probably
20 around 550. Construction costs, the structural
21 engineer that we -- you know, we actually have
22 structural engineers. Most houses don't have
23 structural engineers.

24 And then with -- to meet code, to help meet

1 code because Tom is -- you know, everyone is new to
2 this. So to help Tom out, he requested a few things
3 above and beyond, which call for structural
4 engineers and site inspections and reports.

5 He also asked for a soils test which we are
6 providing for him. So we've been -- although it may
7 not look like I'm conforming with you guys all the
8 time, but, you know, code took me around the ringer
9 for sure.

10 But we met code, and like I said, the only
11 items I thought we were struggling with were really
12 just the container hardware and not so much the
13 windows because we took care of that last time.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: In regards to the
15 windows, this is really -- you've already met the
16 minimum --

17 MR. EVANS: Excuse me?

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: The windows for each
19 were met, the area of the windows?

20 MR. EVANS: Yes.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: You're meeting that --

22 MR. EVANS: That's correct.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- with the windows
24 that you have.

1 MR. EVANS: We had some issues with the
2 egress with the bedrooms. We tried to have
3 floor-to-ceiling windows. They're pretty much all
4 floor-to-ceiling windows.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

6 MR. EVANS: The second floor is a little bit
7 shorter than the first floor with the egress issues.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Would you mind showing us
9 those -- I'll keep this page in mind, yes -- the
10 other facades, the other sides.

11 So where are they all the same, or are they
12 all same as far as material? That seems to be --

13 MR. EVANS: Right.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: -- the elevations.

15 MR. EVANS: Right. Because the bedrooms,
16 the two smaller bedrooms in the front of the home,
17 they're actually going to be the size of the
18 container. So the containers are only 9 feet wide,
19 and if you add insulation and, you know, studs, you
20 lose 6 inches minimum. So the bedroom width is only
21 7 foot 6. So they're like shotguns. They're narrow
22 but long. So to get as many square feet as we can
23 in the bedroom in width, we had the wall the
24 exterior of the home. That's why you see the Hardie

1 board on the sides.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So the front is made of
3 what?

4 MR. EVANS: Container.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it's metal.

6 MR. EVANS: It will be -- yes.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Corrugated metal.

8 MR. EVANS: Corrugated metal. That's
9 correct.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. So that's the front;
11 correct?

12 MR. EVANS: That's the front. As an
13 example, what you see here is the Hardie board.
14 That's because the -- we'll have an exposed
15 container wall in the bedroom. The corrugated wall
16 will be in the bedroom.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So the corrugated metal is
18 the blue out front, and the, whatever, red is the
19 corrugated container.

20 MR. EVANS: That's correct.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: The gray is the Hardie
22 board.

23 MR. EVANS: That's correct.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So what are the other two

1 sides?

2 MR. EVANS: The other two sides -- the other
3 two sides -- this is the kitchen side which would
4 be -- will be the south side facing the alley that I
5 have on my property. That would be corrugated
6 as well.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. I see that the
8 vertical is corrugated. The horizontal is Hardie
9 board.

10 MR. EVANS: That's correct. And, again,
11 that's the other small bedroom on the second floor.
12 That's why it has the Hardie, and then it switches
13 over to corrugated. The rear of the home is going
14 to be all corrugated.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So I guess my question is
16 you've got corrugated and you've got pressed board
17 and corrugated on all four sides, but you don't.

18 MR. EVANS: I don't. I have the pressed
19 board on the north and south ends, but corrugated
20 around the perimeter -- around all four sides.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's what I'm saying.
22 You've got corrugated and pressed board on all four
23 sides.

24 MR. EVANS: No. I've got corrugated on all

1 four sides. Pressed board only on two sides, the
2 two long sides.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So that's the dilemma here.
4 Two sides of pressed board and corrugated.

5 MR. EVANS: I suppose, yes.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Is there a way to
7 put Hardie board -- I don't know if it meets the
8 criteria, but to get a pressed board on all if
9 you've got --

10 MR. EVANS: So we thought about this too. I
11 mean, adding the Hardie board to the front of the
12 home it just -- we feel it ruins the aesthetics of
13 the home. This is a container home. We're not
14 trying to hide the fact that it is. So adding the
15 Hardie board to the front of the home is extremely
16 challenging as far as the aesthetics goes.

17 The garage, detached garage will be Hardie
18 board, the same matching Hardie board as the home.

19 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: All four sides of it?

20 MR. EVANS: Correct.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So what do you think about
22 if you took off that hardware right there on the
23 front and put Hardie board where the hardware is?

24 MR. EVANS: So I would rather not do that.

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I know that. I'm asking.

2 MR. EVANS: But the hardware will come down.
3 If that's the tipping point here, I will take the
4 hardware down.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, if you take the
6 hardware down, it would be more interesting to put
7 Hardie board there.

8 MR. EVANS: Right. But we still have -- the
9 container door will still be there. It would add
10 some contrast without having the hardware on it.

11 I mean, I have a few pictures. I don't know
12 if I can approach and hand a few out. I've got
13 three of them before my printer went sideways.

14 This shows -- you'll have to share. But
15 you'll see that this is what we're trying to
16 achieve. You can see the container -- the second
17 page, we'll skip to the second page. That's what
18 the hardware would look like in the real world.
19 It's not rusty. It's going to be galvanized. It's
20 going to be sealed. And it's fairly new. There's
21 no dents. There's no dings.

22 And then on the first page, it shows you
23 what -- this gives you an idea what the home would
24 look like painted. The colors and the printer color

1 doesn't match 100 percent because there's only so
2 many colors a printer has.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: On the front page where the
4 squares are underneath the corrugated on top, what
5 is that?

6 MR. EVANS: The container doors? I'm sorry.
7 Maybe you could point to -- those are the container
8 doors.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, they are.

10 MR. EVANS: Those are the doors with the
11 hardware. So if we -- so taking down that hardware
12 would be fine, but I'd like to leave the doors
13 exposed just to give you some contrast. You just
14 can't add shutters to this house, you know, so
15 we're --

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm not suggesting that.

17 MR. EVANS: I know but we're -- you know, we
18 need to break it up a little bit as well. That's
19 what we were trying to achieve.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Well, thank
21 you. This is a difficult one. It could go either
22 way. You know, we have a standard that we are
23 required to meet based on the ordinance.

24 The standard with -- the intent of the

1 architectural detail standards is to promote
2 architectural interest and design that complements
3 the traditional building styles found in older
4 neighborhoods.

5 The standard that we're speaking of
6 specifically is the 360-degree architecture is
7 required, meaning that facades must be designed to
8 be viewed from all directions. At a minimum, the
9 same window types and similar trim detailing the
10 front elevation must be used on the side and rear
11 elevations.

12 The applicant speaks about the materials not
13 being consistent on all elevations. He has
14 explained why the design is the way it is and does
15 not incorporate that.

16 The window openings and panes should be
17 similarly proportioned throughout and should be
18 placed in a manner that creates a balanced elevation
19 on all sides of the house. That's a matter of
20 interpretation. Some may feel that that is the
21 case. Some may not.

22 And we understand the doors are part of the
23 container, but they're not appropriate for a
24 residential structure in a traditional neighborhood.

1 Those could be -- and the applicant has agreed that
2 he could remove them, and the finishes are in
3 question as well.

4 So we have a commissioner, I'll paraphrase a
5 couple of us here tonight, who believes that perhaps
6 these standards are not applicable to this type of
7 structure, that it doesn't incorporate or include
8 any kind of modern architecture, post modern.

9 So the fact remains that this is the
10 standard, and this is the guideline that we're
11 working with. If it was different or it could be
12 made differently, that would be a different story.

13 And I'm going to just ask -- I'm going to
14 ask the Commission, do you have any other
15 interpretations of the 360-degree standard that may
16 allow us to overturn -- give this applicant an
17 opportunity to overturn this decision? If not --

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Are there going to be any
19 tweaks? I guess I'm confused as to what we're --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Based on what we
21 have in front of us. If we vote to uphold the
22 denial, the applicant has an opportunity to come
23 back with staff and make his changes if he wants.
24 There's a decision made, and we're just here to say,

1 yes, we stand by the decision they made, or no, we
2 don't.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So not hearing any
5 more discussion then, is there a motion? Anybody
6 willing to make a motion to either uphold or
7 overturn the decision made by staff?

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'll say it wrong, so I'm
9 not.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just read it.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll go ahead. We really
12 don't have any wording specifically for it.

13 I'd like to make a motion that we affirm the
14 decision of the City staff as they have denied the
15 request based upon the standard -- upon the
16 standards, the 360, the architectural details with
17 the intent to promote architectural interest and
18 design that complements the traditional building
19 styles found in older neighborhoods.

20 Specifically, with the standards -- the
21 360-degree architecture which is required, meaning
22 that facades must be designed to be viewed from all
23 directions. At a minimum, the same window types and
24 similar trim detailing to the front elevation must

1 be used on the side and rear elevations.

2 And I think that's enough.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any discussion on
4 that motion?

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just want to hear you
6 say at the beginning of it -- I won't ask you to go
7 through all the detail, but how we would do this
8 once again?

9 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm sorry?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Say it again.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: You know, how do we
12 vote yes or no?

13 MEMBER PRETZ: I make a motion to uphold the
14 decision of City staff to deny the request for this
15 design.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Any second?

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

19 MEMBER FRIO: Tim Kessler.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No.

21 MEMBER FRIO: Jeff Funke.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll say no.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. No means I
24 don't agree with the motion.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: We don't agree with the
2 motion.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. Yes is to
4 uphold it, uphold the denial.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. So I'm going to agree,
6 and I say yes.

7 MEMBER FRIO: James Holderfield.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: No.

9 MEMBER FRIO: Tom Pretz.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

11 MEMBER FRIO: Tom Schuetz.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

13 MEMBER FRIO: Peter Vargulich.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

15 MEMBER FRIO: Dan Frio, yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So that's a
17 denial --

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Can I just say something.
19 You know, I guess, the issue I have is that we've
20 got a great staff here that -- you know, City
21 planners that you can work with to make the tweaks
22 and to work with them to -- I mean it shouldn't
23 really have -- you know, there was really no need to
24 come up here and to present this in my mind.

1 I think that with the staff's comments, I
2 think you can work to get a design that works with
3 the 360 rule and that will meet the standards; and I
4 think that, you know, looking at the comments from
5 the staff, I think you're close.

6 So in my mind, I think you just need to go
7 back and work with the architect and work with the
8 staff and listen to their opinions and what they
9 have to say because they're a great tool to figure
10 out what you can do to make the project pleasing not
11 only to the neighborhood but to the context and to
12 be different at the same time. So that's all I have
13 to say.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So that
15 passes, and we've moved to uphold, and so that's the
16 end of Item No. 4 on our agenda.

17 Item No. 5 on the agenda is the election of
18 officers, and I'd like to table that.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I'd like to make a motion to
20 table that.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there a second?

22 MEMBER FRIO: Second.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

24 (Ayes heard.)

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. That
2 motion passes.

3 Additional business from Plan Commission
4 members or staff?

5 I have a piece of additional business. What
6 I think that I would like to talk about is based on
7 the standards and guidelines that we were discussing
8 this evening regarding design in the RT
9 neighborhoods, I would like to ask staff if it would
10 be possible to begin looking into becoming a little
11 more inclusive of different types of architecture
12 that aren't addressed in here.

13 This is not going to be the last time this
14 comes up, and as Jim so aptly pointed out, these
15 standards and guidelines were written for
16 traditional housing and not to address any other
17 type of housing.

18 So, for example, there could be guidelines
19 and standards written in here that would
20 specifically exclude any kind of modern housing, or
21 there could be standards and guidelines in here that
22 would help include it and so that it could be built
23 in these neighborhoods.

24 So what do you think, staff?

1 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. We can put something
2 together but which -- I guess we'd want some
3 direction which way you would want to go. Do you
4 want to be more inclusive or more restrictive?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We'll ask the Plan
6 Commission. I mean I have my opinion but --

7 MS. TUNGARE: Here's what I would suggest.
8 Maybe at the first meeting it would be considered,
9 we could hold some discussion with the Plan
10 Commission members and get some feedback before we
11 start writing it out.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Great idea.

13 MS. TUNGARE: To make sure that we
14 address --

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So we would put this
16 item on the agenda in the future. Okay. Very good.
17 Okay. Any other additional business?

18 Yes, ma'am.

19 MS. STOPKA: Can I come up there?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. We're done
21 with --

22 MS. STOPKA: Regarding this. Regarding what
23 you just mentioned.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Sure. Come

1 on up.

2 MS. STOPKA: My name is Diane and --

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: She's recording.

4 MS. STOPKA: She can hear me.

5 THE REPORTER: Your last name.

6 MS. STOPKA: Stopka, S-t-o-p-k-a.

7 Regarding the staff adding to the standards,
8 I think it's a good idea to have the neighborhood
9 involved in the decision making. We are the ones
10 that live there. So I think that we ought to be
11 involved in that.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

13 MS. STOPKA: That's just my thought.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

15 MS. STOPKA: Because you guys don't live --
16 you don't live in our neighborhood, do you? I don't
17 think any of you do. Do you?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I live right by
19 there. I live near you.

20 MS. STOPKA: Okay.

21 MS. TUNGARE: That would be a public
22 meeting. So this item would be placed on the
23 agenda, and it would be a public meeting.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All of these

1 meetings are public meetings. So notifying -- we
2 don't typically notify by agenda items, but I would
3 suggest that you check the City website because our
4 agendas are posted before our meetings; and when
5 this is on the agenda, I would encourage you to
6 come.

7 MS. STOPKA: When you create the agenda, are
8 there ideas already in the agenda?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We're going to have
10 a meeting where we conceptualize what types of
11 things we would want to do with the --

12 MS. STOPKA: And that's where I say the
13 neighbors --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's why you
15 should watch for the agenda that this item comes up
16 on, and then you can be here.

17 MS. STOPKA: Okay.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: This would be all
19 neighborhoods. This would be inclusive to the City,
20 not just their neighborhood; right?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The RT neighborhood.

22 MS. STOPKA: The RT.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any traditional
24 neighborhood.

1 MS. STOPKA: Right.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's what we're
3 talking about.

4 MS. STOPKA: Right.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just would add I
6 really appreciate where you're coming from, but all
7 this that we have discussed over these last two
8 weeks only have been about the 360 issue. It was
9 already decided that this could go into our RT-3.
10 That was not what we were here for.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think that --

13 MS. STOPKA: Who made that decision?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I mean it's code.
15 It's part of the code.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: We did.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It wasn't a decision
18 to allow him or not allow him. He had to go
19 through -- because he was building in a residential,
20 RT District, in our ordinance we say that there has
21 to be a design review by staff; and within that
22 design review, staff has the ability or the
23 authority to either accept or deny the application
24 based on the standards and guidelines as they're

1 written.

2 And so the staff has interpreted that
3 particular standard, that one standard that it was
4 not meeting, so they denied the application.

5 Some other commission or group may interpret
6 that guideline or that standard differently. What
7 we're talking about at our meeting here coming up
8 would be to review the standards and guidelines in
9 RT districts to either include, expand, or
10 exclude --

11 MS. STOPKA: Right.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- any of those
13 things.

14 So the decision about whether this building
15 can be built there or not, if it meets the
16 underlying district codes, he could build it; but
17 it's not a question of somebody making a decision.
18 The only thing that put the brakes on here was the
19 additional leg here of the review -- design review
20 in an RT district. That's the one thing that put
21 the brakes on it.

22 So that's what we want to review at a future
23 meeting. So watch the City website. It's really
24 cool, and our agendas are posted up there. And when

1 this item comes up, standards and guidelines for
2 design review in RT districts, then I would urge you
3 and your sister and everybody to come to the
4 meeting.

5 MS. STOPKA: Okay. So no matter what,
6 getting back to this, this is going to be built if
7 he meets the 360.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: It could be.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It could, yes.

10 MS. STOPKA: It could.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah. And it's not
12 a decision that we make. It's the ordinance.

13 MS. STOPKA: Okay. Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Weekly
15 development report -- again, it is a great quick
16 tool to look at to see where we're at with the
17 applications that are coming before or may be coming
18 before us.

19 Any questions on that? No.

20 Any meeting announcements?

21 MEMBER PRETZ: I know you're going to be
22 disappointed, but I'm not going to be here on
23 June 6th.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I already am

1 disappointed, and I may not be.

2 Okay. Anybody else? Any meetings? We've
3 got June 6th, June 20th.

4 Do you have agenda items for the 6th?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes. Potentially, we have items
6 for the 6th.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Planning &
8 Development Committee June 12th and July 10th.

9 Oh, we had an item on the agenda to do
10 public comment, but you did it already. Thank you.

11 That's No. 9 on the agenda, public comment,
12 but thank you for coming forward.

13 So is there a motion to adjourn?

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I motion we adjourn the
15 meeting.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Second.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor?

18 (Ayes heard.)

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This meeting of the
20 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 7:52.

21 (Off the record at 7:52 p.m.)
22
23
24


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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Joanne E. Ely, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 21st day of May, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois