

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2020**

Members Present In Person: Chairman Wallace
Vice Chairman Kessler
Tom Pretz
James Holderfield

Members Present Via Video
Conference: Jennifer Becker
Jeff Funke
Suzanne Melton
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Peter Vargulich

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Russell Colby, Asst. Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Ellen Johnson, Planner, via video conference
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the March 3, 2020 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Funke and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.

5. Election of Officers

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Holderfield and unanimously passed by voice vote to move to continue item to next meeting.

6. Munhall Glen (Airhart Construction Corp.)

Application for Concept Plan

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

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, June 2, 2020
Page 2

7. BEMA Inc., 3620 Ohio Ave. (Heitman Architects Inc.)
Land Bank Parking Request

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the Land Bank Parking Request for 3620 Ohio Ave. (Heitman Architects Inc.).

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Becker, Holderfield, Wallace, Funke, Vargulich, Pretz, Melton, Kessler, Purdy

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried 9-0

8. 1734 Riverside Subdivision (City of St. Charles)
Application for Minor Subdivision

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of 1734 Riverside Subdivision (City of St. Charles), subject to resolution of staff comments.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Becker, Holderfield, Wallace, Funke, Vargulich, Pretz, Melton, Kessler, Purdy

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried 9-0

9. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None

10. Weekly Development Report

11. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, June 16, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, July 7, 2020 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

Tuesday, July 21, 2020 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, June 8, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, July 13, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, June 2, 2020
Page 3

- 12. Public Comment- None**
- 13. Adjournment at 8:29 p.m.**



Planet Depos®
We Make It *Happen™*

Transcript of Munhall Glen

Date: June 2, 2020

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

-----x
In Re: Munhall Glen :
(Airhart Construction :
Corp.) Application for :
Concept Plan :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Wednesday, June 2, 2020
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 271899A
Pages: 1 - 55
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

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

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Munhall Glen
Conducted on June 2, 2020

3

1 PRESENT IN-PERSON:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

5 TOM PRETZ, Member

6

7 PRESENT VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE:

8 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

9 JEFF FUNKE, Member

10 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

11 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

12 PETER VARGULICH, Member

13

14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 RUSSELL COLBY, Community Development

16 Manager

17 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner, via audio

18 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Munhall Glen
Conducted on June 2, 2020

4

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
3 St. Charles Plan Commission will come to order.
4 Tim, roll call.
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.
8 MEMBER BECKER: Here.
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.
10 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.
12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.
14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: She's here.
15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy here.
16 Pretz.
17 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.
18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.
19 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.
20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.
21 MEMBER MELTON: Here.
22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Now, we will
23 recite the Pledge of Allegiance.
24 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

2 Presentation of the minutes of the March 3rd,
3 2020, meeting of the Plan Commission.

4 Is there a motion to approve?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim moved, and Jeff
9 seconded. All in favor.

10 (Ayes heard.)

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That motion passes
14 unanimously. Let me just take a pause for a
15 second.

16 Because of this interesting way that we're
17 meeting, I would just like to ask that anyone
18 before we take comments or ask any questions wait
19 to be recognized by me, just so we can make sure
20 we hear the people speaking.

21 Before we get into this, are there any
22 questions?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Seeing none, is

1 there a way, Russ -- I know that there is a thing
2 you have, a reservation. Is that something that
3 is available to everybody who is on the phone?

4 MR. COLBY: I'm not sure.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There is little dots
6 where you have to say. Okay. If everyone sees
7 over on the left, I don't know how your screen is
8 arranged, but there are dots for options, and
9 there are more options and it has an --

10 THE REPORTER: Is there anything we can do
11 about the feedback?

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Hold on a
13 second.

14 (A recess was taken from 7:03 p.m. to
15 7:04 p.m.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So it looks
17 like we have our issues taken care of.

18 Item 5 on the agenda is election of
19 officers. How would the Plan Commission like to
20 handle that? I mean, we have everyone in
21 attendance tonight. So whether you want to handle
22 it tonight or continue it to the next meeting. If
23 somebody wants to offer a suggestion on that.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think

1 we're going to probably be in person within the
2 next month.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I suggest that we
5 wait for an in-person meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So Tim made a
7 motion to continue Item 5 to the next meeting. Is
8 there a second?

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So moved.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Second by Jim. Any
11 discussion on that? Okay.

12 (Audio difficulties.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If everybody could
14 please mute if you're not speaking, that would be
15 great.

16 (A recess was taken from 7:05 p.m. to
17 7:06 p.m.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Did we vote on
19 that? I'm sorry. I asked for discussion.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: I don't think we voted.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All in favor of
22 continuing Item 5 to the next meeting, say aye.

23 (Ayes heard.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
3 Item 6 on the agenda is Munhall Glen, Airhart
4 Construction Group, application for concept plan.

5 We have the applicant here with us
6 tonight. This is a concept plan review; and what
7 the Plan Commission does is prior to the applicant
8 spending considerable time and money in going
9 through the application process, they have the
10 ability to come before us with a concept plan
11 which they will present to us, and we can offer
12 feedback.

13 After this concept plan review, nothing
14 will occur on the Plan Commission side until the
15 formal application is filed. This is just for the
16 purpose of getting feedback on a proposal.

17 Before we begin, we do have three letters
18 that were submitted, and those letters I will read
19 into the record; and for the court reporter, I'll
20 give you copies of the letters.

21 All right. The first one we have is from
22 McNees & Associates, LLC, dated June 2nd, 2020
23 regarding Airhart Construction proposal: Munhall
24 Glen.

1 "Dear Sirs:

2 "I represent the owner of the properties
3 located at 1501 East Main Street and 1519 East
4 Main Street, St. Charles, Illinois, to wit:
5 Premium Properties & Development, LLC, formerly
6 known as CM2 Properties, LLC. My client's
7 property is to the northwest of the subject
8 property. My client's property is zoned M-1,
9 Special Manufacturing District.

10 "The current zoning for the vast bulk of
11 the subject property is M-2, Limited
12 Manufacturing, and the St. Charles Comprehensive
13 Plan calls for this part of the subject property,
14 which is closest to my client's property, to be
15 developed as an industrial/business park.

16 "My client opposes the proposed rezoning
17 and development of that portion of the subject
18 property, currently zoned manufacturing, to permit
19 single-family homes.

20 "Very truly yours, McNees & Associates,
21 LLC, Robert A. McNees."

22 Next I have an e-mail which is from Jay
23 Wittenstrom. It is also dated June 2nd, 2020.

24 "We own the property to the west, north of

1 South Avenue, and have the following comments:

2 "It would be helpful to traffic flow to
3 connect South Avenue to Munhall/Tyler, so there is
4 traffic access that goes through.

5 "We think industrial it would be more
6 appropriate, but if not, it should not change the
7 existing requirements and setbacks for adjacent
8 industrial in the future. There should be
9 appropriate setbacks/buffers on the new project.

10 "Need to make sure there is appropriate
11 design/buffer so that there are not future
12 complaints about the existing industrial
13 businesses from new residential occupants.

14 "Water flow should go across the railroad
15 right-of-way to the north and not on to our
16 property. A new culvert across or other drainage
17 system may be necessary. In the alternative, we
18 may be willing to allow access to improve the
19 existing drain. Easement access to enlarge the
20 detention across lot lines would be nice for
21 future potential development/expansion.

22 "Thank you, Jay Wittenstrom, Dan Flanagan,
23 Blue Grass Enterprises, LLC."

24 And we have a third letter, which is also

1 an e-mail, from Jeff and Laura Tarro. It's dated
2 June 2nd, 2020.

3 "Dear Community Development Division,
4 "We live at 840 Munhall Avenue, the
5 property directly south of the proposed
6 residential subdivision of Munhall Glen, running
7 alongside the proposed Lot No. 5. We are
8 concerned about the density of the proposed
9 project and the effect it will have on the traffic
10 flow along Munhall Avenue as well as the aesthetic
11 impact it will have on our street.

12 "Our home was built in 1896, and we have
13 lived in it for 15 years. We were thrilled to
14 find a historic home with a large lot on a quiet
15 street so close to the downtown area of
16 St. Charles. We are not opposed to the
17 development of the parcel that adjoins ours, but
18 we want to make sure that its development matches
19 the characteristics that attracted us to the area
20 in the first place.

21 "We are concerned about maintaining the
22 historic integrity of our home, a large lot with
23 mature trees, that has enjoyed having open space
24 around it for 124 years. We would appreciate any

1 consideration that would create an aesthetic
2 separation between our lot and this development.

3 Our main concern is the size and number of
4 the lots and the resulting density of the proposed
5 plan.

6 "Thank you so much, Jeff and Laura Tarro."

7 All right. Now, I will ask the applicant,
8 or rather the presenter to come forward and make
9 your presentation; and what we will do after the
10 presentation is I will ask for questions from the
11 members of the Plan Commission, followed by any
12 questions from members of the public.

13 MR. AIRHART: Hi. My name is Court
14 Airhart from Airhart Construction here this
15 evening with Mark Glassman to talk about the
16 residential development we're proposing that we're
17 calling Munhall Glen.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just a second. If I
19 could ask the Plan Commissioners at home whether
20 you can hear okay. Peter, can you hear?

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Laura can hear.
23 All right. I just want to make sure they can
24 hear.

1 MR. AIRHART: Understood.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Go ahead.

3 MR. AIRHART: Okay. Great. This evening
4 I want to give an overview; maybe a little bit of
5 history about Airhart Construction; discuss some
6 considerable project experience, which I think is
7 germane to the project we're talking about this
8 evening; discuss the location, area, amenities;
9 as well as the zoning, the transitional nature and
10 surrounding uses of the site; and then our
11 neighborhood plan; as well as our house designs.

12 We are a second-generation company. We've
13 been building homes in the area for over 55 years.
14 We are a family-owned company, small, very local;
15 and because of that, as we look at the land
16 developments, we're within the community. We're
17 around, and we always look for how we can fit the
18 needs of a community.

19 And as we evaluate infill projects whether
20 they might be close to rail lines, whether they
21 might be a little more dense area, or downtown
22 areas, we feel that this property would be very
23 well suited for single-level homes as well as
24 story-and-a-half homes. We think it's a perfect

1 location for that.

2 Oftentimes, what happens in the area, and
3 it's happened in St. Charles over the last
4 30 years, has been quite a bit of four- or
5 five-bedroom homes that are built. You have
6 people who have lived in the community. They're
7 part of the community. They've been involved with
8 social organizations, religious organizations.
9 They've been involved with local government, local
10 business.

11 They may have second and third generation
12 of their own family now living in the community,
13 and they're looking to stay in the community.
14 However, their housing needs are not quite being
15 met, and it's causing them to have to look
16 elsewhere for low-maintenance, single-level
17 living, and that's what we're proposing for this
18 neighborhood. As a RS-4 PUD, we think it's
19 perfect for that location.

20 I want to talk about a couple projects
21 that we've done in the last 10 years. We've been
22 very focused on infill neighborhoods. We
23 understand the surrounding uses. Mackenzie Place
24 is actually a development on the north side of

1 Wheaton. We had actually done a north side
2 overlay district, and we had combined 13
3 properties in this neighborhood.

4 We built 41 townhomes, and there was more
5 density on the west side of this property; and
6 transitioning east, we actually put five
7 single-family homes on the east side to make the
8 transition more into the existing neighborhood.

9 Another project that we're just finishing
10 up is called Fisher Farm. This project is 71
11 homes. To the east of this property is actually
12 industrial. To the south of this property is
13 where the new Wheaton Christian Grammar School is
14 located. To the west of this property is the
15 Klein Creek Golf Course. To the north of this
16 property is Windsor Manor, which is a retirement
17 community.

18 This community focused on single-level
19 living and first-floor master bedrooms. We built
20 quite a few of our premier homes which is actually
21 some of the housing that we're proposing for this
22 neighborhood.

23 Another community that we're currently
24 finishing up, our model currently, is called

1 Stafford Place. This property happens to be in
2 Warrenville. Warrenville had actually purchased
3 the property. It was a property that the usage
4 was no longer desired and warranted in the area.
5 So the municipality actually purchased the
6 property.

7 They removed some old structures and did
8 some cleanup, and we came in as the developer of
9 that property. In order to fit in the community,
10 and the layout to the north of the property had a
11 little bit more density and traffic with
12 Butterfield Road, so we've done our cottage homes
13 there.

14 In the center of the property, we built
15 our garden homes which, again, are similar to
16 homes that we're proposing for this neighborhood.
17 They were single-level, story-and-a-half homes.
18 And then to the south of the property was actually
19 a street where some -- this property tied into an
20 existing neighborhood. And so we fit houses more
21 directly in that neighborhood and built similar
22 scope houses along the south end of the property.

23 The location of this property is just to
24 the east of downtown; and for traffic, it's

1 located at the intersection of Tyler and Munhall
2 which actually creates great -- is a great
3 collector for this neighborhood. We're not coming
4 in and out of an existing neighborhood. We're
5 actually coming in and out of a major collector
6 and going -- being able to go up to East Main
7 Street or down Tyler to Kirk.

8 One of the things we always look for in a
9 neighborhood, as we're looking for a residence is
10 what kind of area amenities do we have that they
11 would be interested in; and this property from
12 Langum Park to Hunt Club Park to the East Main
13 Street, Route 64 corridor, which is great for
14 access to downtown shopping or maybe commuting if
15 necessary, as well as Pottawatomie Golf Course,
16 Pottawatomie Park, Boy Scout Island, as well as
17 the Fox River trail, which is really an amazing
18 amenity. It's spectacular. We have an employee
19 who lives along the river in this area and is out
20 there every night walking his two dogs, and Mount
21 Saint Mary's Park.

22 The surrounding zoning -- this property
23 currently has two zoning classifications. It's
24 RS-4 and M-2, and we're requesting to rezone the

1 complete property to RS-4 PUD. We have RS-3 and
2 RT-3 residential to the west, as well as more M-2
3 to the west and to the east. To the north is kind
4 of an open space which is the old rail line.

5 So the surrounding uses from Munhall Glen,
6 we have the private professional offices. It
7 actually really has a very residential feel to
8 them. We have the RS-4 residential to the east
9 and south of the property as well again RT-3 to
10 the west.

11 We've got the municipal storage facility
12 to the west of the property, a mixed-use
13 warehouse, and an abandoned rail line which has
14 the potential for a linear park which would be
15 spectacular in my humble estimation if that were
16 to come through.

17 The Munhall Glen site plan is comprised of
18 51 lots, and there are two open spaces that are
19 part of the site. At the southeast side, at the
20 entrance, we have detention -- or we have a
21 natural landscape stormwater basin.

22 In addition, we also have a neighborhood
23 kind of sharing -- any time we build a
24 neighborhood, we're thinking about how would

1 people who live there connect. The neighborhood
2 would have sidewalks. People have an opportunity
3 to get out, and we like to create those places for
4 interaction.

5 And so in our neighborhoods, we like to
6 create seating areas so if somebody is out for a
7 walk, they see a friend, they have an opportunity
8 to sit and talk and create a connection, meet
9 neighbors, which really is a great feature and is
10 what helps build neighborhood connections.

11 To the north we have a large detention
12 basin, which would also be a natural landscape;
13 and as a part of access to that, we have a path to
14 connect to that for maintenance but also,
15 hopefully, a path to a connection to a future
16 linear park that we would install in preparation
17 for that in the future; and again another
18 neighborhood connection area, so that somebody
19 could walk back in and enjoy that and enjoy the
20 open space as they take a walk in the
21 neighborhood.

22 As it's been said on a couple of the
23 previous neighborhoods we've talked about, because
24 of the size and the shape of the property and

1 setbacks that we're looking to achieve, we felt it
2 was best to actually do a mix of housing in this
3 neighborhood and a mix of lot sizes and widths.
4 Our price points are the same or similar. It
5 helps us to adjust and buffer some of the
6 properties to the east and west that we're
7 interested in providing larger backyards.

8 So we have some wider lots, and those
9 would be for our garden home residences. These
10 are single-level and story-and-a-half homes. One
11 of the -- our Hemsley Ranch is a two-bedroom home
12 because there are people who are looking for
13 two-bedroom homes. As part of that, though, we
14 actually -- can everybody see what's on the top of
15 this thing, and I don't know what that is.
16 There's something on the screen. Sorry.

17 The second shows actually an option for a
18 second level. We really look at our home -- these
19 homes as two-person homes, but they may have some
20 visitors. They may have a home office and so
21 they -- we really talk about the main levels.

22 So in this option, bedroom two then gets
23 turned into a weight room, a flex room, maybe a
24 home office which is more important in these times

1 as we've talked about, or it may be just a great
2 space to get away and read a book. In the open
3 concept houses that we build, it's really nice to
4 have a space where you can close a door.

5 The St. James ranch is a three-bedroom
6 home, and it has a flex space at the front of the
7 house, which could be a home office. It could be
8 a reading space or a music space.

9 The Macrae is another two-bedroom ranch
10 with an option for some second-floor space. In
11 fact, this home, we have an owner who built this
12 in Stafford Place, and she has quite a passion for
13 sewing. The loft area she turned into her sewing
14 area where she has lots of bolts of fabric in that
15 area. So it really gives an opportunity to use
16 the house, and we're thinking about how people are
17 going to use the homes that they're living in and
18 giving them options.

19 The Leyland ranch is another two- or
20 three-bedroom ranch. Again, it creates that flex
21 area for a home office, a study, a TV area,
22 reading, whatever it may be.

23 Then Chestnut Hill is the largest of the
24 garden homes. This actually is a model at

1 Stafford Place. It's a three-bedroom home with a
2 second-story space and a couple of bedrooms and a
3 loft.

4 The second group of housing, which would
5 be on the thinner lots, is where we have premier
6 residences. These are residences, very similar
7 homes which we built in Fisher Farm. They are
8 single-level, story-and-a-half, and there are some
9 two-story homes there.

10 The Glen Arbor is a 1700-square-foot
11 ranch, and the Oakfield is about a
12 1900-square-foot ranch, and the Oakfield has a
13 little bit more of a fine dining area. Some
14 people are still looking for a little bit more
15 formal dining area, and it gives them an
16 opportunity instead of just more open space.

17 The Lynford is another three-bedroom
18 ranch, which actually has a three-bay garage which
19 gives an opportunity for three cars, if they may
20 have an extra car or something like that, a
21 vehicle, or they're just looking for a little
22 extra storage space.

23 The Legacy is a four-bedroom home with a
24 master bedroom up.

1 The Sandhill is a story-and-a-half home
2 with quite a bit of space, and the Maple Hill is
3 again a two-story home.

4 The home sites in Munhall Glen, again,
5 you'll find two types, and it has to do with the
6 setbacks we're trying to achieve. We're trying to
7 get larger setbacks on the east and west of the
8 property; and so far adjusting the lot size and
9 working within the guidelines of the RS-4 PUD,
10 we're able to achieve this.

11 Our garden home lot is -- we're working
12 with setbacks here. Our porch setback, we're
13 looking at about a 15-foot setback. Our front
14 living setback, living space setback is 20 feet,
15 which is RS-4. And one of the things that we
16 impose on ourselves is to actually set the garage
17 space back to 25 feet.

18 If you can have garages in an alley,
19 that's great; but sometimes you can't have the
20 garage in the back. So what we do is we purposely
21 set the face of the garage back from the living
22 space. By having the porch living space and then
23 the garage, we're stepping the front, and we're
24 diminishing the impact that a two-car garage can

1 have.

2 In fact, what we've been doing at Stafford
3 Place is actually painting the garage door the
4 same color of the siding of the house to eliminate
5 even more impact of that.

6 So our minimum lot dimensions for our
7 garden home would be 74 feet wide by 95 feet deep.
8 Our minimum lot size would be 7,030 square feet,
9 which is actually above the RS-4 requirement,
10 standard requirement.

11 Our setbacks again, 15 foot with the
12 porch, 20 feet with enclosed heated living space,
13 and then 25 foot for the face of the garage. Our
14 side yards we have approximately 6 feet with
15 approximately 12 feet in between the houses. Our
16 corner side yard will be 15 feet. Our rear yard
17 will be 30 feet.

18 Our lot coverage is 37 1/2 percent. The
19 reason we're doing that is any time you're focused
20 on single-level living, it impacts the lot
21 coverage ratio, and so that's one of the reasons
22 as well we're requesting the RS-4 PUD. We want to
23 focus on single-level living for these homes.

24 The premier home lots are a little thinner

1 but still the setbacks are the same. Our minimum
2 lot dimension is 53 by 115. Our minimum lot size
3 is 6,126 square feet. Our setback again for a
4 porch will be 15; the house with enclosed heated
5 living space at 20 feet; the garage once again,
6 25 feet. Our side yard is 6 feet with
7 approximately 12 feet between the houses or a
8 corner side yard of 15 feet; rear yard, 30; and
9 lot coverage, 37 1/2 percent.

10 We think Munhall Glen would be a great
11 addition to St. Charles. We think it would meet a
12 real housing need for those looking to stay in
13 St. Charles, which is a wonderful community, and
14 haven't been able to find the housing they're
15 looking for -- new, low-maintenance, single-level
16 living, and story-and-a-half. We think this
17 neighborhood would fit really well into the
18 existing area.

19 I really appreciate your time tonight, and
20 thank you very much; and, again, my name is Court
21 Airhart. If you have questions, I'd be happy to
22 respond.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

24 Plan Commissioners, do you have any

1 questions?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim, go ahead.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think this one
5 is probably more for staff to begin with. There's
6 a roadway that goes between that car wash and the
7 strip mall. Is that a road? Is that a public
8 roadway? Can you tell me that? It is south of
9 the car wash, just south of the car wash.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Can you hear me?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes, I can.

12 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. This is Ellen.

13 That's not a public roadway. That's just an
14 access to the business behind the car wash.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All right.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So it's not public.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's not a public
18 roadway, no.

19 And I'll tell you the reason I'm asking.
20 The reason I'm asking is this is a one-in, one-out
21 development which is something we try to avoid if
22 we can. I'm just seeing if there were other
23 options for access of the property.

24 It appears that it doesn't have -- with

1 the rail line and the properties to the east and
2 west, that the only exit is where it is.

3 MR. AIRHART: We've left a potential
4 right-of-way space that would match up with South
5 Street just in case for the future, if there was a
6 requirement for that.

7 But there's actually an open space
8 right -- unfortunately, the graphics don't line up
9 perfectly here, but there's South Avenue, and this
10 is a 60-foot right-of-way which matches up to the
11 50-foot right-of-way of South Avenue. Again, the
12 graphic doesn't line up the way it does, but it
13 does line up just in case there's a requirement
14 for that.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Very good.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Would there be any
17 impediment to doing that? Does South go all the
18 way up to the lot line?

19 Russ, do you know? Ellen, do you know?

20 MR. AIRHART: The right-of-way of South
21 goes all the way to the property line, yes, it
22 does.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So you would
24 have at present the ability to do that --

1 MR. COLBY: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- if necessary.

3 MR. AIRHART: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

5 Other questions from Plan Commissioners?

6 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes. This is Jeff Funke.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Jeff, go ahead.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: There was a concern from
9 one of the neighbors that live on that farm, I
10 think it's on the southeast corner of the lot off
11 of Munhall Avenue. And my question is is it
12 possible that the entrance come in, which is at
13 the (inaudible), is there a connection to create a
14 main entrance at that location?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Did you hear
16 what --

17 MR. AIRHART: I think I did.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm having a little bit
19 of problem hearing you here.

20 MR. AIRHART: I think he's asking if we
21 could shift the entryway a little to the north,
22 and what we did with the lot that's along the
23 south end, we actually made that lot about 11 feet
24 wider, and the reason we did that was to create

1 some additional buffer for that existing home to
2 the south. So we would actually not just have a
3 6-foot setback there. The house to the south, we
4 would actually -- we would have about a 16-foot
5 separation, 15-foot separation there.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Jeff, did you
7 hear that?

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes. And, I think, the
9 concern I have is of the traffic that you'd be
10 diverting up to Munhall Avenue. Is it possible to
11 have a direct connection to Tyler so it would
12 divert all the traffic -- all your traffic is
13 coming in -- you know, in and out on Tyler Avenue.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So he's asking
15 if there's a possibility to have a direct
16 connection through to Tyler, instead of going to
17 Munhall and then to Tyler.

18 MR. AIRHART: The space that the detention
19 area is in would not be appropriate for the
20 right-of-way and also -- to go out directly to
21 Tyler, and also you would typically not want to
22 have two roadway exits that close to each other
23 for traffic design.

24 And so actually one of the things that we

1 did with our location, we wanted to be back from
2 the stop sign from Munhall so that we wouldn't
3 have people turning while people are turning off
4 of Tyler. There would be more vision for that
5 traffic area.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Other questions?

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a question.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Jim.

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Clarification,
10 focusing up here. There's two lot sizes. They're
11 narrow and wide. It could be 3-foot wider. How
12 many of those lots are in that count of 51?

13 MR. AIRHART: So we have of the 53 lots, I
14 think, what we have, if memory serves, 27 of those
15 and 24 of the others. It's either 22 and 29 or 24
16 and 27. I'm sorry. I'm a little embarrassed. I
17 don't know that exact number, but it's close.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on one second.
19 What was that?

20 MS. HITZEMANN: Can the people at home
21 hear the presenter now?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. It looks like
23 people lost audio. Can you hear us right now?
24 Laura? Peter? Sue? Jeff?

1 MR. AIRHART: Hello.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't think anyone
3 can hear.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We'll be good at
5 this in a year.

6 MR. AIRHART: Thank you. We appreciate
7 you're trying to keep things moving forward.
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Laura, can you
10 hear me?

11 MS. HITZEMANN: Hold on. I'm trying to
12 call them again.

13 MR. AIRHART: Testing.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They still aren't here.
15 It looks like we're going to have to dial in.

16 Let's take a pause for a minute.

17 (A recess was taken from 7:36 p.m. to
18 7:37 p.m.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Laura, can you hear me?

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes, I can hear
21 you.

22 MR. AIRHART: Testing.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Peter, can
24 you hear me?

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: I can hear.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It sounds
3 like we're back.

4 Are there any questions from Plan
5 Commissioners?

6 MEMBER FUNKE: My only question that I
7 have is is it possible to have a connection onto
8 Tyler through relocating that detention on the
9 east side of the property?

10 MR. AIRHART: Okay. So the detention area
11 where that comes through is not quite wide enough
12 to create a connection there; and also in the
13 traffic design, we typically want to keep accesses
14 apart from each other; and because the south of
15 Munhall is so big and where Munhall and Tyler
16 connect together, we wanted to keep the entrance
17 to Munhall Glen further down to Munhall Avenue.
18 That's the reason we don't go through there.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
20 questions?

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Can people mute
22 their -- they're talking over everybody. So
23 everyone calling in from home needs to mute.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes. Please everyone

1 who is not speaking, please mute your audio.

2 Go ahead, Jennifer.

3 MS. BECKER: Chairman, are you looking to
4 proceeding?

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Please say that
6 again.

7 MEMBER BECKER: Let me try again. Can you
8 guys hear me?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, I can hear you.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: I can hear you.

11 MEMBER BECKER: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jennifer, do you have a
13 question?

14 MS. HITZEMANN: Okay. I'm not sure why.
15 It says it's connected.

16 MR. AIRHART: Jennifer, I can hear you if
17 you want to ask a question.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They can't hear us.

19 MS. HITZEMANN: Try now.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Jennifer, can
21 you hear me?

22 MEMBER BECKER: Yes, I can.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead with
24 your question.

1 MEMBER BECKER: Well, my first is a
2 comment. I live in a neighborhood that until
3 recently only had one entrance, and it was very
4 concerning from a public safety standpoint and
5 from an accessibility standpoint. So I would
6 strongly recommend that the South Avenue entrance
7 be incorporated in any site plan.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Let me make sure
9 that we all heard. She is saying that she lives
10 in a neighborhood with just one entrance, and
11 she's concerned about the congestion and wants to
12 make sure that the South Avenue entrance is
13 incorporated into the plan.

14 Is that correct, Jennifer?

15 MEMBER BECKER: Actually safety and
16 mobility.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I didn't hear.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Safety and
19 mobility.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Safety and mobility.
21 Okay.

22 MEMBER BECKER: And the other issue is a
23 question about the underlying aerial shows a
24 pretty robust development with mature trees on the

1 site. Could the applicant please address why
2 those trees are going to be removed, and they seem
3 to be very much absent from the concept plan.

4 MR. AIRHART: The trees that are out --
5 and this is a farm field, and the actual quality
6 of the trees are very low. We're actually talking
7 about leaving trees around the neighborhood.
8 We'll be talking further with the engineer about
9 that, but primarily most of them are buckthorns of
10 very low quality.

11 So the trees and plants that we would be
12 coming in and planting as a part of the
13 neighborhood would be a much higher quality than
14 those. You find this quite a bit where you've got
15 edge plantings along a farm field or something
16 like that where it's just really invasive tree
17 species.

18 MEMBER BECKER: Okay. Understood. The
19 other question I have is (inaudible).

20 THE REPORTER: I can't hear.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on a second.

22 Jennifer, we need to start over. Can you
23 repeat it?

24 MEMBER BECKER: Sure.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wait. Hold on. Hold
2 on. Sorry. We're kind of in an echo chamber
3 here.

4 (An off-the-record discussion was held.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jennifer, go ahead.

6 MEMBER BECKER: Okay. So in asking for
7 variances from the setbacks along with the
8 separation, et cetera, and educational variances,
9 and how the planned development fits into the
10 community, and there shouldn't be a variance to
11 put more lots in there.

12 Is there a commensurate amount of open
13 space; and even though there are a couple of those
14 little pocket parks, I'm not seeing a huge change
15 for those areas. I would ask the applicant to
16 respond to that issue.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So she's talking
18 about the variances, the sidewalk variances; and
19 she wants to know if there's a commensurate amount
20 of open space beyond those little pocket meeting
21 areas.

22 MR. AIRHART: What we look at is with the
23 surrounding areas and some of the setbacks around
24 the property and the open space, this is zoned

1 M-2. Somebody could come in, and they can do a
2 large parking lot, do a large building, and it is
3 what it is, the zoning.

4 Because of the size and shape of the
5 property and the type of housing, which I think
6 there is a real need for single-level living
7 housing in the community, we think that that meets
8 some of the PUD requirements in regards to dealing
9 with some of those setbacks, and we think that
10 it's appropriate to grant in this case, especially
11 since we're down zoning, for a much more intensive
12 potential use of the M-2.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I have a
14 question. Just regarding the type of house, I
15 notice that a lot of them are smaller houses, and
16 I'm assuming that you're aiming more to the empty
17 nest type --

18 MR. AIRHART: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- resident. How many
20 families with children under 18 would you
21 anticipate to be in this neighborhood?

22 MR. AIRHART: So I would anticipate
23 actually very few families that would move in.
24 There absolutely will be some; but primarily, this

1 housing is -- they're not focused on play areas in
2 the backyard. They're not focused on -- they're
3 looking for single-level living; and so from a
4 percentage basis, both Stafford Place and Fisher
5 Farm actually are significantly under -- the
6 actual children in both of those neighborhoods are
7 actually under your attached home guidelines for
8 your school and park donation.

9 And so actually some of these we've
10 built -- out of the last 20 houses we built, we've
11 actually built five houses for singles, single
12 professionals. It's actually been single women,
13 and so we find that you have a situation we don't
14 have here. And so that's why when things were
15 brought up with regard to donations, we look at it
16 that way.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

18 MR. AIRHART: But the homes will still pay
19 property taxes just like every other home in the
20 community on an ongoing basis.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
22 questions? Okay.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Who was it?

24 MS. HITZEMANN: Peter has a question.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Peter, do you have a
2 question?

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a question and a
4 couple of comments.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead with
6 your questions. It's kind of difficult to hear.
7 So let's do them one at a time.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: (Inaudible).

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Hold on. Hold
10 on, Peter. Sorry. We're trying to figure out why
11 we're getting such an echo here. We're having a
12 lot of problems here.

13 (A recess was taken from 7:48 p.m. to
14 7:49 p.m.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hey, Peter, try again.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: First of all, I just
17 want to tell you that I like the overall project,
18 and I like the various lot sizes and the home
19 choices.

20 The comment about the native trees, I
21 would be in agreement that there's a lot of just
22 succession, but there are a number of mature
23 trees, the oaks that are in the eastern portion of
24 the homes, and then a few along the south parkway

1 site. As the development moves forward, and
2 basically, hopefully, the quality trees, you will
3 embrace those within the layout with your trees.

4 And I think that Jennifer's comment about
5 the access to South Avenue is very important.
6 Currently at the west end of the City's property,
7 South Avenue is blocked with a barrier. So that
8 would have to be addressed.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So the first
10 comment was regarding mature trees and trying to
11 preserve some of them on the east and south sides
12 of the property, and then the second was regarding
13 the connection to South Avenue. Do you feel
14 that's a necessity?

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: And you can also look
18 at improving Munhall up to their new street.
19 Because right now the improvements on Munhall as
20 far as curb and gutter is about -- at the end of
21 their detention pond.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Did you hear that?

23 MR. AIRHART: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

1 Anything else, Peter?

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would just want to
3 look at moving their north commons area, the
4 neighborhood area a little further to the north,
5 so you have a nice overlook of the pond.

6 I understand what Jennifer's comment was
7 about moving the access drive on Munhall further
8 to the north, but I think that there wouldn't be
9 adequate separation with the adjacent street,
10 Tyler.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Okay. All
12 right. That's it?

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. Are
15 there any other Plan Commission questions or
16 comments? Otherwise, I'll see if any member of
17 the public has anything.

18 Okay. Does anyone else have a question or
19 a comment?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I'm not seeing
22 that anyone does. If you do, speak now or forever
23 hold your peace.

24 All right. No. Okay. Laura Tarro is

1 texting and asking if she can hear us. We cannot.

2 MS. HITZEMANN: Tell her to try now.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Try again,
4 Laura.

5 Okay. Unfortunately we still can't hear
6 you. Okay. Laura says that she can't unmute.

7 MS. HITZEMANN: She is not muted according
8 to my screen.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have someone here.

10 Laura, you don't appear to be muted from
11 our end. I wonder if the microphone on your
12 computer is on.

13 It's on, not picking up. Okay.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Text her question.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Would you want to text
16 your question by chat to us, and I can read it?

17 MS. JOHNSON: If Laura is calling by
18 phone, there's instructions for dialing by phone
19 to the Plan Commission meeting being taped.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry for the
21 difficulty, Laura. We do want to know what you
22 have to say. In the meantime, they're going to
23 try to call in.

24 Is there anyone else that has any

1 questions or comments.

2 MR. LANDERS: Yes, this is Mike. I'd like
3 to make a comment, please.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Mike?

5 MR. LANDERS: Yes, Mike.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes. I can hear you.
7 What's your last name?

8 MR. LANDERS: Landers. I live on Munhall
9 Avenue.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Mike Landers on
11 Munhall Avenue. Go ahead.

12 MR. LANDERS: So one of my big concerns is
13 there's 51 houses going in here. I'm going to
14 figure two houses -- or two cars per house. So
15 that's 102 cars. Currently a lot of people
16 utilize the neighborhood that Munhall is attached
17 to, Adams and Lexington and so forth and work
18 their way to town, especially during high
19 congestion times.

20 With this subdivision or area, it's going
21 to increase the traffic through our neighborhoods
22 immensely. I really think we need to make sure we
23 have a second access on South. Even with that, I
24 think that we're going to increase a lot of

1 traffic through the neighborhoods.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So Mike is again
3 repeating the access to South Avenue to try to
4 decrease the impact of traffic through that
5 neighborhood basically to the southeast and the
6 south.

7 Is that correct, Mike?

8 MR. LANDERS: That is absolutely correct.
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you,
11 Mike.

12 Any other questions? Comments? I'm
13 hoping we'll get Laura to call in here.

14 MEMBER BECKER: I have a question of
15 staff. Is that all right?

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, Jennifer.

17 MEMBER BECKER: Will a traffic study be
18 (inaudible).

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I didn't catch that.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Will a traffic
21 study be required?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, will a traffic
23 study be required. Russ?

24 MS. JOHNSON: Typically for a development

1 of this size, a traffic study would be required if
2 it's requested. So if that's something that we
3 want to see in the future, then that should be
4 noted.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6 MR. AIRHART: I will say regarding
7 traffic, one of the benefits of a neighborhood
8 like this is that a lot of people that live here
9 are not the 7:00 a.m., 8:00 a.m., 8:15 a.m.
10 commuting types; and so the traffic patterns
11 actually vary greatly from the existing
12 neighborhoods.

13 Actually, typically for this housing type,
14 there's reduced trip generation; and so, you know,
15 if we're required to, we'll do a traffic study;
16 but I think the layout and the entrance on Tyler
17 is really beneficial for this. And what we've
18 seen is lower traffic generation than, say, a home
19 with a couple of kids and that type of thing.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. Any
21 other questions?

22 MR. TARRO: Can you hear me? Okay.
23 Great.

24 I actually walked over to Mike's house.

1 This is Jeff Tarro.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. How are you
3 doing?

4 MR. TARRO: Thank you so much for waiting.
5 Mike's computer was working, so I went there.
6 Sorry for the confusion or the connection of the
7 phone. (Inaudible.)

8 I know the property very well, and my main
9 concern is the developer is asking for variances.
10 I'm actually very concerned about the development
11 in general. With the apartments, Amli, that's
12 similar to putting in major density of the homes.
13 And I know four years ago a West Chicago
14 developer -- (inaudible). They actually went to
15 West Chicago because we didn't allow them to put
16 the homes in, and I believe the density for that
17 subdivision was far less than this is proposed.

18 So removing the (inaudible) as the
19 developer stated, and he's suggesting major
20 variances here to make the lot sizes much smaller
21 than the setback standards to make the homes on
22 the property.

23 And as I believe Jennifer had -- I'm not
24 sure who did -- there's really no green space.

1 This is extremely dense. It's pretty much the
2 whole area is going to be covered with buildings
3 and noise with no extra room for maintenance for
4 these empty nesters.

5 (Inaudible) property there's going to be a
6 handful of homes, I believe there's going to be
7 nine homes up in the upper section; and looking at
8 (inaudible) that when I mentioned, and he kind of
9 looked at it and he said, How are they going to
10 fit nine homes in that area? When you come in and
11 look, they have nine homes. It's just extremely
12 dense. I think we're moving in that direction
13 with a couple of new subdivisions we've put in,
14 and that's a concern to the residents and thinking
15 about safety here in town also.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Okay. So the
17 big concern is -- and his name once again was Jeff
18 Tarro, T-a-r-r-o, and his concern is with the
19 density and the number of homes that are being put
20 into this space.

21 All right. Are there any other questions
22 or comments? All right. Well, I think that
23 we've -- is there anything else?

24 MR. AIRHART: Can I respond just briefly?

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, yes, please do.

2 MR. AIRHART: One of the reasons we're
3 looking at the PUD zoning is because of the size
4 and shape. Actually our average lot size there is
5 about 8,000 square feet which is about 15 to
6 18 percent larger than the required lot size for
7 the RS-4 zoning, which is 6600. We do have some
8 lots that, yes, are smaller than the 6600, but it
9 has to do with kind of the size and shape of the
10 property.

11 So one of the reasons the PUD works well
12 is because we are going to have a larger lot. Our
13 average size actually is larger than the required
14 RS-4 just because the size and shape that we need
15 to make and shifting with that. So I'd just like
16 to let that be known.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. Any
18 other comments from Plan Commissioners? I think
19 people kind of made comments on their way through,
20 so I'm not going to go through and poll each Plan
21 Commissioner. If there's anything additional that
22 you have for the developer.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I just have
24 to add my vote. I think that a connection to

1 South Street is extremely necessary, extremely
2 necessary. We've been over this many times over
3 the last 15 years in this community, and one-in
4 and one-out with that many homes is more difficult
5 than we might imagine.

6 I'm also sure that it would be difficult
7 to get two exits out on Tyler Road in that small
8 of an area. So that makes South Street even more
9 important.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anyone
11 else?

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Can I have --

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, please.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just want to say
15 that I'm pleased to see a proposal for
16 single-family dwellings as we've had plenty of
17 apartment and town house proposals coming through.
18 The development of this property I also think
19 would be prudent for the City, plus homes that
20 have the current view, I think that's good too.

21 But then I get all crossed up, and I
22 understand the small lot sizes. I wonder how
23 this -- it may not even figure in to this, but the
24 Cambridge subdivision -- I don't know how that

1 compares to that other subdivision. That's
2 probably irrelevant but the small lot sizes.

3 And even more so I think the small lot
4 sizes is exceeding the building coverage
5 percentage on the lot. I think it's 30 percent
6 more, isn't it?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 37 1/2 percent, I
8 think.

9 MR. AIRHART: We're about 37 1/2 percent.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: 30 percent is the
11 accepted; right?

12 MR. AIRHART: Correct.

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And you're up to
14 37.5.

15 MR. AIRHART: Correct.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. And then I
17 worry about the street. I don't know what
18 information you were given. It's less than what
19 was acceptable. How that could be negotiated, I
20 don't know. These are the things I don't know. I
21 think it's great. I just think it's a great plan,
22 but the density of the homes. I want that to be a
23 single-family dwelling development. Those are my
24 concerns.

1 MR. AIRHART: I appreciate that. The
2 right-of-way width is 60 feet in the surrounding
3 communities. It matches the 60 feet. I think
4 there was a comment can you make the street a
5 little wider. Yes, we'd actually be happy to.

6 Regarding the lot size and density,
7 actually Fisher Farm, the subdivision I spoke of
8 earlier, those lots are actually 5300 square feet.
9 So you get people who are in this -- smaller than
10 these lots. You get people who are looking to
11 downsize. They're enjoying the patio and enjoying
12 the deck. They're not looking for a large lot and
13 maintenance. In fact, a lot of times when we
14 figure this out, these are going to be maintenance
15 free with landscaping and snow removal taken care
16 of.

17 And one of the things we look at is these
18 are people who want to get out beyond their doors
19 and enjoy some of the park areas and stuff like
20 that. So these lot sizes that we're proposing it
21 would be very relevant to see. Once again our
22 average is actually larger than what RS-4
23 requires, our average lot size. We do have some
24 that are below the RS-4 6600 requirement. So

1 appreciate your comments.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can I just ask you had
3 mentioned the three other developments --
4 Mackenzie Place, Fisher Farms, and Stafford Place.

5 MR. AIRHART: Stafford Place, yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can you just real
7 quick, I know the Mackenzie Place was the actual
8 name of the street in Wheaton.

9 Fisher Farm, where is Fisher Farm located?

10 MR. AIRHART: So Fisher Farm is located
11 off of St. Charles Road. It is west of Gary
12 Avenue, east of Pleasant Hill Road on the south
13 side of Taylor Drive. And so it's just on the
14 east side of Klein Creek Golf Course. You can
15 drive in there and see.

16 We are under construction of the last
17 three houses actually in that neighborhood. So
18 you can get a good feel for that.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You said Taylor Drive.

20 MR. AIRHART: Taylor Drive, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Okay.

22 MR. AIRHART: And those setbacks are
23 very -- we did like a shifting setback there.
24 It's not a 6 and 6. It's not an even width. It's

1 very similar to those, the 12- and 13-foot width
2 between those houses.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. And
4 how about Stafford Place? That's in Warrenville.

5 MR. AIRHART: Stafford Place is in
6 Warrenville. So Butterfield Road -- if you're on
7 Route 59, you go to Butterfield Road. At the
8 intersection of Butterfield and Route 59, you
9 would head east on Butterfield Road about a mile
10 and a half; and before you get to the intersection
11 of Batavia Road, which actually also enters
12 actually on Butterfield -- Batavia Road, you would
13 turn south on Rockwell Street into the
14 neighborhood.

15 You'll see our cottage homes upfront which
16 are our row homes, cottage homes; and then as you
17 drive on Mount Street there, you would see our 11
18 garden homes in the center of the development.

19 If you go to our website,
20 Airhartconstruction.com, that's where our model
21 is, so you can get an address if you want to
22 Google that address.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Those setbacks
24 are close.

1 MR. AIRHART: Those setbacks are actually
2 closer. The setbacks between those houses are
3 5 and 5.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

5 MR. AIRHART: One of the things also with
6 setbacks with single-level living is we're
7 bringing all of our roof plates down to first
8 floors. So it's not like you're having two-story,
9 two-story. We have a lot of first-floor roof
10 plates. So it actually brings the houses down and
11 diminishes the impact of them.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any other
13 questions or comments?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Anything else
16 from anyone online?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then unless
19 there's something else from staff, I think we can
20 conclude this item.

21 Thank you very much. Appreciate it.
22 We're looking forward to seeing you again.

23 (Off the record at 8:11 p.m.)
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 8th day of June, 2020.

My commission expires: May 16, 2024

Joanne E. Ely

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



Planet Depos®
We Make It *Happen™*

Transcript of Heitman Architects, Inc.

Date: June 2, 2020

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

-----x
In Re: BEMA, Inc., 3620 :
Ohio Avenue, Heitman :
Architects, Inc., Land :
Bank Parking Request :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Wednesday, June 2, 2020
8:11 p.m.

Job No.: 271899B
Pages: 1 - 11
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2
3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand
14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
15 of Illinois.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 PRESENT IN-PERSON:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

5 TOM PRETZ, Member

6
7 PRESENT VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE:

8 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

9 JEFF FUNKE, Member

10 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

11 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

12 PETER VARGULICH, Member

13
14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 RUSSELL COLBY, Community Development

16 Manager

17 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner, via audio

18 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 7 is
3 BEMA, Inc., which is 3620 Ohio Avenue, Heitman
4 Architects, Inc., land bank parking request.

5 Russ.

6 MS. JOHNSON: I will take this one. Can
7 you hear me?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, we can hear you.

9 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. The City has received
10 a request to allow land banking of required
11 parking for the BEMA, Incorporated, facility which
12 is located at 3620 Ohio Avenue in the M-2, Limited
13 Manufacturing District.

14 The zoning ordinance allows up to
15 25 percent of required parking for warehouse and
16 distribution uses in the M-2 district to be land
17 banked for future consideration or for future
18 construction.

19 BEMA is planning a new addition with
20 onsite circulation and new parking areas. BEMA is
21 adding the new addition size to the existing
22 building size. 120 spaces are required. They are
23 proposing to construct 100 spaces now with the
24 remaining 20 identified on the plan for future

1 construction if needed. This will constitute
2 17 percent of the parking requirement.

3 Per the zoning ordinance, land banked
4 parking requests require a recommendation from the
5 Plan Commission, and the petitioner has presented
6 a study that demonstrates that the number of
7 parking spaces can be reduced without affecting
8 their ability to adequately allow for their
9 parking demands, and the land banked parking would
10 not create a shortage of parking for other uses
11 located in the area.

12 The applicant has submitted a land bank
13 parking plan which addresses the five items that
14 are attached on your summary. And we're working
15 with the applicant to explain the plan. Please
16 hold on one minute. I got an e-mail from him.

17 Yes. So I see that you just sent me a
18 PowerPoint. I'm not able to share my screen. I
19 just sent it to Rachel.

20 Rachel, I just emailed you the PowerPoint.

21 MR. HEITMAN: So I can share my screen? I
22 can run it from my computer?

23 MS. JOHNSON: He should be able to share
24 his screen, if he goes to share.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. You should be
2 able to share your screen if you go to share.

3 MS. JOHNSON: Share content.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Share content. There
5 we go.

6 MR. HEITMAN: Okay. Thank you.

7 (Inaudible). We are proposing an addition
8 in the M-2, Limited Manufacturing District, at
9 3620 Ohio Avenue. This is a mirror view of the
10 existing property. We're the property on the left
11 in that circle. We are extending to the east.
12 The existing building will be removed, and we will
13 be building a 48,000-square-foot addition to the
14 same structure and facility.

15 So here is the existing survey drawing of
16 the property. The property is on -- as I
17 mentioned, this is the existing structure of this
18 building, and the existing building will be taken
19 down to accommodate the addition.

20 Hopefully, the screen is tracking. So you
21 should be seeing on the screen a site plan of the
22 proposed addition. The existing building is to
23 the left. You can see the building we're
24 proposing will have seven docks at angles, and the

1 docks are accessed off a (inaudible) to the
2 property, and it's located within a 40-foot
3 building setback.

4 We are proposing 100 spaces, and the
5 requirement would be of 120 spaces, and we're
6 seeking approval of the parking of what's stated
7 or the 70 percent.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

9 MR. HEITMAN: So there are 31 spaces
10 located to the south of the building addition and
11 59 spaces located to the North.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And so the spaces along
13 the north property line, they're kind of dim
14 there. Those are the ones that are being reserved
15 but not constructed; correct?

16 MR. HEITMAN: Correct. They're there if
17 the future spaces should then be needed.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Ellen, what would
19 trigger construction of those spaces? Would there
20 be an event that would require them to construct
21 those?

22 MS. JOHNSON: The code says that the City
23 can request or require that the business owner
24 construct those spaces if there's a shortage, if

1 there has been complaints of inadequate parking,
2 or if there's issues that are occurring on the
3 property with parking, that the City has the
4 ability to require they be constructed.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. Are
6 there any questions from any members of the Plan
7 Commission?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything from the
10 public?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. In that case, I
13 would call for a motion.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a
15 motion to recommend approval to the Planning and
16 Development Committee of the City Council to
17 approve the land bank parking request at 3620 Ohio
18 Avenue, Heitman Architects, Inc.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
21 moved and seconded.

22 Any discussion on the motion?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. We're going to

1 do a roll call, Tim.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker. Becker.

3 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: She said yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: She said yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

11 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Did you say Jeff Funke?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. Funke.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I knew we missing
23 somebody.

24 All right. That's unanimous, and that

1 concludes Item 7.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. HEITMAN: Thank you very much.

4 (Off the record at 8:18 p.m.)

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 8th day of June, 2020.

My commission expires: May 16, 2024

Joanne E. Ely

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



Planet Depos®
We Make It *Happen™*

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision

Date: June 2, 2020

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

-----x
In Re: 1734 Riverside :
Subdivision, City of :
St. Charles, Application :
for Minor Subdivision :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Wednesday, June 2, 2020
8:18 p.m.

Job No.: 271899C
Pages: 1 - 13
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

2

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

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

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

3

1 PRESENT IN-PERSON:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

5 TOM PRETZ, Member

6
7 PRESENT VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE:

8 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

9 JEFF FUNKE, Member

10 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

11 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

12 PETER VARGULICH, Member

13
14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 RUSSELL COLBY, Community Development
16 Manager

17 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner, via audio

18 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 8 is
3 1734 Riverside subdivision, City of St. Charles,
4 application for minor subdivision.

5 MS. JOHNSON: The subject property is a
6 half-acre unsubdivided parcel at the northeast
7 corner of Riverside and Moore Avenues. A
8 significant portion of the property is located in
9 the floodway and a floodplain. The City purchased
10 the property two years ago and demolished the
11 previous home that was located on the property in
12 support of the 7th Avenue Creek Project.

13 The plat of subdivision has been submitted
14 by the City represented by Ken Jay in the public
15 works department. He is proposing to divide the
16 parcel into two lots. Lot 2, the majority of
17 which is outside the floodplain, will be available
18 as a buildable lot for a single-family home.

19 Staff recommends approval of the final
20 plat of subdivision subject to resolution of all
21 staff comments.

22 Also I believe Ken Jay is on the line for
23 public works if there's any questions for him.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes, I have a

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

5

1 question.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So it appears
4 that, I believe, it's Lot 1 would be in the
5 floodplain; is that correct?

6 MR. JAY: Yeah. It would be in the
7 proposed floodplain. Can you hear me?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I noticed this
9 when I looked at the material, the 100-year
10 floodplain became a 500-year floodplain.

11 But is Lot 1 -- almost all of Lot 1 is in
12 that floodplain; is that correct?

13 MR. JAY: Yeah. Can you hear me? Can you
14 see the plan?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I'm sorry.

16 MR. COLBY: Could everyone hear Ken?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, I can't hear him.

18 MR. COLBY: He was responding.

19 Ken, can we get an answer again and maybe
20 try to speak up.

21 MR. JAY: Sure. The majority of Lot 1 is
22 in the floodplain; correct.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I guess I'm
24 not real clear. I thought you couldn't build on a

1 floodplain. So why are we -- what's the rationale
2 here?

3 MR. JAY: Lot 1, there's no intention to
4 build on Lot 1 at this time. There currently was
5 a house on Lot 1. That was in the floodplain, and
6 that's what the City purchased and demolished, and
7 there is no current plan to build but in the
8 future (inaudible).

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I'm not
10 real clear on any of this. I mean, when you
11 subdivide the two lots, and I'm reading this, and
12 Lot 1 is almost entirely in the floodplain. Lot 2
13 is not. You say there currently is no plan to
14 build on Lot 1, but isn't it correct there will
15 never be a plan to build on Lot 1 in the
16 floodplain?

17 MR. COLBY: I don't know if Ken is there,
18 but I can try and answer the question.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

20 MR. COLBY: The City's intent with
21 purchasing this property was to personally remove
22 the house from the floodplain but also to
23 subdivide the property to be able to have a
24 buildable lot on Lot 2. Lot 1 would continue to

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

7

1 be owned.

2 MS. HITZEMANN: The phone hung up again.

3 (A recess was taken from 8:23 p.m. to
4 8:24 p.m.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Can you hear me?

6 MR. JAY: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can you finish,
9 Russ.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Ken.

11 MR. JAY: I'm here.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Russ was answering
14 the question.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ was offering an
16 explanation.

17 MR. COLBY: Yes. So the City purchased
18 this lot with the intent of, as Ken had mentioned,
19 to tear down the existing house that was there in
20 the floodplain; and in subdividing, Lot 2 will be
21 available as a buildable lot that a house could be
22 constructed on.

23 Lot 1, the ownership will be retained by
24 the City for the time being, recognizing that it's

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

8

1 almost entirely within the floodplain/floodway.
2 So the City has long-range projects to improve the
3 7th Avenue Creek so that that floodway area would
4 be reduced in the future. So it's possible that
5 at some point in the future that could be a
6 buildable lot; but for the time being, the City
7 would retain ownership of it.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Would the City
9 retain ownership of it forever or until it became
10 a buildable lot?

11 MR. COLBY: Yes. I believe that's the
12 intention.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you,
14 Russ.

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

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: I had some questions.
18 This is Peter.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: In asking for this
21 subdivision, Russ was stating Lot 1 may or may not
22 ever be sold to the public, and it may be retained
23 by the City; but Lot 2 is going to be offered in
24 the near future, hopefully. The current

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

9

1 subdivision will cause the builder and the buyer
2 to have flood insurance. There will be floodplain
3 on the lot. Are you aware of that?

4 MR. JAY: This is Ken. I will speak to
5 that. That's actually not true. The only flood
6 insurance is if the floodplain touches your
7 structure; and when you take that insurance, you
8 can get an elevation certificate which certifies
9 that your structure is not in a floodplain, and
10 then you don't need flood insurance.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. If it touches
12 your property, then they have to?

13 MR. JAY: There are insurers out there who
14 treat it that way, but that is not the letter of
15 the law.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Sure.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
19 questions?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. All right. Seeing
22 none, do we have a motion on this application?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd make a motion
24 to recommend approval to the Planning and

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

10

1 Development Committee of the City Council for 1734
2 Riverside Subdivision, City of St. Charles,
3 application for a minor division --

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Subject to staff
5 comments.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- subject to
7 staff comments.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's moved and
11 seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Tim, roll call.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

15 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

19 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

11

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

3 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes
8 unanimously, and that concludes Item No. 8 on our
9 agenda.

10 Is there any additional business from the
11 Plan Commission members or staff?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The weekly development
14 reports you should have received.

15 Meeting announcements -- do we have any
16 plans for future meetings?

17 MR. COLBY: We do have a meeting scheduled
18 for June the 16th, so we are planning to have that
19 meeting at this time.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So June 16th. I
21 would say just --

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Stay tuned.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Stay tuned.

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

12

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Stay tuned.

2 All right. Any comment from any member of
3 the public?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Nope. All right. Is
6 there a motion to adjourn?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So moved
10 and seconded. All in favor.

11 (Ayes heard.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The City of St. Charles
15 Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

16 (Off the record at 8:29 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Application for Minor Subdivision
Conducted on June 2, 2020

13

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 8th day of June, 2020.

My commission expires: May 16, 2024

Joanne E. Ely

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois