

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 20, 2021**

Members Present: Vice Chairman Peter Vargulich
Jennifer Becker
Jeffrey Funke
Colleen Wiese
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Laurel Moad

Members Absent: Jim Holderfield
Suzanne Melton

Also Present: Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Russell Colby, Asst. Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Ellen Johnson, City Planner
Rachel Hitzemann, City Planner
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the June 22, 2021 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Ms. Becker, seconded by Mr. Funke and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2021 Plan Commission meeting.

Commissioners agreed to amend the order of the agenda and heard Item 7 prior to Items 5 and 6.

7. First Street Redevelopment PUD – Alter Brewing, 12 S. 1st St. (Douglas B. Walker)

Application for Special Use (PUD Amendment)

a. Public Hearing

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

Motion was made by Ms. Macklin-Purdy and seconded by Ms. Moad to close the public hearing.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, July 20, 2021

Page 2

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Funke, Moad, Macklin-Purdy, Wiese, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent: Holderfield, Melton

Motion carried 6-0

b. Discussion & Recommendation

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

Motion was made by Ms. Macklin-Purdy and seconded by Ms. Moad to recommend approval of the Application for Special Use (PUD Amendment) for First Street Redevelopment PUD – Alter Brewing, 12 S. 1st St., upon resolution of staff comments.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Funke, Moad, Macklin-Purdy, Wiese, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent: Holderfield, Melton

Motion carried 6-0

5. River East Apartments (Conrad Hurst)

Application for Concept Plan

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

6. Dean Street Mixed-Use Project (Slaten Construction, Inc.)

Application for Concept Plan

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

8. Election of Officers

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

Motion was made by Ms. Macklin-Purdy and seconded by Ms. Moad to elect Peter Vargulich as Chairman.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Funke, Moad, Macklin-Purdy, Wiese, Becker

Nays:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, July 20, 2021
Page 3

Absent: Holderfield, Melton
Motion carried 5-0

Motion was made by Mr. Funke and seconded by Ms. Becker to elect Laura Macklin-Purdy as Vice Chairman.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Funke, Moad, Macklin-Purdy, Wiese, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent: Holderfield, Melton

Motion carried 6-0

- 9. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None**
- 10. Weekly Development Report**
- 11. Meeting Announcements**
 - a. Plan Commission
 - Tuesday, August 3, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Tuesday, August 17, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Tuesday, September 7, 2021 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room
 - b. Planning & Development Committee
 - Monday, August 9, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Monday, September 13, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- 12. Public Comment**
- 13. Adjournment at 9:32 p.m.**



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

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment PUD - Alter Brewing

Date: July 20, 2021

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: First Street :
Redevelopment PUD, Alter :
Brewing, Application for :
Special Use (PUD :
Amendment) :

-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, July 20, 2021
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 336730A
Pages: 1 - 20
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 First Street Redevelopment PUD - Alter Brewing
Conducted on July 20, 2021

3

1 PRESENT:

2 PETER VARGULICH, Vice Chairman

3 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

6 LAUREL MOAD, Member

7 COLLEEN WIESE, Member

8

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSSELL COLBY, Assistant Director of
11 Community & Economic Development

12 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

13 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

14 RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community &
15 Economic Development

16 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I would like to
3 call the meeting of the St. Charles Plan
4 Commission to order.

5 Roll call, Jim Holderfield.

6 (No response.)

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura Moad.

8 MEMBER MOAD: Here.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura Purdy.

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

14 MEMBER WIESE: Here.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

16 MEMBER BECKER: Here.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sue Melton.

18 (No response.)

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So
20 if everybody would please stand for the Pledge of
21 Allegiance.

22 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So on the
24 presentation of the meeting minutes from our last

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment PUD - Alter Brewing
Conducted on July 20, 2021

5

1 meeting on June 22nd, is there a motion to
2 approve?

3 MEMBER MOAD: So moved.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Second by Funke.

6 All in favor?

7 (Ayes heard.)

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Opposed.

9 (No response.)

10 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion passes.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I would like to
12 make a suggestion that we move Item No. 7 up to
13 the first item or it would be No. 5. I know
14 there's a lot of people here that want to talk,
15 and I think the First Street Redevelopment PUD
16 would probably go through pretty quickly.

17 So is anyone in agreement with that?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Do we need a
19 formal motion for that, Russ? No.

20 MR. COLBY: No. If the Commission is in
21 agreement, you can hear that item first.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So
23 we're going to do that.

24 All right. So as far as some housekeeping

1 rules on this, this item is a public hearing. The
2 role of the Plan Commission is to conduct public
3 hearings on zoning applications that are filed
4 with the City.

5 All testimony and evidence both for and
6 against this application shall be given under
7 oath.

8 We'd like the applicant to make a
9 presentation first. Then we'll take questions by
10 the Commission, followed by questions the members
11 of the public. After that, we will take comments
12 from the public or anyone else wishing to give
13 testimony.

14 The Plan Commission will then discuss the
15 evidence gathered related to the findings of fact.
16 The findings of fact submitted by the applicant
17 are attached to the packet.

18 The form is called Criteria for PUDs, and
19 the PUD and PUD amendments, such as this, there is
20 one single finding that must be found in the
21 affirmative for the Plan Commission to recommend
22 approval, and that is that this proposal is in the
23 public interest.

24 When the Plan Commission feels it has

1 gathered enough evidence to make a recommendation
2 to the City's Planning and Development Committee,
3 we will close the public hearing and vote on a
4 recommendation.

5 Before we begin, I'd like to have
6 everybody who wishes to give testimony or to ask
7 questions or to provide comments to be sworn in.

8 So if you're planning to do that for this
9 item, if you could please stand.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Which one?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. This is for
12 the First Street Redevelopment PUD, Alter Brewing,
13 12 South 1st Street. On your agenda, it's Item
14 No. 7. The Plan Commission decided to move that
15 up first. Okay.

16 (Witnesses sworn.)

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: When you're
18 speaking, please stand at the lectern, state your
19 name, spell your last name, and state your address
20 for the record as we have a court reporter.

21 And so if you're ready, please come.

22 MR. WALKSLER: Thank you. I'm glad I
23 showed up on time. Doug Walksler, 1080 Wexford
24 Court, Wheaton, Illinois, partner in Alter Brewing

1 Company, presenting a request for -- an
2 application for a PUD amendment.

3 Thanks. A request for a PUD amendment to
4 allow for graphics on the upper container bar
5 covers for a seasonal use.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Anybody have any
7 questions or anything right now?

8 Did you want to show any more slides
9 related to this? There's just the one, but I
10 think there's a couple more.

11 MR. WALKSLER: Sure.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: They might be
13 helpful.

14 MR. WALKSLER: Thank you.

15 So this slide represents the actual plan
16 for the graphics showing the dimensions of the
17 canvas covers. There's one cover that's on the
18 east elevation of the upper container; and let's
19 see, and that one, one cover that's on the north
20 elevation of the upper container.

21 The canvas covers themselves were approved
22 as a part of a minor PUD amendment in 2019. That
23 was a part of our whole plan build-out project.

24 The other items that were included in that

1 minor PUD amendment were the seasonal enclosure
2 that you see in this slide, the container bar,
3 first- and second-level container bars themselves,
4 and building signage and awnings.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So this is
6 basically what was up all last year; correct?

7 MR. WALKSLER: This was up -- yes. Well,
8 not all last year but the winter season.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: The winter season.

10 MR. WALKSLER: Yes.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

12 MEMBER BECKER: So for my purpose, I
13 didn't see this last year. You say seasonal. So
14 it's only during the winter?

15 MR. WALKSLER: Yes. So the upper
16 container -- that's a good question. The upper
17 container is hospitality space. So when we can
18 operate hospitality on our patio and outdoors, you
19 know, we have it open. Those openings are just
20 open, wide open for the public to use and view and
21 enjoy the view of the river from the upper
22 container.

23 Then when the weather turns, and it's not
24 always that predictable, but the idea is that when

1 the weather turns, we change the use of our patio
2 completely. We install the -- for the season, we
3 install the seasonal enclosure and then cover the
4 upper container just really for weather
5 protection.

6 MEMBER BECKER: And the seasonal enclosure
7 that's in white, that has a sign on it when it's
8 up also.

9 MR. WALKSLER: It does.

10 MEMBER BECKER: Okay.

11 MR. WALKSLER: Yeah. That's a real-time
12 photograph, image.

13 MEMBER BECKER: Is the purpose for, of
14 course, for advertising, but kind of drawing
15 attention to the building in the winter?

16 MR. WALKSLER: Yeah. The concept is
17 containers are really unique architecture, really
18 unique structures -- and unique architecture, and
19 there's -- you know, there's many ways that they
20 can be -- their appearance can be enhanced so they
21 just -- they just don't look like -- you know,
22 like a blocky shipping container.

23 And you all may have seen these containers
24 when they're operating, but when they are, and

1 they're open, you know, the insides of them are
2 orange, which is a part of our, you know, our
3 brand, kind of a burnt orange.

4 And in the lower container, not the upper
5 container, there's actually an Alter graphic
6 that's visible, you know, when the lower container
7 is open.

8 So our notion was to create -- to create
9 an element, an architectural element that was more
10 attractive than, you know, just simply a canvas
11 cover over a container.

12 MEMBER BECKER: Thank you.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: There was a
14 recommendation by the Historic Preservation
15 Commission regarding limits on time and how that
16 would be done.

17 Have you had time to think about that?

18 MR. WALKSLER: Yeah. It was discussed at
19 the Historical Commission level; and what seemed
20 to make sense to us was the seasonal enclosure
21 by -- I think it's a requirement of the PUD
22 amendment, the minor PUD amendment has a limit of
23 180 days of use.

24 That's not defined which 180 days it is

1 because it's a flexible weather environment, but
2 it seemed to us to make sense to tie the canvas
3 cover treatment to that same time period.

4 I think that was the recommendation of the
5 Historical Commission. Rachel may --

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I believe that's
7 true, but staff can help.

8 MS. HITZEMANN: Yeah. So it's the
9 recommendation to correlate the covers with the
10 tent. So when the tent was up, the covers could
11 be up; and when the tent came down, the covers
12 would come down.

13 And it's 180 days, like he said, flexible,
14 so there's not a specific date that it has to go
15 up and come down, but within 180 days.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question.
18 What's the allowable square footage for signage
19 that you guys have on the site for your space, and
20 what are you proposing?

21 MR. WALKSLER: I don't know.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: You don't know.

23 MR. WALKSLER: I do not. I don't know
24 the -- you know, the signage was approved as a

1 part of the minor PUD amendment. So I actually
2 don't know how that got dealt with in terms of
3 size of signs.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: So do you think you're a
5 little bit over, or do you think you're double
6 what's allowed?

7 Do we know that?

8 MS. HITZEMANN: So the signage goes back
9 to the underlying zoning, which is the CBD-1,
10 which permits 1 1/2 square feet per lineal foot on
11 which -- the wall on which the sign is located.
12 They're permitted to have two wall signs, and they
13 do -- or they have one, I believe, that meets that
14 requirement facing Main Street.

15 And then they're also permitted to have
16 awning signs, which are allowed to be 1 square
17 foot per width of the awning, and they have those.
18 So this would be kind of a new classification, and
19 it would be permitted under the special use, to
20 have this sign be permitted as part of the
21 special use.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: So do we know what that
23 calculation is? Do we know what they're proposing
24 and what's allowed by --

1 MS. HITZEMANN: So we don't have a
2 classification for this type of sign. So
3 technically nothing, as of right now, in the code
4 would allow this sign per square footage. But we
5 could calculate -- I could calculate what they're
6 proposing.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah. I'm just curious
8 with the size of the signs, size of the letters
9 and what's -- because it looks like they're -- in
10 my mind, it looks like they're a lot over what's
11 allowed.

12 MEMBER BECKER: So a follow-up question to
13 that, if this isn't allowed by ordinance, in lieu
14 of making a general amendment, you're going to
15 be -- the applicant is proposing adding this new
16 type of signage under the PUD.

17 MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

18 MEMBER BECKER: So it wouldn't be
19 universally applicable to the rest of the
20 community.

21 MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

22 MEMBER BECKER: It would just be for this
23 particular site.

24 MS. HITZEMANN: Correct, yes.

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment PUD - Alter Brewing
Conducted on July 20, 2021

15

1 MEMBER BECKER: Thank you.

2 MS. HITZEMANN: And the size of the
3 signage would also be tied to these particular
4 signs. They wouldn't be applicable to any other
5 signs within the City.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I think it's the
7 idea that this is a unique situation, and so we're
8 to address it from that standpoint as an amendment
9 to a unique PUD that they were allowed and granted
10 previously.

11 The sign on the front of the seasonal
12 enclosure, is that part of the calculation, or is
13 that part of the structure that was approved?

14 MS. HITZEMANN: That was also part of the
15 minor change that was approved.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

17 MEMBER BECKER: Did we review this? We
18 did?

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes, we did.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

21 MEMBER BECKER: I don't remember.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I would actually
23 like to make a recommendation for approval for the
24 First Street Redevelopment PUD, Alter Brewing, 12

1 South --

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sorry. We need
3 to close the public hearing.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Oh, sorry. I
5 recommend that we close the public hearing.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So first off, is
7 there anybody from the public -- since nobody else
8 stood up, but by chance, did somebody else come in
9 who would like to either ask questions or give
10 testimony?

11 (No response.)

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Not seeing
13 anybody, so that's all good.

14 All right. Is there anything else from
15 Plan Commission members?

16 (No response.)

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. There are
18 no other comments from the public. So do we feel
19 that we can close the public hearing formally and
20 take care of that. So is there a motion?

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I make a motion to
22 close the public hearing.

23 MEMBER MOAD: Second.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We have a

1 second. Is there any discussion on that, any
2 further discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So
5 if we could please have a roll call and vote.

6 Laura Moad.

7 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura Purdy.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

13 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

15 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Peter, me, yes.

17 All right. So now with that closed, we
18 can move to the next item, which would be 7b.

19 MR. WALKSLER: Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So is there any
21 other discussion?

22 MEMBER FUNKE: I guess I've got a
23 question. So is this a temporary sign? This is
24 just for 180 days out of the year?

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment PUD - Alter Brewing
Conducted on July 20, 2021

18

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Seasonal.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Seasonal. Okay.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I guess

4 temporary, but they're tying it to a seasonal --

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- aspect of the
7 PUD.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: All right.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So would anybody
10 like to make a motion or a recommendation?

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I would like to
12 make a motion or recommendation for First Street
13 Redevelopment PUD, Alter Brewing, 12th South 1st
14 Street, Douglas B. Walker -- Walksler, application
15 for special use PUD amendment.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

17 MEMBER MOAD: Second.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So
19 we have a second. Any other discussion before
20 we vote?

21 Roll call on the vote. Laura Moad.

22 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment PUD - Alter Brewing
Conducted on July 20, 2021

19

1 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura Purdy.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

4 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

6 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

8 All right. That concludes this item.

9 Thank you very much.

10 (Off the record at 7:17 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF 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 26th day of July, 2021. 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 River East Apartments

Date: July 20, 2021

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: River East :
Apartments, Application :
for Concept Plan :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, July 20, 2021
7:17 p.m.

Job No.: 336730B
Pages: 1 - 93
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 River East Apartments

Conducted on July 20, 2021

3

1 PRESENT:

2 PETER VARGULICH, Vice Chairman

3 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

6 LAUREL MOAD, Member

7 COLLEEN WIESE, Member

8

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSSELL COLBY, Assistant Director of

11 Community & Economic Development

12 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

13 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

14 RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community &

15 Economic Development

16 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Now, we come
3 back to Item 5 on the agenda.

4 So the next two items, the first one will
5 be River East Apartments, are going to be concept
6 plan types of discussions and public input.

7 So for these plans, everyone here, these
8 are just for remarks. There's no particular
9 voting with respect to something being approved.
10 So the purpose of this is we allow the applicant
11 to have informal input on their conceptual plan,
12 which would be their application that they have
13 submitted and with respect to any drawings or
14 details that they have provided.

15 The concept plan process serves as a forum
16 for our citizens, neighboring property owners to
17 ask questions and express views on the potential
18 development.

19 Our procedure tonight will be to start
20 with the applicant's presentation. After that,
21 the Plan Commission will ask questions. Then
22 members of the public who wish to speak will be
23 given a chance to do so. After that, finally,
24 Plan Commission members will offer final feedback.

1 The Plan Commission will not take any
2 action with respect to approving or denying this
3 project. After this meeting, the concept plan
4 will be discussed again at the Planning and
5 Development Committee meeting of the City Council.
6 If the applicant decides to pursue this project,
7 zoning applications will be filed, and property
8 owners will be noticed again.

9 I ask anyone who wishes to speak to allow
10 me to recognize them. Again, you will come up to
11 the lectern, state your name and your address for
12 the record.

13 So River East Apartments, Conrad Hurst.
14 You guys ready?

15 MR. CURT HURST: Good evening. Thank you
16 for letting us present this evening. Thanks for
17 the introduction as well in terms of the process,
18 which is really what we're wanting to do is to get
19 some informal input before we go through all of
20 the, you know, final engineering and those
21 processes to make sure that -- oh, I'm sorry.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And also if you
23 could please introduce yourselves --

24 MR. CURT HURST: Yeah. I'm sorry. I

1 apologize.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- for the
3 record and for the public.

4 MR. CURT HURST: Yes. I'm Curt Hurst, and
5 I live on 700 North Third Avenue in St. Charles.

6 MR. CONRAD HURST: Conrad Hurst, 9 East
7 Main Street, St. Charles.

8 MR. CURT HURST: So I already said that
9 part, so I won't go back on that.

10 I'd like to open with the fact that what
11 we've been looking at, you know, over the
12 course -- and, obviously, everybody is relatively
13 aware of, you know, that we are doing some other
14 things in downtown St. Charles.

15 But we paid close attention to what the
16 2013 comprehensive plan for the City of
17 St. Charles is really presenting because it's gone
18 through a rigorous process over the years to kind
19 of get to where it is now, which is really to help
20 guide development within the City to what the
21 community and the City wants. So it's been very
22 well thought out, and it's been put together in
23 terms of how that is presented.

24 What this site is identified within that

1 comprehensive plan -- it's a 2013 plan, which was
2 updated in 2020 as well. And this site is located
3 in what's called the "Downtown Subarea" within the
4 comprehensive plan. That's all in the package.
5 Rather than kind of flipping back and forth, I
6 think I'll just keep the comments relatively
7 general.

8 It's further identified as a catalyst
9 site; and in that catalyst site, it's got one of
10 the greater potentials for riverfront development
11 on the east side, particularly, which we think is
12 significant.

13 And then also it's a southern gateway to
14 the downtown area. As a southern gateway, it
15 should include some features that are important
16 not only, you know, it is, you know, the front
17 door, if you will, from the south. So some things
18 that, you know, architecturally and, you know, use
19 wise we think should be part of the plan.

20 The primary objective of the comp plan is
21 to provide mixed uses that foster active -- an
22 active and interesting district. These are all
23 things -- I'm paraphrasing a little bit, but these
24 are all things identified in the comprehensive

1 plan. We just wanted to make sure that everybody
2 understands that we are trying to work within the
3 framework of that comprehensive plan.

4 So having said that, some of the things
5 that are on this site plan that we think are
6 relevant are looking at the southern part of
7 that -- again, we'll admit that the plans at this
8 stage are very raw. So you have to kind of look
9 at it with, you know, what the intentions are as
10 opposed to the specific things within it because
11 they're not fully developed.

12 We continue to develop them as we get
13 input, as we think of things, as we, you know,
14 look around at what's happening in the rest of
15 downtown St. Charles. We want to make sure that
16 we're considering all those things. So this is
17 just a very raw plan at this stage.

18 At the southern part of the -- we'll just
19 call it -- there's actually three parcels there.
20 It's the -- on the north side, which is -- it's
21 hard, I don't know if I have a pointer there. But
22 the north side where the existing parking lot is,
23 you're all familiar with it, it's got the BMO ATM
24 in it.

1 We currently own that site. It came as
2 part of our acquisition with the BMO parcel.
3 There were three parcels that came with that
4 acquisition. One was the BMO building and the
5 parking that's to the south of that immediately,
6 this site, and then also the site on the other
7 side of Illinois Street here which is part of the
8 Riverside building, which has Pollyanna and
9 Flagship in it. So those three parcels were part
10 of that acquisition.

11 Subsequent to that, we bought the former
12 Chamber building, which is how that's identified
13 on there, and that's how everybody, you know,
14 affectionately knows that building. It housed the
15 Chamber of Commerce for the most part. There were
16 a couple of other smaller tenants in there, but we
17 purchased that building about four months ago.

18 And then the balance of that triangular
19 area, the southern part is currently Indiana
20 Avenue and a small open area of park space.

21 So our thoughts here are, to be consistent
22 with the comp plan, to kind of, first of all,
23 consolidate all of those just so we can get more
24 of an entrance feature, if you will, from the

1 south, including, you know, again it may not show
2 it here very well, but it does anticipate open
3 space down there that, you know, encourages
4 outdoor activity. You know, whatever outdoor
5 activity is, whether it's for public or private
6 use.

7 Our anticipated use on that would be --
8 and I've had the conversations with the intended
9 user in here, so I can now kind of talk about it
10 publicly, which I haven't been able to do previous
11 to this.

12 The first floor of this building is going
13 to be Sammy's Bikes, and he's going to expand his
14 operation and to do a lot of other things that are
15 very pedestrian oriented, which will be some
16 rentals of kayaks, those types of things. He's
17 going to have an outdoor cafe that has mostly a
18 juice bar, that type of thing.

19 If you're familiar with, which you all
20 are, the Riverside corridor, it's a very active
21 bicycle and pedestrian area already; and we're
22 just trying to take that momentum and enhance it
23 so that, you know, this site is fully utilized not
24 only for that but also for the Riverside Avenue

1 corridor altogether.

2 So that's kind of the plan, if you will,
3 for the southern tip of that. The Chamber
4 building we're currently -- it's currently an
5 existing building obviously. We're expanding the
6 footprint a little bit to the north, not
7 significantly, but on the first floor that
8 building will go from approximately 5700 square
9 feet to approximately 7500 to 8,000 square feet,
10 depending on how that final footprint works out,
11 and that will all be one user, which is Sammy's
12 Bikes.

13 And then above that, as the architecture
14 kind of indicates, we're doing four stories of
15 apartment units that will also extend out over the
16 existing parking lot. That existing parking lot
17 is going to stay in place, as noted in the
18 package, and so there's currently 37 parking spots
19 on there.

20 Depending on how the architecture lays
21 out, you know, we have to think of structural
22 items, it could be as low as 32 but somewhere
23 between 32 and 35 parking spots will remain on
24 that flat-surface parking lot.

1 There's also currently 11 parking spots in
2 the rear of the building that exist today. Those
3 are City parking spots, and then we're proposing
4 adding another 11 spots along Second Avenue and
5 eight more spots on Riverside Avenue. That will
6 get the count up to approximately 62, depending on
7 how that 37 shakes out between 32 and 37.

8 So currently there are 48 spots. We're
9 proposing to make it into 62 spots. I think the
10 package actually says 51; but if you do the count,
11 it gets it to 62.

12 In addition to that, a lot of the things
13 that we're really focused on here are -- and it
14 actually is part of the comprehensive plan as well
15 is that a big component of being in the downtown
16 area is to make it pedestrian friendly, to make it
17 oriented to, you know, walk about, walkability in
18 the downtown area, using the services that are
19 provided by all businesses within the downtown
20 area.

21 And currently, Riverside Avenue is -- I'm
22 not going to state the width because it's X width.
23 We are proposing to narrow that down a little bit
24 just so that we can slow the traffic down a little

1 bit. It's called -- in the engineering world,
2 which we learned, it's called traffic-calming
3 measures.

4 So really one of the things that you can
5 do is to narrow the street down a little bit and
6 provide some things, for instance, the crosswalk
7 that goes across to the street there is raised
8 about 6 inches. I forget the technical name
9 for it.

10 It's a sidewalk basically but, you know,
11 maybe it's done in pavers, but it's raised up a
12 little bit, and you put signs there to let
13 everybody know, but it definitely slows things
14 down. It acts as a speed bump essentially. It
15 also elevates pedestrians so that they can be seen
16 as they're going back and forth, which again
17 that's all part of the comprehensive plan is to
18 make this, you know, very accessible to
19 pedestrians, bicycles, everybody using the
20 downtown services.

21 So, in general, we want to continue that.
22 It's not reflected in this PUD or this plan; but
23 further north on the other side of Illinois on
24 Riverside Avenue, we're continuing that theme so

1 that there's a lot of walkability and
2 traffic-calming measures so that we're slowing
3 that traffic that's going down.

4 We don't have the opportunity to do that
5 on Route 64, but we can certainly impact that
6 here, and I think First Street is a great example
7 of that. The First Street development has done a
8 great job down there in terms of slowing traffic
9 down and making it very walkable.

10 Even with the new closure of that First
11 Street from North Avenue, I think it's a great
12 addition to downtown as well because it does do
13 all of that -- make it much more pedestrian
14 friendly.

15 So in general, those are the overall
16 comments that I would make rather than getting
17 into each of the specific items, but I'm sure, you
18 know, there's going to be an opportunity to talk
19 about those as questions come up.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Before you
21 conclude, could you -- if they're available on
22 this, could you walk us through the building a
23 little bit both architecturally or floor plan just
24 so that we understand what you're -- you've talked

1 about the units, but could you help us understand
2 that.

3 MR. CURT HURST: Sure. Absolutely. This
4 is probably the right picture for that, for the
5 footprint.

6 If you see the dotted line kind of in the
7 middle of that building, and the part to the south
8 is, essentially, the existing Chamber of Commerce
9 building right now.

10 The part to the north would be the added
11 part on the second -- second, third, fourth, and
12 fifth floors. And also on the south part, which
13 is the current Chamber building, we would have the
14 second, third, fourth, and fifth floor as well.

15 The first floor will remain, essentially,
16 intact as it is from a front elevation with some
17 awnings, decorative items that are included in the
18 architecture, and a little bit of an expansion of
19 the footprint. So like I said earlier, that
20 footprint gets from about 5700 square feet plus or
21 minus to 8,000 square feet, depending on what that
22 final architecture looks like.

23 So that, essentially, you know, talks
24 about the footprint of it. The architecture --

1 well, okay, let's go back to that one.

2 So you can see how the apartments lay out
3 on there. Our goal for the apartments here -- you
4 know, our target for these are to be the urban
5 professional, for lack of a better word, don't
6 know what that means necessarily, but for those
7 people that want to use the downtown services,
8 live, work in the downtown area.

9 And maybe it's a springboard to buying
10 their first home as well. I don't want to
11 pigeonhole myself into X dollars per month, but
12 they're certainly for that urban professional; and
13 if I can use, you know, an example of somebody, we
14 have 300 employees that work at ALE. That's our
15 target market.

16 We want those folks to live, work,
17 entertain downtown, grow their families, move to,
18 you know, homes within the St. Charles community
19 because they love being in the St. Charles
20 community. That's what we've done in the last 20
21 years. I've raised my sons, my children here. So
22 we love the downtown area.

23 So that's kind of the footprint. There
24 are 12 apartments, plus or minus. Again, we say

1 that based on what the final architecture and
2 footprints come out to, the engineering, all of
3 those things. So we're working through all of
4 those, again, getting all the input from all the
5 stakeholders in it.

6 The next one is the architecture, which,
7 again, we've been through a couple of iterations
8 through this both before we put the first one in
9 front of the Historic Commission, which really
10 wasn't -- you know, they didn't like it, to be
11 very honest. It was somewhat -- it was the first
12 one before this.

13 It was somewhat modern. You know, you
14 could say that, you know, and that's what was
15 told. So we made some adjustments to it, and then
16 we looked at the comprehensive plan and took some
17 of the things in there again as well.

18 They want you to step back -- you know, if
19 you're going to go to a certain number of floors,
20 they want you to step back that top floor. Maybe
21 we accomplished that, maybe we didn't on this one,
22 but we're certainly open to the comments on how we
23 get through that process.

24 By no means are we, you know, necessarily

1 locked in on architecture at this point. We're
2 just trying to get an idea and a sense of the
3 input on, you know, how we get through that, and
4 we're continuously, you know, going through
5 iterations of this.

6 And we've gotten some very good input from
7 the Historic Commission as well in terms of ideas
8 that they would like us to incorporate. We've
9 missed the mark, so we're going back and changing
10 that. So we're, you know, open to those ideas.

11 So that's kind of the overlay of the
12 building itself.

13 MEMBER WIESE: Could I ask a question?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If I could
15 just --

16 MEMBER WEISE: Sure.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- just from a
18 standpoint -- there have been several letters, two
19 letters that were in our packets, and then
20 apparently there's been about six other letters
21 that have been submitted to us.

22 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sure they've
24 been provided to you in some format.

1 MR. CURT HURST: Yes. All of those
2 letters -- we've gotten all of those letters, just
3 so you know.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes. And so are
5 those -- I mean, obviously, some people are here
6 to testify or provide some comment and things like
7 that.

8 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And we just hope
10 that then you'll take the opportunity to address
11 those to the best you can and to at least address
12 these comments. Would that be okay? For you to
13 be able to address those comments at some future
14 date if you proceed ahead.

15 MR. CURT HURST: Oh, absolutely, yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So just for the
17 record, we have two letters that we received in
18 our packet from a Greg Taylor at 211 South Third
19 Avenue and also a letter from Anton Shulski at 304
20 South Second Avenue. So those were in our packet.

21 We also received six additional letters
22 recently. One from a Dick Petrizzo dated the 17th
23 of July; a letter from -- I'm sorry I'm doing this
24 a disservice -- Asucena Saldivar -- I apologize --

1 304 South Third Avenue dated the 7th of July -- or
2 I'm sorry, the 20th of July; Sharon Bringelson,
3 from 372 Brownstone Drive, and some Brownstone
4 residents also signed her letter, dated the 20th
5 of this month; Marilyn Shulski, 304 South Second
6 Avenue, letter dated the 20th of this month; Janet
7 Foster, 203 Illinois Avenue, dated the 20th; and
8 also Martha Gass, 211 South Third Avenue.

9 So we have received all these. We have
10 tried to digest them and also provide our own
11 comments, and then there will still be
12 opportunities for people to speak.

13 So now I can open it up, so please.

14 MEMBER WIESE: I just wanted to clarify
15 what I'm looking at. So is the parking underneath
16 that second floor that extends over the current
17 parking lot now?

18 MR. CURT HURST: That's correct.

19 MEMBER WIESE: Okay.

20 MR. CURT HURST: Because those 37 spots
21 that are there today will stay as a parking lot.
22 There will be a few changes in the count just
23 based on how the structure lays out.

24 MEMBER WIESE: Got it. Okay. I just

1 wanted to make sure.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a couple
3 questions.

4 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Right now your
6 architectural plans are showing, is that Second
7 Avenue, as being a street, and the civil plans are
8 showing that you're vacating that. So is that
9 correct?

10 MR. CURT HURST: Which one?

11 MEMBER FUNKE: The architectural site
12 plan.

13 MR. CONRAD HURST: Yeah. That hasn't been
14 updated to reflect the site plan.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: So we're supposed to go
16 with the civil drawings? If you look at the
17 architectural site plan --

18 MR. CURT HURST: Oh, right, that's
19 correct, yes. No. Right. That was an early
20 iteration and we haven't -- so that's not part of
21 the current site plan that we're expecting to do
22 as part of the PUD application or the plan.

23 MR. CONRAD HURST: We do have a plan to
24 incorporate some kind of a courtyard patio space

1 like the architectural site plan shows there, but
2 you kind of have to look at the engineering site
3 plan, which isn't really a site plan at this
4 point, to understand the rest of that. Everything
5 below the architecture shown as a patio will
6 become courtyard and parking.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: I think it would be helpful
8 next time to incorporate the architecture into the
9 proposed site plan.

10 MR. CURT HURST: Yeah. That's a good
11 point. It's an iteration -- the one previous is
12 an iteration that the architect had done versus
13 the engineer, which is the site plan, so.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: No, I get it. I get it.
15 The next question I have is that you're
16 showing a 59-foot height in the elevations. It's
17 saying that you're going 63 in the application.
18 And then the elevations also show a negative 5
19 foot 1. So I'm really confused as to what the
20 height of the building is going to be.

21 MR. CURT HURST: That's a good point. The
22 59 feet is on the Second Avenue side.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

24 MR. CURT HURST: And the 63 feet would be

1 on Riverside Avenue because there is a slope to
2 that from Second Avenue.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: But it's showing minus 5
4 foot 1.

5 MR. CURT HURST: That five-foot
6 difference -- and maybe the math is off. Is it 59
7 and 5 is 64, so it should be 64.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

9 MR. CURT HURST: So that's really, you
10 know, we had to work through that, you know, that
11 engineering.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: All right.

13 MR. CURT HURST: But that's, essentially,
14 the difference is, you know, Riverside Avenue
15 obviously is lower than Second Avenue. So there
16 will be a shorter height in the back.

17 MR. CONRAD HURST: It has an awkward
18 slope, and we measured from the tallest point just
19 to make sure we're covering our bases.

20 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

21 MR. CONRAD HURST: So the 63 illustrates
22 what is the tallest opportunity for that building.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. The next question I
24 have is you're in close proximity to single-family

1 homes to the east, and it would be good to see,
2 like, something to show what the difference in
3 height is from the building to the buildings next
4 door and the proximity to those buildings. I
5 don't know what that is from the street, how big
6 the street is.

7 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: And, you know, and maybe
9 some shadow studies to show what kind of shadows
10 are going to be cast on the neighbors next door.

11 MR. CURT HURST: Okay.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: I think that's important.

13 MR. CURT HURST: We're working on that on
14 a lot of the background engineering and
15 architecture, so we can to do a lot of perspective
16 so that you really get a good sense of, you know,
17 what that looks like from the south, from the
18 east, from the west, including some of the, you
19 know, the green spaces and greenery more detailed.
20 So all of those will definitely be, you know, part
21 of our next approval process.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: I think a shadow study
23 would be key because that's going to --

24 MR. CURT HURST: Right. Show what is

1 casting a shadow --

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Casting a shadow on, you
3 know, the next-door buildings.

4 MR. CURT HURST: Sure. Absolutely.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: And did you speak to the
6 neighbors next door? Did you kind of talk to them
7 about what you're proposing?

8 MR. CURT HURST: No. We have not talked
9 specifically to the neighbors other than the
10 Historic Commission preliminary concept review.
11 They were here, and we had a little bit of
12 dialogue during that process but not any direct
13 conversation.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: And then my last comment
15 is, you know, in the existing zoning you have, you
16 know, the MGA is 40,000 square feet, your
17 allowable square footage, and the lot area is
18 48,000 square feet. So that comes out to .83, and
19 you guys are proposing 64,000 square feet of MGA,
20 and your lot is 25.9 thousand, which comes out to
21 2.5.

22 So you guys are, essentially, three times
23 the allowable area for that site. So it's quite a
24 density. You're asking for three times the amount

1 of area that's allowed.

2 MR. CURT HURST: It's an interesting
3 point, and I think that, you know, it's currently
4 two parcels, actually it's going to be -- there's
5 three parcels there if you could consider the park
6 there and Indiana Avenue.

7 It's currently -- but it is two things
8 there, so two parcels. And if you look at the
9 ordinance, it's actually 40,000 per parcel per
10 building. So if you don't combine the pins, then
11 you actually get the 80,000 because you'd get the
12 40,000 for each parcel. So, you know, we're
13 trying to figure out what the best way to present
14 that is.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: It would be good to see
16 that analysis --

17 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: -- and compare them, to see
19 what the zoning allows --

20 MR. CURT HURST: Right. Because then we
21 wouldn't be looking for that density variance --

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

23 MR. CURT HURST: -- based on per lot if we
24 didn't combine the pins.

1 It's also, you know, not necessarily for
2 this conversation, but at least for, you know,
3 knowledge, that the southern -- or the northern
4 parcel, which is the current parking lot, is in
5 the TIF, the First Street TIF, and the Chamber
6 building is not in the TIF.

7 So we're kind of wrestling with how do we
8 put all that together. And so we'll figure all
9 that engineering out, what the best way to do
10 that is.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: It would be nice to see
12 the -- you know, whatever this site is, I mean,
13 the entirety of the site --

14 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: -- what that square footage
16 of what, you know, you're proposing compared to
17 what the zoning allows.

18 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: It would be nice to see
20 that number and that comparable.

21 MR. CURT HURST: Okay.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: That's all I have. Thanks.

23 MEMBER BECKER: I'll take a few.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure.

1 MEMBER BECKER: I guess regardless of the
2 math, my opinion is that building is too bulky for
3 the site, and I think that it will be an
4 encroachment on the neighborhood across the
5 street.

6 In thinking about it being a gateway, I
7 think that is an appropriate thing to think about.
8 If you think about the mass across the river where
9 they even on the Fox, even on the River, I think
10 that scale is -- to mirror something like that
11 across the river and then step up to the north, to
12 the more dense and higher buildings would be more
13 appropriate at this part in the downtown.

14 The other thing I'm wrestling with is the
15 use of public right-of-way for private parking
16 spaces. So it sounds like it's going to be a
17 challenge as well as the vacation of Indiana
18 Avenue and using public park or open space for
19 private.

20 So I'll be interested to see how that
21 works out from a land transfer standpoint. I
22 don't think it's appropriate to have those
23 diagonal spaces on Riverside Avenue backing out
24 into that. I acknowledge that they're already on

1 Second Street. So that seems to be working all
2 right, but adding new ones onto Riverside
3 regardless of trying to do some traffic calming, I
4 don't think that's an appropriate use there.

5 So those are my comments.

6 MR. CURT HURST: Okay.

7 MEMBER MOAD: I am largely concerned with
8 parking availability because parking on the
9 weekends in particular in that portion of downtown
10 on the east side is always full. And if we add
11 more residential units to that area, the residents
12 are going to have an expectation of parking, and
13 that will deter visitors from being able to park.

14 So I think we have an inadequacy in terms
15 of anticipating our parking needs long term, and I
16 agree with the comments that have been made with
17 regards to the bulk of the building for the space
18 that it's on.

19 I am in favor of the multiuse concept and
20 multifamily housing --

21 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

22 MEMBER MOAD: -- above Sammy's, but the
23 building feels much too massive for a gateway to
24 our town.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Are we giving
2 comments or questions?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Whichever, it's
4 our turn.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: You can if
7 you're ready.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I don't have any
9 questions per se. I do agree with Commissioner
10 Funke about a shadow study. That is something
11 that I know the neighbors would appreciate.

12 MR. CURT HURST: Okay.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I do like the
14 project. I think it's a great use of the space.
15 If we're ever going to develop into a larger
16 community, that we're all striving for, we need
17 more density downtown.

18 It may be a little bit large for the
19 space, but I think you're going to do some --
20 maybe working on that. I know that you're
21 probably going to go back to the drawing board a
22 few times.

23 I like the whole concept. I like Sammy's.
24 I like the apartments above it. And I know your

1 kind of MO is to create pedestrian friendly, bike
2 access, river access. So I think the whole
3 concept is very positive for our downtown.

4 MR. CURT HURST: Thank you.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Go ahead.

6 MEMBER WIESE: I like the one thing that
7 you did say in terms of helping drive more people
8 to St. Charles and giving them an opportunity for
9 a place to live that they may not buy into right
10 away and eventually grow to love the downtown and
11 grow into St. Charles.

12 And I agree that I think the mixed-use,
13 the idea of Sammy's is something that provides
14 St. Charles more access to the river and to be
15 able to use the river, and the site plan is
16 phenomenal. I think that's a necessary asset for
17 downtown.

18 My suggestion would be the ideas for the
19 courtyard, for that to be more fully developed.
20 You know, any changes that you make -- anything
21 that can show and bring to light, I think, will
22 help kind of determine what is the road to -- like
23 what does that look like and is it going to create
24 more green space. Is it going to create more --

1 you know, I think those are the things that are
2 unclear and probably causing hesitancy.

3 The idea of parking seems to be answered.
4 I understand that there probably would be
5 increased density, but I also think future parking
6 in St. Charles isn't solely on your shoulders.
7 That's something the City needs to think about
8 with the Arcada, with all the great things that
9 are coming downtown.

10 So I think that's something that in some
11 way the City as a whole needs to think about
12 because I think the idea of bringing more people
13 to St. Charles is a good thing.

14 I would agree with some of the comments
15 about the density of the building. So I'd like to
16 see what that ends up looking like, but I do think
17 this is a gateway entry point. You know, as a
18 resident that doesn't live far from this area, I
19 have always wondered why that space has been
20 vacant --

21 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

22 MEMBER WIESE: -- and looked the way it
23 looks. So I'm excited about something coming
24 there, and I think you're on the right track. I

1 just think that there's probably some tweaks and
2 things that need to -- and to the point, listening
3 to the residents and hearing concerns, I think is
4 valid and seeing where we can then take it.

5 MR. CURT HURST: We appreciate those
6 comments, and that's really the value of this
7 process of an informal versus the formal process
8 and getting here and not being able to do that.
9 So we're continually going through that and taking
10 all the input and trying to incorporate those in.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I have
12 somewhat -- I'll start with some high-level
13 questions --

14 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- and some
16 thoughts for you.

17 MR. CURT HURST: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We've touched a
19 little bit on parking. I guess I'm a little
20 uncertain as to how -- is all this parking, the
21 existing spaces and the proposed spaces,
22 understanding that this can change, but let's just
23 work with what you have right now.

24 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Are all those
2 intended to be public parking spaces, or is some
3 of it, specifically for the residents, like on the
4 existing lot? Because right now I think people
5 use it as public parking.

6 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So if you build
8 a building, you're going to need parking for
9 residents at some level, and how would that be
10 secured for them?

11 MR. CURT HURST: Yeah. So I'll try to
12 answer that sort of in a direct and roundabout
13 way. So there's 37 spots there, and they're
14 private. And they're currently used, you know,
15 for the enjoyment of everybody, and we fully
16 expect that there's going to be a large component
17 of that to remain.

18 Largely, because we have a very vested
19 interest in the community, not just in what we do
20 financially but what we do personally. We live
21 here. We enjoy the community. We do all those
22 things. So we want to make -- we want to be as
23 respectful as we can to what the parking is.

24 With that in mind, there are ordinances

1 that, you know, kind of dictate that. You know,
2 the ordinance says you have to have one per unit,
3 so 48 spots, and they can be public spots. They
4 can be across the street. There's a, you know,
5 it's in the package, X number of feet away.

6 And so you could say that, you know, if
7 you did an apartment and just did the ordinance
8 and they were all public and you had no private
9 and you met that ordinance, then none of those
10 residents would have any specific parking, other
11 than fight for the parking that's on the public
12 streets or in other public lots within that area.

13 We've got sort of a hybrid going. We
14 don't know what the final metric is going to be.
15 There's going to be some, and you'll pay for it,
16 no different than if you're doing an apartment
17 complex somewhere else.

18 You have X number of open spots. Those
19 are sort of in -- and it's a little different in a
20 non-downtown area because they build X amount of
21 parking for the residents and typically no other
22 people are going to use them unless they're
23 located near retail, which that probably happens
24 as well.

1 But then they build covered spots or
2 garages, and they charge X dollars for those, and
3 there's some ratio. I don't know exactly what
4 that ratio is, but there's some ratio.

5 So we anticipate that that will happen,
6 that there will be some ratio of spots that
7 tenants would pay for additional in order to have
8 the private reserved spot underneath the building
9 so their car doesn't get snowed on or whatever the
10 case may be. Again, so we don't know exactly what
11 that's going to work out to be.

12 We have a retail component here, a very
13 vibrant retail component that we want to
14 accommodate as well, which is why we want to make
15 sure we're trying to do as much as we can with
16 additional parking in the limited space that we
17 have.

18 So there's going to be some push and pull
19 of where that parking goes. And so the other ways
20 you can control things is, you know, 24-hour
21 overnight parking restrictions and things like
22 that. So we haven't really gotten to that point
23 in the engineering yet, but that's a way to let
24 the public use the parking in general so that

1 whether you're going to the Arcada or you're going
2 to Alter or you're going somewhere else because
3 that lot gets full over there, and people have to
4 walk across the street as well. Maybe they have
5 to come over here and park.

6 So we want to encourage that as much as we
7 can, and then we'll figure out what the right
8 components of all of that kind of come together.
9 So I know that's not the direct answer, but it at
10 least gives you a flavor of what we're trying to
11 figure out and what that right ratio would be.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And maybe for
13 you and for staff, is this something that gets
14 rolled up into any kind of a parking study that
15 they would do or a traffic study that they might
16 need to do in conjunction with how all the
17 downtown parking is working because of the varying
18 intensities of uses that we have?

19 MR. COLBY: Yes. That is something that
20 could be requested by the Plan Commission and/or
21 City Council as a comment in reaction to this
22 concept plan if you believe that type of analysis
23 is warranted.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Okay.

1 All right.

2 A second thought with respect to just
3 general planning independent of how many units
4 you're going to end up with and all of that is I
5 think with respect to the concept plan and also
6 our downtown plans that have been done, and
7 there's little vignettes that have been done, and
8 I think part of them were in our packet.

9 I mean, one of the options that seems to
10 be identified was actually closing Riverside
11 Avenue --

12 MR. CURT HURST: Uh-huh.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- and making it
14 all pedestrian. As you talk about pedestrians and
15 the use, and you have a bike path that, you know,
16 traverses north past the property. And you're
17 trying to, you know, have a speed table to help
18 slow people down and, you know, do all those
19 things. And not necessarily that it has to be a
20 totally paved plaza --

21 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- but the idea
23 becomes instead of the right-of-way trying to
24 accommodate a narrow bit of traffic and the

1 challenges with that with respect to is that okay,
2 is the pavement width okay, does public works feel
3 that's okay, and all these other parties.

4 Is it possible to look at using the entire
5 thing as a pedestrian space and how that -- I
6 guess even to further go beyond that is would the
7 consideration be if the right-of-way was -- I
8 don't know if vacated is the right word, but I
9 will start with that. That's the most permanent
10 versus a license, versus an easement, that kind of
11 thing.

12 MR. CURT HURST: Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If it was
14 vacated and you could adjust the massing of the
15 building and move some of it forward, but now you
16 still have a pedestrian way --

17 MR. CURT HURST: Correct.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- there, and
19 move some of the massing forward, which would then
20 if your number is 48 units for a good reason for
21 now, would then potentially spread that out and
22 lower the building or move the mass forward with
23 respect to Commissioner Funke's question about
24 shadows obviously in the afternoon. How far does

1 the building cast a shadow onto the Second Street
2 right-of-way and does that -- you know, at what
3 time of the day does it, you know, impede on the
4 neighbors on the other side, on the east side of
5 Second Avenue.

6 MR. CURT HURST: Correct.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And so I guess I
8 ask for that thought. I don't know who the right
9 people are at the City to ask about that kind of
10 thing. But I think, you know, since our comp plan
11 did suggest that as one attempt at redevelopment,
12 I think that could be another way to look at this
13 and still accomplish all the things you are trying
14 to do as well as Sammy's and all of that.

15 MR. CURT HURST: Right. We're definitely
16 open to a lot of that. You know, that's exactly
17 what the comp -- what you described, obviously, is
18 straight out of the comprehensive plan, and we
19 looked at that. And you know we're, you know,
20 just wrestling with how all of that works with,
21 you know, timing, costs, city participation.

22 At this point, and I don't want to, you
23 know -- I don't know a way to say it. You know,
24 at this point, we're really not asking -- it's

1 kind of been our format. We're not asking the
2 City for financial assistance on this. We haven't
3 asked for it for any of our other developments.
4 And so we're really trying to, you know, wrestle
5 with all of those components. And are we open to,
6 you know, that concept? Sure.

7 And, you know, the one thing that also
8 came in was how do we preserve the amount of
9 traffic for getting to some things that are
10 already downtown, whether it's on the east or the
11 west side of the river. So that's a consideration
12 as well.

13 And that's kind of how we came up with the
14 hybrid was, sure, we love this concept that has
15 been, you know, part of the comprehensive plan,
16 but how do we preserve that look and feel. And
17 you can do a similar thing by -- and what we came
18 up with was what we came up with, which is slowing
19 the traffic down and narrowing it down and leaving
20 it as a street.

21 There's another way to do that is to kind
22 of go in between those two and have, you know,
23 even less of a street. So you can still use it
24 whether it's for parties or events or whatever it

1 is, you can still use it, but you kind of open and
2 close it because it's private, and you can kind of
3 make a hybrid of that. So there's a lot in that
4 small package, if you will.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Agreed.

6 MR. CURT HURST: But we love the thought
7 process and are certainly open to that.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Again, none of
9 that is a simple answer.

10 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I mean, you
12 already identified -- I wasn't focusing, but you
13 already identified that technically the parking
14 lot is in the TIF. So while you're not asking for
15 assistance, but maybe to do some of this, you
16 might, you know, if everybody is -- if all parties
17 together are in agreement, where the TIF funds
18 could be used to help with these kinds --

19 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- of
21 infrastructure and that kind of thing.

22 Part of that parking study but also a
23 traffic study is if you take out Riverside Drive
24 there, all of a sudden you're shifting how traffic

1 moves.

2 MR. CURT HURST: Correct.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And so that
4 becomes important because -- you know, maybe to a
5 lesser degree, but it certainly does impact, you
6 know, the traffic onto Second Street then. You're
7 not balancing it on the light anymore. And so,
8 you know, with it being a gateway from the south,
9 you know, how important is it that you hit that
10 light. I don't know. I think a traffic study --

11 MR. CURT HURST: Right.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- would help to
13 sort that out. You can still make the changes,
14 but I think it helps to sort that out.

15 I know you've worked on the building. We
16 have had some people already comment. I'm sure
17 there's others who will, and you've already gotten
18 feedback from the Plan Commission.

19 I think with the idea of a gateway, you
20 know, into our City from the south and coming out
21 of 25, I do think that there's at a high level
22 some improvements to this.

23 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And if you still

1 end up at, say, four stories, even if it's five, I
2 think the building now feels just really massive.
3 If there are some things either with a combination
4 of materials or windows that can help give it a
5 lighter touch --

6 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- a lighter
8 feel visually. I think that goes a long way.
9 That may tend to make it more modern, and I think
10 there's, you know, some balance between those.
11 But I think making it feel lighter so that it
12 doesn't have the sense of mass that the current
13 building feels that it does.

14 I think visually at least right now in the
15 elevations and the renderings that you've shown,
16 realizing that there could be development. Right
17 now it just feels pretty massive.

18 MR. CURT HURST: The massing is definitely
19 ringing loud and clear, and we're working through
20 that.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. And I
22 think there are ways architecturally -- I'm sure
23 Jeff would agree.

24 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: There are ways
2 architecturally that will make it feel a lot
3 lighter visually.

4 MR. CURT HURST: Absolutely.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And I think that
6 then that not necessarily changes opinions for
7 people who just don't like the idea of it --

8 MR. CURT HURST: I understand.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- but I think
10 that architecturally how it fits to the City and
11 everything, it does make a difference.

12 MR. CURT HURST: Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And as a
14 gateway, I think that does make a difference.

15 MR. CURT HURST: And that's great input,
16 and that's what we really, you know, wanted to
17 have.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So if we're done
19 for now, I'd like to open it up.

20 MEMBER BECKER: I'm sorry. I have one
21 more question.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

23 MEMBER BECKER. I'm so sorry. I might as
24 well ask it now.

1 There's some discussion in the staff
2 report about the floodplain. Could you maybe talk
3 about how the floodplain affects your development
4 at this point in the process. You probably don't
5 have it all nailed down.

6 MR. CURT HURST: He's much better at it
7 than I am.

8 MR. CONRAD HURST: It basically just
9 dictates a specific elevation that we can have our
10 lowest opening or our lowest floor at. So it's a
11 little bit additive to the height factor, which is
12 that if you look at the building as it exists,
13 there's a tall foundation, and whether or not that
14 was done to remediate some floodplain issues, it
15 actually serves that purpose today.

16 So it's really just a matter of getting
17 the openings, doors, windows, things like that up
18 to a specific height.

19 MEMBER BECKER: So will that parking lot
20 be used as compensatory storage? Is that how it
21 operates now, or you'll have to find somewhere
22 else on site to accommodate that?

23 MR. CONRAD HURST: Well, we haven't done
24 all the calculations for compensatory storage --

1 MEMBER BECKER: Okay.

2 MR. CONRAD HURST: You know, that is
3 engineering money we'll spend once we get what the
4 final shape and footprint of the building is going
5 to be. And if we have to go underground with it
6 or whatever the case may be, we'll figure out how
7 to provide that.

8 MEMBER BECKER: Right. That will drive
9 what you have to store. Got it.

10 MR. CONRAD HURST: Detention, retention,
11 yeah.

12 MR. CURT HURST: A good example of what
13 the impact is in terms of whether you're going to
14 call architecture or engineering is the Riverside
15 building. We have the same condition there.

16 If you look at that Riverside building, we
17 have elevated all of the openings up to the FPE,
18 which is the County's requirement, which is 3 feet
19 above the base flood elevation. That's why we did
20 the garage doors there versus down at the grade
21 level, which will be a similar condition here.

22 Just because you have to get -- and the
23 County has a different requirement than the City,
24 so we follow the County -- we have to follow the

1 County's requirement which is 3 feet above the
2 base flood elevation, and that's the FPE.

3 MEMBER BECKER: Thank you.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a quick question.
5 Are you guys saving the building, and you're going
6 to build on top of it?

7 MR. CURT HURST: Correct. Yes. That's
8 the current anticipation. We're going to use the
9 existing footprint with a bit of an extension to
10 the north of that, and then the foundation of the
11 west side would move out a little bit to
12 accommodate, essentially, an awning and a patio
13 type environment, albeit closed in, but we would
14 anticipate that coming forward some, about
15 10 feet.

16 But the structural elements of the
17 building are very sound and expect -- because it's
18 basically on bedrock. You know, and if you know
19 the architecture, which you do, in those days, and
20 I found this to be true in the Arcada and the
21 other buildings that we've been doing is that
22 these foundations and buildings have been built
23 very well. So there's no reason necessarily to
24 take that down, although it could be if we changed

1 the footprint.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. And, you know, I
3 agree with Commissioner Vargulich regarding
4 spreading the building out and maybe taking over
5 Riverside Avenue. I mean, if you could lower the
6 building, but I think you need to maintain Indiana
7 Avenue, at least that vista, that view portal. I
8 mean, you can close off the street, but, you know,
9 I wouldn't push the building south so you block
10 that off.

11 MR. CURT HURST: Okay.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: I think that's a really
13 critical street. You know, I walk that street a
14 lot because I live on Indiana. I just love
15 walking down that street and seeing the river.

16 So you know, I think it would be a great
17 addition to the riverfront, that plaza on the
18 river. I think it's a great idea and getting it
19 away from the residences to the -- it would help
20 getting away from the residences to the east too.

21 MR. CURT HURST: Sure.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Maybe making -- closing off
23 Riverside Avenue and making Second Avenue larger,
24 right, to accommodate that traffic.

1 MR. CURT HURST: Okay. We love all those
2 ideas.

3 MR. CONRAD HURST: We appreciate it.

4 MR. CURT HURST: Yeah. We appreciate your
5 input as well.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So I
7 think we're going to take a break, and we'll allow
8 you to take a break from our discussion, and we'd
9 like to hear from residents. They'll be able to
10 come up one at time, please, and then we can
11 start.

12 Is that okay with you guys?

13 MR. CURT HURST: Absolutely. Thank you
14 very much.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Would you like
16 to speak on this project? Please.

17 MR. SMUNT: Hi, I'm Dr. Steve Smunt. I'm
18 the vice chair of the Historic Preservation
19 Commission, and we've been working with Conrad
20 Hurst for a number of years, and I have the
21 highest admiration for his organization, their
22 projects, at least so far as I've seen.

23 As far as the 2013 concept plan for the --
24 comprehensive plan, I should say, as far as a

1 gateway or a catalyst site, I think we're right
2 on. That site is perfect for what he's proposing
3 as far as a gateway structure or a gateway
4 development.

5 In our review process at our Historic
6 Preservation Commission level, our ordinance
7 dictates that we actually look into certain
8 proportions such as architectural details, height,
9 massing, directional expression. These are not
10 specific to architecture, but they relate to
11 adjacent structures such as the neighborhood to
12 the immediate east, Second, Third, Fourth avenues
13 going up the hill to the east.

14 And I really feel that what we're -- that
15 we're at risk of maybe over -- I heard the word
16 overpowering this site. The size and the height
17 of this structure has a great risk of overpowering
18 an entire neighborhood in its mass and height.

19 And Mr. Hurst is aware of our feelings on
20 this. Most critical with these structures that
21 are on the east side of Second Avenue, they're
22 mainly two-story residential structures. A
23 five-story building is going to completely
24 overpower them; however, as you go up the hill,

1 Second, Third Avenue, and Fourth Avenue, that
2 becomes less and less because given a two-story
3 building going upgrade is going to not have the
4 same negative impact.

5 So perhaps there's an opportunity for them
6 to bring down the height of this building, and I
7 know it's been mentioned before, and with some
8 proper setbacks, we could make this more palatable
9 to the pedestrian who is coming in from the
10 southeast into our town.

11 I don't believe I buy into the idea of
12 closing Riverside Avenue. Riverside Avenue
13 currently is a traffic signal at Route 64. For us
14 to lose that to traffic heading and force it onto
15 north Second Avenue -- heading northbound on
16 Second Avenue is going to be a disaster when it
17 comes to Route 64. So I'm not sure that's an
18 idea.

19 And the vista on Indiana Avenue, if
20 they're only doing a patio and maybe some parking,
21 we're not going to obstruct a vista looking down
22 westward on Indiana Avenue looking at the Fox
23 River. I don't think it will obstruct any vista.
24 It will obviously force traffic to go in a

1 different direction.

2 So I think I would like to see, for the
3 benefit of our Commission and for the Plan
4 Commission, a streetscape elevation of how their
5 proposed structure relates to the streetscapes on
6 the east side of Second Avenue so we can get an
7 idea of what the height issue really is and be
8 able to compare apples to apples on this.

9 And in conclusion, I think the key to this
10 succeeding would be to add the architecture, make
11 this -- if this is an outstanding architectural
12 proposal, it's going to be a lot easier to swallow
13 than, obviously, some proposals that I don't -- I
14 think need a lot more time to develop. Thank you.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you. Yes.

16 MR. RASMUSSEN: Hi, my name is Bob
17 Rasmussen. My office is at 405 Illinois Avenue,
18 right up the street from this proposed project.

19 Many things I want to address, and I'll
20 just try to walk through the packet here and
21 address the items that I've highlighted.

22 My biggest concern being -- first of all,
23 I do like the concept of the mixed use here. I
24 also did the First Street redevelopment project,

1 which is still in the works, and there's still one
2 or two more buildings to do, which I believe the
3 Hursts are planning on doing one of them. We've
4 spent 17 years on that project trying to get it
5 right for what the City set out to do.

6 So what we need in this town is more
7 bodies. We all agree to that, more homes, more
8 apartments, more condos, whatever it may be; but
9 we also need to marry it into the existing
10 structures, marry it into the downtown, marry it
11 into what our City was meant to be and what it
12 began with.

13 The first thing I'll look at is we've got
14 a series of streets and roadways in our town that
15 were created for a purpose and a reason.
16 Sometimes you can turn left. Sometimes you can
17 only turn right. In some places, there's lights,
18 what have you.

19 The closing of any street needs to be
20 considered for an extreme amount of time because
21 there's a reason that street is there. To walk up
22 that street right now where I developed Heritage
23 Square 1, Heritage Square 2, and Judd Mansion, two
24 entire City blocks in the last 21 years, our only

1 way to get to downtown St. Charles is down
2 Indiana. We can't turn left on Fourth. We can't
3 turn left on Third. We can't turn left on Second.
4 And maybe that will change, but then I've got a
5 question why we can't turn left now. There must
6 have been a traffic study. There must be a reason
7 for it.

8 So for us to go down Indiana, take a right
9 on Riverside Avenue, head to the downtown that
10 we're trying to make flourish, that's what exists
11 today. I drive it every single day. So to close
12 the street -- which I don't think we have a
13 precedence there. I fought hard to not close
14 streets when we did First Street. The Walnut
15 Street was not closed. You can still drive
16 through there. The Blue Goose parking lot, you
17 can still drive through there.

18 That was done on purpose. These are
19 extensive meetings over several years because
20 nobody wanted to close streets, and First Street
21 is a pedestrian street. It was always meant to
22 be. It's not a thoroughfare. Riverside is a
23 thoroughfare. All the people coming from the east
24 side of our east, southeast quadrant, and then the

1 northeast quadrant of Geneva come up Riverside.
2 It's the way they go downtown, turn left at that
3 light, and you have a right-in, right-out in a
4 large parking structure that we built in '08.

5 If you change that program, they're going
6 to come down 31, and they can't get in the parking
7 structures easily. So there's a lot of reasons
8 all this stuff was designed. So to throw it out
9 the window and close the street, I don't believe
10 is appropriate.

11 We also must look at the parking situation
12 that is here. If you look on your page 4, one of
13 the things that they discuss in people accessing
14 parking is parking should be located at the rear
15 of the lot, and minimal curb cuts should be
16 provided.

17 Most of this parking is at the forefront
18 of this property, some of it on Riverside, most of
19 it on the corner with the building not covering
20 it. You can see it. We just discussed it, where
21 the BMO Harris drive-thru is. This is absolutely
22 against anything we've ever tried to do in our
23 downtown.

24 Every parking garage that we built, the

1 big one and the little one behind Alley and
2 Sterling was built to be concealed by other
3 buildings so you don't see the actual parking, and
4 that's everything that was done new in this town
5 in the last 20 years.

6 So I think we need to consider that, and I
7 think the Hursts can handle that situation. I
8 just want to make sure it gets considered. It
9 just needs to be hidden.

10 If you go to the concept plan that we did
11 with those buildings, and you're going to notice
12 they were drawn at four stories, not five. So
13 consider the fact that that concept plan was
14 four-stories. Also consider the plan to the north
15 of it where they show a four-story parking
16 structure. That was all in that concept plan.
17 You can't build one without the other, I guess, is
18 my point on the parking.

19 You go to the next page, and you get into
20 bulk standards. We're not in the ballpark of bulk
21 standards. Not one bulk standard is even in the
22 ballpark. We've got to get in the ballpark with
23 something there. We can do a PUD and ignore it,
24 but I don't think we should in this scenario.

1 So going back to the parking, there's a
2 lot of development happening on the east side
3 right now, and it's all good. These guys have
4 done a tremendous job with Pollyanna, BMO,
5 Flagship, the Arcada. Imagine the potential
6 traffic we're going to have when the Arcada opens
7 back up.

8 We are losing parking. The 62 stalls that
9 currently reside in the parking around Pollyanna
10 don't reside because there's outdoor patios on
11 them. If those outdoor patios remain, the parking
12 stalls aren't there. They're just not.

13 And if we take this site and we add
14 property -- give property to the developer to put
15 street parking, which I don't know that we've ever
16 conveyed or vacated property from the City to an
17 individual to own parking.

18 I'll give you two examples. When I
19 developed the Heritage Square in 2003 across from
20 Lincoln School, there are seven angled parking
21 stalls there which I installed and I maintain and
22 I plow.

23 I have no right to use them beyond the
24 public's right to use them because they're in the

1 public right-of-way. I own the property adjacent
2 to it, and I had to build them, and that was part
3 of the way the City functioned.

4 So, again, I was not allowed to have the
5 exclusive right to that property. So it's been a
6 problem over the years because all the people park
7 there from the school. Not necessarily the
8 teachers, but every mom and dad that goes there to
9 drop their kids off. So we don't really get to
10 use those stalls that I installed, maintain, and
11 do everything on. That's the reality of the
12 public right-of-way.

13 Go to the Judd Mansion development, we
14 were losing some street parking there. So we
15 added two parking stalls in the Judd Mansion that
16 are on the street. Again, the same scenario, I
17 have paid to build them. I've paid to maintain
18 them on an annual basis. I have no more right to
19 use them than the individual across the street who
20 spent 40 years parking on that street and now he
21 can still park there.

22 I drive by this site every morning. There
23 are four cars parked along Second Avenue on that
24 triangle every single morning. On my way here

1 tonight, there were three, missing one.

2 We're going to take those away. We're
3 going give the property to an independent
4 developer, and there's no way that those are going
5 to become public stalls. So if they're going to
6 be public stalls, then we should not be vacating
7 or giving the property to the developer.

8 And I'd like to see the precedence in our
9 town where we've done that in the past because I
10 don't believe it exists. So I think it's an
11 important factor in that scenario.

12 All these parking things lead to the fact
13 that it's a great building. It's just too big for
14 this particular location. When we've developed in
15 this town, and I've done a lot of it for a lot of
16 years, it's always about where that development is
17 relative to the rest of the community.

18 What's the transitional space. What's
19 next to it. How are you getting from here to
20 there and progressing up to that big building.
21 There's no progression here. There's no
22 transition here. It's wham. It's in your face,
23 and that's a problem.

24 When I developed the Heritage Square, the

1 Historic Commission which -- Steve, were you on it
2 back then? You might have been. We're getting
3 old.

4 Anyhow, I was asked specifically to make
5 that complex look residential, to look like the
6 old 50-foot lots and houses that were in there.
7 You can drive by it today. That's exactly what I
8 did, and I internalized all the parking, and I
9 handled the street parking for folks by adding the
10 angled spaces that are public.

11 Those are the things we need to do in a
12 transitional space. This is a transitional space.
13 It is a gateway. So in the least, I would ask
14 that a parking study be done for this entire
15 corridor.

16 We can't look at the other side where we
17 built the parking garages for First Street because
18 every discussion I've had with Rita and Russ
19 throughout the years, those parking spaces are for
20 the buildings that are there and the potential
21 building 8, which right now the Hursts have a
22 development agreement on, and building 6, which we
23 still haven't built because of parking issues.
24 Building 6 goes on that Blue Goose public parking

1 lot there, if you will.

2 I've had proposals on it to replace it,
3 put parking underneath the building that equals
4 the parking, but now you've lost that parking.

5 Anyhow, so parking is a significant
6 challenge in our downtown, and nobody has looked
7 at it on this side, and I think it becomes very
8 important to do at this point. You've got some
9 very successful businesses. Just look at the
10 people that are around on a Friday and Saturday
11 night.

12 There just isn't any parking, and now
13 we're going to exacerbate the problem with a much
14 larger building, and we don't have to look at the
15 8,000 square feet of retail space because it's in
16 the CBD-1 zoning, but we do have to look at the
17 8,000 square feet from a global picture to make
18 sure that people can find a place to park.

19 Because what's going to happen is I
20 believe many of these folks live up the street.
21 Those cars are all going to be up those streets,
22 and I don't think anybody wants that in this town.
23 It's never a good thing to see that many cars
24 parked on the City streets in front of people's

1 houses on a day-to-day basis, and those are the
2 things we have to preclude.

3 So my two things are a parking study and a
4 traffic study. Riverside Drive is a thoroughfare.
5 I believe it's somewhat absurd to think that we
6 could angle the parking on Riverside Drive. I
7 think it's absurd to shrink the size of City
8 streets, which I don't believe we've done that
9 anywhere but on First Street.

10 And First Street we did it on purpose, and
11 Rita was there from the beginning, to make it a
12 pedestrian-friendly street. I'm not sure from
13 Illinois south on Riverside that it's a
14 pedestrian-friendly area. It's our only way to
15 get into downtown if we don't go to Route 31 or
16 Route 25. That's it.

17 So we have to look hard at maintaining the
18 concept of what the City was built upon and the
19 street structure that was designed for these very
20 purposes. It's been here for a long time. We
21 shouldn't just ignore it. So Riverside, the
22 thought of closing it, in my opinion, would be a
23 travesty for getting people from Geneva and
24 St. Charles into our downtown, which is our very

1 objective. So I think you need to look at that.

2 So that's all I really wanted to say, and
3 I appreciate your listening. Hopefully, we'll
4 look further at this project and bring it to
5 fruition in a much better format. Thank you.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes, please.

7 MS. MYERS: I'm Susie Myers, and I live on
8 Third Avenue, on the corner of Indiana and Third.

9 I wasn't going to speak tonight, but
10 there's a -- no one has mentioned the fact that
11 the fire station is on Riverside; and if you've
12 got a fire on the west side of town, you're going
13 to have to turn onto, 64 or both of them, they
14 take Riverside, and they go over to Prairie and
15 up. That's how they manage to move.

16 So I think that is a real big -- unless
17 you plan on moving the fire station, I wouldn't be
18 making 6-foot bumps and all that sort of stuff.
19 That is the firemen's road. Okay.

20 Secondly, parking. I just have to look
21 outside, and, oh, our town has got something going
22 on tonight because all up and down Indiana, all up
23 and down Ohio, all up and down Third Avenue, cars,
24 cars, cars, cars, cars. None of our cars. These

1 are all people coming in, and they come across,
2 and then they park there, and then they walk over
3 to whatever, and then they go to the bars, and
4 then they come back laughing and screaming and
5 happy at midnight.

6 So it is a real pain, and I think if you
7 put these in, I don't know where people are going
8 to park. They're going to have to be all over
9 further up from Fifth and stuff, maybe the library
10 parking. I don't know. Anyway, those are my
11 points.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

13 Okay. Anyone else? Please.

14 MR. SHULSKI: Hi, I'm Mark Shulski,
15 S-h-u-l-s-k-i, and 4N024 Wingate Road,
16 St. Charles. My parents both wrote letters, so I
17 figured I'd better get up here and talk or they're
18 probably going to cut me out of the will or
19 something, so.

20 But I grew up in this area. I was born
21 and raised here in the area you're talking about.
22 It's where I spent my whole childhood, you know,
23 all the way through college and everything. So I
24 know the area really well.

1 Some of the points that were made are
2 excellent. I mean, one of the reasons, I mean,
3 you talk -- obviously, that area is not a gateway
4 to downtown if you can close down Riverside. The
5 reason you can't turn left on Illinois and that
6 now is because people would try to beat the light,
7 cut through Indiana, turn left onto Second Avenue,
8 and turn left onto Illinois and try to cut through
9 there.

10 I'm there every weekend cutting their
11 grass or during the week, and I can't tell you how
12 many times I've almost been hit by cars. If you
13 close down Riverside, I'm pretty much a dead man
14 trying to cut the grass there with the traffic
15 that's going to be flying through there.

16 So, I mean, that's -- I think we all
17 know -- and the only other point I'd make about
18 the parking is if you want to really see an impact
19 of what it is, go there on the 4th of July because
20 the whole area is packed with people down in the
21 area. They're watching the fireworks. It's a
22 very narrow road.

23 If you put parking on one side of the
24 road, now you're down to one lane. So you have

1 cars that come down, and basically they hit each
2 other. They can't go anywhere. People have to
3 back all the way up. So, I mean, you don't have a
4 lot of space there.

5 So that kind of leads into the point of,
6 you know, the proposal sounds nice. I mean, you
7 talk about walking areas and everything like that.
8 I mean, it sounds like a beautiful area, but the
9 thing is I don't think if anyone talked to any of
10 you and said what is your plan for beautifying
11 that area, you would say put up a 60-foot-tall
12 apartment building.

13 No matter what town you live in, no one is
14 going to say that. I mean, it blocks the views
15 and everything. And I really kind of feel when
16 you do something, you build everything off a focal
17 point. And what do you have that this town
18 doesn't have in a lot of areas, you have a
19 beautiful river here.

20 And if you enhance that, that's the
21 walking path. That's what's drawing people there,
22 and you start building tall buildings and blocking
23 that view, now all of a sudden your focal point is
24 not the river, your focal point is the apartment

1 building. And that's just not -- I don't think
2 that's a vision the City would want to have.

3 And, you know, I'm kind of just going off
4 the cuff on the things I heard tonight, but, I
5 mean, that's just kind of some of the thoughts
6 there.

7 But, you know, also the impact it's going
8 to have. You know, bringing down -- already
9 there's a lot of drainage issues in the area. So
10 you've got to have studies on what that's going to
11 do. You're going to have more people there,
12 utilities, things like that.

13 But really I just feel, you know, it
14 sounds like it's a nice area. It's just, I think,
15 you know, the point made before if you look at the
16 restaurant across the river, and you kind of scale
17 things in that area. You know, it would fit in
18 and blend into the area and not be something that
19 just sticks out, and it's a focal point for the
20 whole thing.

21 And that really doesn't matter what the
22 architecture is or how nice it looks. I mean,
23 it's not really what you want to have as your
24 image.

1 And, you know, my last point I'd make is
2 growing up in that area for my whole life, and if
3 someone said where do you live, we always said --
4 you know, anybody who lived in that neighborhood,
5 all the kids, you know, we live in town. We don't
6 say we live downtown. I don't consider that
7 downtown. It's outside of -- downtown is this
8 area here.

9 So, you know, there's a lot of points
10 about the downtown. That's not really downtown,
11 and you talk about the buildings that are built
12 here and they're higher, taller, and stuff, but
13 they're not built in front of residential homes.
14 And, like I said, that's a narrow road, and you're
15 going to talk like from here to the desk away, and
16 you're going to have a 60-foot building. I just
17 don't think that's right to do for the people who
18 are the residents here, so.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you very
20 much.

21 Anyone else? Please.

22 MR. ALTERGOTT: My name is Robert
23 Altergott, A-l-t-e-r-g-o-t-t, 317 Indiana Avenue.

24 I want to -- you know, the first thing

1 I -- I'm a little hard of hearing, but they said
2 that they were going to be renting to families.
3 Right? Did they say that?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I don't believe
5 he said families. I think they -- not that that's
6 not possible, but I don't think they were
7 specifically saying families.

8 MR. ALTERGOTT: Well, what I'm saying is
9 that families have two cars nowadays. They should
10 be looking at 96 parking spots not, what, 60
11 something. That's putting 30 cars on our streets.

12 And like they had said, the people, when
13 they come for the fests, they're way past the stop
14 signs. They're blocking the fire plugs. It's a
15 mess, and you're now going to say, oh, you can
16 have that every day, and I don't want to see that
17 every day.

18 I can't back out of my drive because I got
19 a car across the street that's 2 feet away from
20 the curb. You know, and that's all along. And
21 this goes on from morning until night for any kind
22 of event. People come from -- and come in and
23 park in our area. It's perfect for them, but it
24 isn't perfect for us.

1 And the other thing is the school buses
2 run up and down Indiana Avenue to pick up the
3 kids, and another thing is they're going to have
4 children. Have they talked to the schools about
5 do they have room for more children. I mean,
6 they're bussing kids all over the place. So now
7 we're adding more buses in and out of the area,
8 and we're blocking the road that the buses take.

9 I'm just trying to say what's going on.
10 So that's all I've got to say.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

12 Anyone else from the public?

13 MR. ANTON SHULSKI: Anton Shulski. I've
14 got a cold, so I can't speak too well.

15 THE REPORTER: Can you spell your last
16 name.

17 MR. ANTON SHULSKI: S-h-u-l-s-k-i.

18 Solve the problem. Take this building,
19 put it on top of Pollyanna's next to the Arcada
20 theater. You'll have more room up there, more
21 apartments, get more patrons into the bars and
22 restaurants. Take the old -- tear it down, put a
23 two-car height parking garage there. That takes
24 care of the parking, and leave the rest of the

1 stuff alone. That building on top of Pollyanna's
2 would fit in downtown, would complement the
3 buildings across the river and be an eyesore to
4 nobody, and that should make the Arcada building
5 look better. It's just a blank wall.

6 We should get some people with spray paint
7 and put up a mural up there or something and make
8 it look better. That's my point.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

10 MR. SHERIDAN: Rob Sheridan, 211 Indiana
11 Avenue.

12 Thanks for your patience. You know, I
13 think people are excited about development of that
14 property in particular. I think it will actually
15 give a presence as you go north into the downtown
16 area.

17 I think the big feature is the scale of
18 the property and how it fits into the neighborhood
19 in terms of the oversize. I think if I came to
20 you as an individual and I wanted to put a 20-foot
21 fence in in my yard, I would find it difficult to
22 have the fence codes changed to accommodate my
23 particular request.

24 In fact, we have an individual trying to

1 do just that. Trying to build in a fortress
2 around his own property and not be scalable for
3 the other property owners around them.

4 You know, we came a few weeks ago to the
5 preservation group, and no mention, when it was
6 discussed, in terms of paid parking or private
7 parking. Public parking was discussed. And here
8 we are again tonight where the details aren't
9 final.

10 We seem to have a lot of floating designs,
11 and the details are very foggy and gray. You
12 would expect, as a community, that we would have
13 something more concrete, something for you to grab
14 ahold of and say this is exactly what we're
15 agreeing to.

16 When the property on the north side of
17 this, the parking lot was developed into the BMO
18 drive-thru, it was done haphazardly. There's
19 still construction debris laying in that parking
20 lot. It's not paved. The planters around the
21 edge are not even filled with dirt. They just
22 jammed in bushes like it was supposed to be final.

23 If the gentleman would come to that
24 neighborhood, he would see in that particular

1 building right there, there's garbage that's been
2 sitting out in that dumpster for two months. Now,
3 if I was an individual, the City would have a
4 problem with my construction debris laying out and
5 my garbage laying in front of my house for two
6 months.

7 That's not being a neighbor. That's not
8 supporting the community. Don't take the good
9 things that we've done and bully this project into
10 a place it's not supposed to be. This is not a
11 good fit. This is not the legacy our community
12 needs to be able to have here with a 1970s train
13 depot in the middle of our downtown community.

14 I don't think that the scale looks right,
15 the design looks right, and the proper
16 communication in terms of the final details of how
17 this is supposed to work matches anything that
18 we're talking about tonight.

19 I recommend you slow it down and make sure
20 that we get it right and have a great legacy like
21 this community deserves. Thank you.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

23 Anyone else? Yes.

24 MS. GASS: I'd like to thank the

1 Commission for listening to all of us so
2 patiently. My name is Martha Gass, and I live at
3 211 South Third Avenue.

4 Like I did at the Historic Preservation
5 Commission meeting, I'd like to thank Conrad and
6 Curt Hurst for the development that you've put in
7 so far. I feel like it has been well done. Once
8 again, I'm going to state a few points about this
9 development that I don't like.

10 I would also just urge you to pay special
11 attention to what Mr. Rasmussen said regarding the
12 traffic studies and the parking in the area. A
13 lot of people who have spoken about this have
14 talked about Second Avenue becoming a corridor if
15 Riverside is closed.

16 I truly think it would be Third Avenue,
17 which is my street. Already we get all the
18 traffic that comes off the Prairie Street bridge.
19 For me it would be horrible to have a traffic
20 light right at the end of my street.

21 Furthermore, like everybody has talked
22 about parking being an issue, and it's not just
23 for special events. The houses in our
24 neighborhood are old, and a lot of the driveways

1 are single-car driveways. And what that means
2 just for my husband and myself is that we're not
3 getting two cars in that single-car driveway all
4 the time.

5 Around the corner on Illinois Avenue are
6 several rental houses that do not have enough
7 parking, and there are also owned homes that now
8 have teenage children that also do not have enough
9 parking in a single-car driveway; and so in front
10 of my house every day, every day, there are at
11 least three or four cars parked that belong in the
12 neighborhood.

13 And on special events, every single bit of
14 space in front of my house is taken up, which is
15 wonderful. Right. We want to have a lot of
16 support for the special events that go on in the
17 community. But it does make it difficult to pull
18 in and out of the driveway and navigate traffic.

19 I also submitted a letter to you and in my
20 letter, I put some photos of things that I feel,
21 like, should be strongly considered. One of them
22 is just an example of a very large building that
23 was put in in downtown Geneva. It's the Geneva
24 Place building, and that I'm concerned is what is

1 proposed here.

2 It's just like a singular block with
3 almost no architectural interest; and furthermore,
4 it goes straight to the maximum use of the space
5 so that there's hardly any green space to soften
6 the look of the building.

7 I urge you to cap the height of the
8 building; and with that, I know that the Hursts
9 have also proposed a mansard-style roof on their
10 building, and so I did just submit a few photos of
11 what I feel, like, are not very attractive looking
12 low-story buildings with that mansard-style roof.

13 I also submitted some photos of things
14 that I think would be more strongly supported by
15 the neighborhood, and one of them is a row house
16 concept where -- which I think would fit in that,
17 where fronts could be on either side, on Riverside
18 and on Second Avenue, with an alley-type parking
19 situation in between those row houses, garages
20 that would accommodate the cars that would be
21 associated with those.

22 And also I referenced Mr. Rasmussen's
23 development and that the parts of the building
24 that face the street, because he's on a hill, are

1 shorter, and they're more interesting, and
2 they're, I don't know, less heavy feeling I guess
3 from the street, where you're not looking at the
4 entire structure. And then as you go down the
5 hill, another story is added, but it's concealed
6 from the street view which would be our street
7 view on the higher end of the hill.

8 So his are still a little tall for my
9 taste, and I included another building that's over
10 on Seventh Avenue and Main that is similar to that
11 and it's on a hill and where they incorporated
12 another story by going on the hill.

13 My final point is going to be about the
14 ATM which is actually when you presented your
15 concept at the Historic Preservation Committee,
16 you were saying that that is actually going to
17 stay in place, and I feel like we should strongly
18 consider figuring out an alternative to that. It
19 just seems a shame that an ATM would have the
20 prime corner spot on that development. Thank you.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

22 MR. TAYLOR: Greg Taylor, 211 South Third
23 Avenue.

24 For all of the reasons already stated, I

1 just want to go on record as opposed to this as
2 presented, and I'd like to emphasize two things
3 and offer one new thought.

4 One is the sewage, someone briefly
5 mentioned it. The sewage load on the system
6 already, people in the neighborhood have sewage
7 backing up in their basements on heavy rain days,
8 and raw sewage is pumped into the river now on
9 heavy rain events, even though it's consistent
10 with OSHA guidelines. This is only going to make
11 a bad situation worse.

12 No. 2, the thought of closing Indiana,
13 giving that property to the developers, and the
14 park, is offensive to the neighborhood and to me.
15 We use that all the time. We use the park. And
16 just to cede that to a developer, it would lessen
17 our quality of life. I'll just go on record as
18 saying that.

19 I would just like to say if the City does
20 feel that this type of development is essential
21 for the development of downtown, I would propose
22 putting this at the old police department. You
23 would get your population density. You're right
24 down by the river. Utilize that space.

1 And I would hope that the City would not
2 put a hotel there because it makes no sense to me
3 to put in a competition for a landmark business
4 already when the Baker Hotel is successful and
5 makes the whole downtown more vibrant too, and
6 that's a landmark business too.

7 So those are my comments. Thank you.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you very
9 much.

10 Sir, please.

11 MR. KERSHNER: Bob Kershner, it's
12 K-e-r-s-h-n-e-r. I live at 316 South Third
13 Avenue, corner of Third Avenue and Ohio.

14 A lot of points that I was going to bring
15 up have already been addressed, so I'm not going
16 to beat a dead horse, but the parking thing was so
17 obvious to me that Bob brought up. 48 apartments,
18 that's two cars, 96 parking spots. Look what
19 would happen, so that's ridiculous.

20 The one thing that -- the architecture of
21 this really surprised me, and I want to say this
22 too. You've done a great job with what you've
23 done down here and I think this is your -- you're
24 sticking your toe in the shallow end of the

1 residential side of town. You've been downtown
2 this whole time. So I think this is kind of a
3 misstep at this point on the impact of this
4 building.

5 And the architecture, I would say this, if
6 the architect that's working on this building is
7 the one that designed it, that bank thing, I don't
8 know if I'd go with him anymore because that is
9 atrocious. That's such an eyesore, and I totally
10 agree with this gentleman over here, that that
11 whole parking area is just an eyesore, and it's
12 been for many years, far before the ATM was put in
13 there.

14 But I look at the architecture of this
15 thing, and I know you've put such great effort
16 into the architecture and the history of this
17 City; but I look at the Baker -- or, I'm sorry,
18 not the Baker but the Arcada, that's basically a
19 three-story building.

20 The thing that gets extremely high is the
21 theater portion. So you have a three-story Arcada
22 building. You have your street. Now, you have
23 basically a story part of Flagship and Pollyanna
24 building and then -- I'll even give it a story and

1 a half, and then you're going to want a five-story
2 building. It's ridiculous. It doesn't flow at
3 all.

4 And then this mansard-style building, I
5 guess you could say that the Arcada building is a
6 mansard-style building, architecture with the tile
7 on the top. It's kind of a Spanish mansard, I
8 guess, you could call it.

9 And those elements -- and I know this is
10 conceptual, but I think you might have done
11 yourself a disservice by how that looked because,
12 No. 1, I think maximum should be two-story on this
13 property.

14 And I find your study about the shadow
15 study -- I can save the City some money. It's
16 going to be a nighttime for the residents on
17 Second Street after 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon.
18 Because if you look at the First Street
19 Development, with those huge buildings there, when
20 do you get sun down that street. So that kind of
21 tells you right there how the back of that
22 building is going to be.

23 Plus, if you look at the elevation that
24 shows that east side of the building, there's

1 actually balconies back there looking into that
2 property. How would you like to be sitting on
3 your front porch waving to the guy grilling his
4 burgers up there on the fifth floor. I don't
5 think that's a real inviting part of this either.

6 So I think -- I'm in total -- I agree
7 totally with the concept of not closing Second
8 Avenue down there. A lot of people, transfers,
9 and it is going to push all that parking back up
10 on our Third Avenue.

11 And I love the events here. I enjoy
12 talking to the people when they're going down to
13 this stuff because they're all juiced up, and
14 they're really juiced up when they come back at
15 2:00 o'clock in the morning, and I've found some
16 wonderful things in my flower beds and all that
17 stuff down there. So it's exciting. It's
18 exciting between midnight and 2:00 o'clock in the
19 morning. But I don't mind that because it's for
20 the best of the City to have that going on.

21 Now, we talked about Sammy's. Sammy's is
22 great. I love that location down there, but let's
23 think about that again. Every time you've looked
24 at Sammy's parking lot, when he's got a Saturday

1 morning bike event that's going to go, there's
2 10, 15 bikes. Where are they going to congregate
3 on that street. And they've mentioned kayak
4 rentals. I competed on this river since 1971 in
5 all these kayak races, part of the St. Charles
6 canoe club, kayak club.

7 And when you rent kayaks and you're
8 training people on how to paddle, you have to
9 stage kayaks out there. Where are they going to
10 stage kayaks out there. And then you're going to
11 have Riverside Drive, and you're constantly going
12 to be going across that dragging kayaks, dragging
13 bicycles, which trust me, I love the sport.

14 I've even thought of trying to open a
15 kayak shop or a bike shop in the area, and it just
16 takes a large footprint to be able to do those
17 things. So I love the idea of Sammy's being
18 there. I think it would be an upgrade from the
19 building that he's at.

20 I think it would put him on the map. He
21 might be able to do another one of those -- I
22 think that was a national race that he had done
23 here. I'm sorry. Yes. I would love to see that
24 again in this town. I love it when -- the fellow

1 that runs all the running races around here. Dick
2 Pond.

3 We could get Dick Pond maybe a more
4 visible spot down there because those people are
5 running all the time and to have those
6 competitions down there.

7 So these are all great things, but parking
8 I think is one of the major keys here, and then
9 the size of that monstrosity, and I understand
10 you've got to have so many dollars per square foot
11 to make this whole thing viable and make a profit.

12 But if you look at what Shodeen has done
13 down there at the Mill Race, he's trying to play
14 hardball down there, and that thing just keeps
15 getting uglier and uglier and uglier, and it's
16 going nowhere because he's got -- you know, he's
17 got the property now and he keeps presenting
18 high-density situations.

19 The same situation that went on in another
20 Shodeen project in Batavia where Route 25 makes
21 the jog and they tore down that Baptist church.
22 Go back and look at all the arguments that went on
23 in that process, and they wanted high-density
24 residences, and they were not providing any

1 parking. And I still think parking is a huge
2 issue with that project, and it might even involve
3 tearing down the existing parking garage that they
4 have.

5 So there's a lot of issues. I would love
6 to see something here because everybody now with
7 this gateway thing. This has been the ugliest
8 corner that's ever been, and I love the fact that
9 that was an old creamery down there. It's just a
10 great piece of history to keep there, but it
11 didn't really fit and look good.

12 And they tried to do -- and let me say one
13 other thing is the pedestrian bridge needs some
14 real attention because that's a jewel that we
15 don't want to lose either. If you put your City
16 out there to take a walk down there and see how
17 that thing is starting to rust apart, and it
18 looked like the Adams family house today when I
19 took a walk through there because there's more
20 spiders and stuff.

21 If you want to get a community
22 organization together, we'll work on it. I think
23 that thing should be decorated at Christmastime.
24 It's a beautiful old bridge, the old Hall Company.

1 In fact, it was there from the Piano factory days.

2 So we need that architectural response to
3 what this is. We need to have it look a little
4 bit like the Arcada. We could even make it look
5 like some of the brownstones, and I think it would
6 be a good fit.

7 But keep the faith, keep working on it,
8 but this is nowhere near what it needs to be at
9 this point. Thank you, guys.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

11 All right. Everybody done? Nobody left,
12 at least on this topic.

13 So to finish up, we're going to allow each
14 of our Plan Commission members to provide some
15 final feedback now that we've heard from our
16 residents, and then I think we'll be done with
17 this concept plan discussion. All right.

18 MEMBER BECKER: Oh, boy, thanks.

19 Well, I said my piece earlier, and I think
20 that my main comments have been talked about by
21 many, and it mainly deals with the bulk of the
22 building and the use of right-of-way for private
23 spaces. I think that's a huge challenge in
24 closing Indiana.

1 I think that the multiuse building is a
2 great idea, but interpretation of the gateway, I
3 think it's going to take a lot more work than what
4 is proposed right now. That's it. Thanks.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, I agree with
6 everything that's been said, and like I said in my
7 comments earlier, I think the density is too high.
8 You know it's stated in the existing zoning of
9 .83, and you're actually tripling that.

10 So bring the scale down, you know, talk to
11 the neighbors; and if that works well, then come
12 up with a great plan that works for everybody. So
13 that's all I have to say.

14 MEMBER WIESE: Yeah. I would say my
15 comments before stand. I appreciate the community
16 being involved and wanting to be heard, and I
17 appreciate the developers wanting to listen and
18 getting input.

19 I think something will get worked out.
20 I'm excited to see the iteration -- the next
21 iteration of what this could look like. I think
22 everyone is excited that something can be done on
23 this site and give it the proper gateway that it
24 should be.

1 MEMBER MOAD: Of course, I'm echoing
2 everything that's been said. I would encourage
3 you to do a parking survey and study of the
4 community as well as a traffic study prior to
5 moving forward with the concept of closing some of
6 those streets. Love the multiuse concept and
7 would like to see the density somewhat lower.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: First of all, I
9 would just like to say the Hursts have been huge
10 champions for our City, and I know that everything
11 that you are working on is only for the good of
12 our community.

13 That being said, I do think that it needs
14 some massaging. I did work and live at Heritage
15 Square. I do understand -- after you kind of
16 like pinpointed the traffic, I do think that is an
17 issue. And to be honest, you did do a good job
18 with the parking situation at Heritage Square.

19 So I think that needs to be worked on a
20 little bit, and it does fit within the
21 comprehensive plan. I do like the idea of the
22 mixed use, and I love the idea of getting an
23 active business on the first floor of this plan
24 because that's the way of our future, utilizing

1 our best resource, which is the river.

2 But I do think some things need to be
3 reevaluated, and I know that you will probably
4 move forward with a parking and traffic study and
5 look at all these objections and constructive
6 comments, and I know you will look at those and
7 address them.

8 So that's really all I have to say.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: As a group, I
10 think that I just want to help the audience
11 understand. There were a few questions related to
12 approval or changing information and not feeling
13 like -- at one meeting it was one thing and today
14 it's something else.

15 This is a concept plan meeting, and so it
16 is open to continued updating. This is not a
17 formal process at this point. They just are not
18 at that point to go into all of the time and
19 energy it takes to do that.

20 When that does happen, then I think you
21 will see very detailed analysis supported by
22 engineering, supported by a traffic study, which
23 some of our members have asked for, and I think it
24 will be really important with respect to parking

1 and access to this property, especially given a
2 potential for 48 units.

3 For me, I think a mixed-use project is
4 good. I think there were some things, not
5 understanding all, that somebody like Sammy's
6 does, but to introduce kayaks and understand the
7 logistics for actually doing that and how that
8 potentially works for crossing Riverside Drive,
9 which then has pros and cons if you explore
10 closing it, notwithstanding the fire department
11 using it as an access way to go south.

12 Certainly, a traffic study would look at
13 all of those issues and features. So I would
14 certainly encourage that to happen. I do like the
15 mixed-use, though, whether -- hopefully, it's
16 still Sammy's, and hopefully, all those little
17 details can get worked out with him, understanding
18 what his operations are and logistics are.

19 Because I think that a lot of the things
20 that he's doing are not only good as a business
21 but also supports continued growth in our
22 downtown, which obviously everyone would like to
23 see.

24 It's always a little awkward. A thought

1 that no matter what you do when you try to change
2 something, you're going to have things that are
3 going to not make people happy or make people
4 happy as well as you're going to have things that
5 are going to cause a little rub one way, but they
6 will be a benefit in the end for something else.
7 There's no way that everything will turn out
8 perfectly.

9 So between our City staff, our
10 departments, I'm sure a lot of that will get
11 worked out. So I encourage you to come back,
12 which I'm fairly certain you will, and I'm sure
13 we'll have detailed drawings and studies for us to
14 look at and for the public to also look at.

15 With respect to the public, if you would
16 like to continue to have the City's attention on
17 this topic, there is a meeting scheduled on the
18 9th of August with the Planning and Development
19 Committee. So you are welcome to attend that.

20 For now, I think, we'll close this and
21 move on to our next agenda item. Thank you.

22 (Off the record at 8:58 p.m.)

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 26th day of July, 2021. My commission expires: May 16, 2024



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Dean Street Mixed-Use Project

Date: July 20, 2021

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: Dean Street :
Mixed-Use Project (Slaten :
Construction, Inc.) :
Application for Concept :
Plan :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, July 20, 2021
8:58 p.m.

Job No.: 336730C
Pages: 1 - 40
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 Dean Street Mixed-Use Project
Conducted on July 20, 2021

1 PRESENT:

2 PETER VARGULICH, Vice Chairman

3 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

6 LAUREL MOAD, Member

7 COLLEEN WIESE, Member

8

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSSELL COLBY, Assistant Director of
11 Community & Economic Development

12 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

13 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

14 RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community &
15 Economic Development

16 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Dean Street Mixed-Use Project
Conducted on July 20, 2021

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Item No. 6 is a
3 concept plan for the Dean Street mixed-use project
4 by Slaten Construction. All of the rules are the
5 same.

6 So I'd like for everybody to come on up,
7 introduce the applicant, and we'll get started.

8 MR. SLATEN: Hi, John Slaten, S-l-a-t-e-n.

9 MR. PIPER: Troy Piper, P-i-p-e-r.

10 MR. SLATEN: Good evening everyone. John
11 Slaten, 720 Prairie Street, St. Charles, Illinois,
12 and our office is on 2325 Dean Street.

13 We're very, very early stage. I just
14 wanted to present to you guys. We're long-time
15 friends with Driessen Construction, worked there
16 26 years before I opened Slaten Construction.
17 Good friends with Malcor, the property owners at
18 the proposed lot on Dean Street.

19 And right now it's a M-1, and we would
20 like to go through the efforts of getting
21 architectural plans and seeing if it would be
22 possible to stay within what the surrounding area
23 is. The one request is I wanted to see if it's
24 possible to have an apartment for the owner to

1 live in, myself.

2 So we would -- you know, we're again very
3 early stages, as you can see. We just messed
4 around putting different footprints that worked
5 with the civil engineer, and we're very open.

6 I have -- a very long time in that
7 property, have been. You know, like I said, I
8 worked with Driessen, who were the original owners
9 for many, many years. And, you know, we're open
10 to keep it the same. We'd like to go a little bit
11 modern, but we would match the existing buildings
12 if it was the wish of the Commission.

13 The only request is we would like to put a
14 couple apartments -- we're not sure one to two, to
15 maybe possibly three for the owners to live in;
16 and the bottoms would be our office, Slaten
17 Construction, which is the commercial division,
18 very large scale, in 15 states right now.

19 This is our home. We have the building on
20 2325 Dean Street. We rent, but we have the entire
21 building, and we'd like to have our main
22 headquarters here. We're currently in Nevada,
23 opening two offices in California, and this is our
24 home, and we'd like to establish a good footprint

1 here.

2 We'll always have a home here, and we'll
3 always have something here, and we have over 40
4 employees here in St. Charles.

5 So that's our request. If it's able to
6 go, I know it won't be answered tonight. I'd like
7 to take it to the next step. I'd like to sit down
8 with my architect and, you know, get something
9 drawn up, proposed, and we're very open to say,
10 no, John, you can't do that. We want it to look
11 like this. We're good with that.

12 I've been in that building that's looked
13 exactly like that for 26 years. I love it. It's
14 a part of my life. You know, if Driessen didn't
15 close, I'd still be the vice president there. So
16 I have a lot of love for Malcor, a lot of love for
17 that property just because where it comes from.
18 And I'd love to put my feet in the ground there,
19 and I'm very connected to it. So that's my
20 request.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Plan
22 commissioners, any questions?

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So you do realize
24 you would be right next to a brewery, industrial.

1 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. I'm very familiar with
2 the Tribune building, Malcor, the boxing. I
3 actually worked in most of those buildings. I did
4 Ruffners. I actually sat in front of you guys
5 20 years ago when the Driessens did the original
6 proposal for that lot with Mr. Driessen.

7 And, you know, so we would like to change
8 that up a little bit, and we would sit down with a
9 local architect that you're very aware of and draw
10 that.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And would you be
12 putting in a new curb cut from Dean Street, or
13 would you be using Driessen's?

14 MR. SLATEN: We would probably -- we'd do
15 a new curb cut from Dean Street. Yeah. And
16 originally when I sat down, when we had this idea
17 with Bob before he retired, there was a couple
18 things he proposed. So that's why we kind of got
19 to this layout, but, again, we're very open.

20 We did do a geo on it. We did hire a
21 civil engineer to, you know, kind of get the lot
22 situated, and that's as far as we took it because
23 that was very inexpensive for us. You know,
24 \$5,000 as opposed to 50 to get permit plans.

1 So we're willing to take that next step.
2 We just wanted to see if it would be possible to
3 have an apartment in there for our family and
4 their family, and we both work there, and it would
5 be -- you know, obviously, it would be separate of
6 the warehouse and stuff.

7 It would be done up like, you know, not a
8 big skyscraper going up but we would -- if we had
9 to put it on the first floor and go up two floors
10 and then start fresh, we are willing to do that.
11 If we could do it from the roof up, you know, 10
12 feet high in there and kind of put something so
13 you don't see it. We're very open with the
14 concept.

15 MEMBER WIESE: One thing that I thought
16 was really interesting about this is the fact that
17 you want to do the units for yourself, so it's not
18 like you're trying to rent this out; and in
19 talking with staff, I understand that this is a
20 bit of a transitional area. I think it could be
21 interesting --

22 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

23 MEMBER WIESE: -- for the community to see
24 development that would be housing -- it's not for

1 sale. It's for your personal use. Whether that
2 triggers further development in that area, you
3 know, from a transitional, and while I know it's
4 warehousey --

5 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

6 MEMBER WIESE: -- I do think that there's
7 an element to that that's pretty interesting and
8 cool and provides --

9 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. I love it too, yeah.

10 MEMBER WIESE: It provides a different
11 type of housing, and there's already the brewery.
12 There's already a gym. I see an opportunity to
13 spark. If it doesn't spark anything, then it's
14 your property and you live there.

15 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. I mean, I have four
16 divisions. So all four divisions are going to
17 be -- you know, you have 2,000 square feet. You
18 have 2, you know. So it's -- you know, we're
19 going to be renting to ourselves, you know --

20 MEMBER WIESE: Correct. And that's why --

21 MR. SLATEN: -- to our partners.

22 MEMBER WIESE: That's what interests me is
23 that it's just for you. It may go no further, and
24 that's the only residential that ends up going in

1 that area, but it could spark something
2 interesting in a transitional area --

3 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. That's a good point.

4 MEMBER WIESE: -- potentially. I don't
5 know if it would or if it wouldn't.

6 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

7 MEMBER WIESE: But I think it's a safe and
8 interesting concept depending on how -- I know the
9 staff has -- you know, I know there's concern
10 about another curb cut. I know there's things in
11 here that --

12 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

13 MEMBER WIESE: -- you know, you'd have to
14 work through.

15 MR. SLATEN: Right. For sure.

16 MEMBER WIESE: And, obviously, you want to
17 make sure all of these things are met but I do --
18 I'm interested in this concept.

19 MR. SLATEN: Appreciate that. Thank you.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I actually like the concept
21 too. I love the idea --

22 MR. SLATEN: Thank you.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: -- of having a work/live
24 situation. I think it's great for an industrial

1 building that, you know, you have guys that own
2 their own companies that want to, you know, work
3 and live in the same area.

4 So one thing that I've questions on is
5 you've got those two drive aisles, the one on the
6 top and the one on the bottom. Are those shared
7 by the buildings to the north?

8 MR. SLATEN: No. That would be -- because
9 if you go down a little bit, Jeff, then there's
10 another entrance which would take you into Malcor.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

12 MR. SLATEN: Let's see which --

13 MEMBER FUNKE: So that street that you're
14 pointing to on the west side --

15 MR. SLATEN: Yeah, yeah. That is shared,
16 yes.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: Is there an easement
18 agreement with those buildings to the north?

19 MR. SLATEN: There is, yeah.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

21 MR. SLATEN: And we had to shoot -- you
22 know, that's why we had to move -- we had to
23 actually take it --

24 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

1 MR. SLATEN: -- further to the east for
2 that reason.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: In the future maybe you
4 just want to get a letter from them in that
5 there's an easement --

6 MR. SLATEN: Sure.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: -- agreement in place and
8 they're okay with, you know, you parking on that
9 drive.

10 And then, you know, another thing is
11 what's going to happen -- right now you're showing
12 trees and things on the southeast corner. Are you
13 going to maintain that? Is that going to be --

14 MR. SLATEN: We would do a whole
15 landscaping plan. Yeah, absolutely. If we knew
16 we were able to say, yes, go ahead and take it to
17 the next step, personally, you would be the person
18 I would be talking to.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: I actually like that idea.
20 I mean, It's a great buffer from the buildings to
21 the east, and then that 25-foot entrance to the --
22 on the top, is that a public street?

23 MR. PIPER: This right here?

24 MEMBER FUNKE: No. That one to the right.

1 Yeah. Right there. You have an entrance on that
2 street. Is that a public street or is that --

3 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

4 MR. PIPER: That's the entrance to all the
5 buildings.

6 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. So that's shared
7 between boxing and Malcor. The brewery is right
8 there where the arrow is at.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

10 MR. SLATEN: And that's the Tribune
11 building to the left there. So you could come in
12 there. That would be our space, the green. We
13 would have, you know, parking.

14 We had to do a couple -- like we did take
15 that concept a couple steps with Bob already,
16 where we found we could find underground drainage,
17 so we could put 20 more spaces. So we know it
18 would work for parking between warehouse, office,
19 and, you know, we came up -- so we did get that
20 far a few years ago.

21 And so we know it would work; and now if
22 we know we could do that, then we would go to the
23 next step with, you know.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: Right. Same idea, if

1 you're putting an entrance on to that private
2 street, just to get their approvals and
3 authorization.

4 MR. SLATEN: Yes. And that's the owner of
5 all of those buildings. That would be my partner.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: And then the second thing
7 would be -- you know, I like the idea of having --
8 you're going to have some great views on the third
9 floor. From an accessibility standpoint, just
10 think about accessibility and getting people up to
11 that floor. I mean, if it's -- you're going to
12 have -- this is an office-industrial use.

13 MR. SLATEN: Right.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: Are you going to have
15 elevators for each unit?

16 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. What I was initially
17 thinking, which, you know, if you don't mind,
18 we'll definitely be -- you and I will be talking,
19 but my thought was either coming from the first
20 floor, if I was, like, just saying we don't want
21 it that high.

22 Then I would start at the first floor, and
23 then that elevator would take you to the second,
24 but my key would take you to the third, and that

1 would be, like, the entrance in.

2 And I wouldn't need much space, you know,
3 just -- you know, because if I'm on the roof now,
4 I could keep it low, and I could keep it long, you
5 know. That was my initial, but then, of course, I
6 would need two elevators. You know what I mean.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

8 MR. SLATEN: So cost-wise, I was going to
9 weigh that out, but yeah.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. I like the idea. I
11 think it's great --

12 MR. SLATEN: Appreciate that.

13 MEMBER FUNKE: -- incorporating
14 residential and commercial use.

15 MEMBER BECKER: So I've been in a space
16 like this, it just popped into my mind, up in
17 Elgin, Rieke Office Interiors. They go by a
18 different name now, but a new family member or
19 somebody bought the business, and they have their
20 showroom and manufacturing on the first floor; and
21 then on the second floor they have -- their
22 president has her suite up there, and it's also
23 used as an entertainment space for the company and
24 it is -- it looks right out over I-90, which

1 that's not anybody's --

2 MR. SLATEN: Yeah, yeah.

3 MEMBER BECKER: It is really cool, really
4 cool.

5 MR. SLATEN: That's awesome. Yeah. You
6 know, I love that look.

7 Yourself, Jeff, I've seen a lot of your
8 drawings. You have a great vision with that kind
9 of stuff. I think it would look very good. We
10 could do it, you know, tastefully to blend in but
11 yet kind of -- I don't know, you know, city-like,
12 if you will, industrial.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, first of
14 all, the use, I don't have any problems with the
15 use or even combining the residential, but I think
16 that as a general amendment, to take off on your
17 comment, if you're going to spark something else,
18 I think I would rather see it as a general
19 amendment, and maybe it's a live/work requirement
20 rather than being able to use them as general
21 rental apartments.

22 And if it was limited to something, yet to
23 be worked out, I'm sure staff will help with that.
24 I think that could be a very viable combination.

1 MR. SLATEN: Got you.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. But --

3 MEMBER WIESE: And just to clarify, the
4 spark something else was not just related to
5 theirs, but that that development sparked another
6 development, not that they're going to turn
7 something else. So I was thinking that what they
8 do could spark --

9 MR. SLATEN: Someone else to say, hey, I'm
10 going to do that. Yeah.

11 MEMBER WIESE: Or something to that
12 effect, just to clarify.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, but also
14 one of the questions in front of us is how do we
15 address -- if we're thinking we want to allow a
16 residential use, how do we want to address it from
17 a zoning standard. Is it a PUD but then --

18 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. I wasn't sure either.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- we need all
20 the justifications for that versus if it's an
21 amendment, but the amendment is set up that it has
22 the limitation of the work units or it's a limit
23 on the number of the units or the square footage
24 that the units are allowed or something yet to be,

1 you know, worked through.

2 Then it allows them to do it, but then
3 somebody else could do it within this district as
4 long as it fits that criteria, that set of
5 criteria, something like that.

6 MR. SLATEN: We could call it like the
7 Slaten bill or something.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure. Sure.
9 Sure. You can send us a white paper. That will
10 be just fine, just fine.

11 But on the site plan, I think that there
12 has been a number of comments from our staff, and
13 it's helpful for me to understand the
14 clarification about on the east side, that it's a
15 common driveway that you do have the ability to
16 have access with. Obviously, there's reciprocal
17 easements, and all of that would be disclosed, if
18 you went into detail.

19 MR. SLATEN: Correct.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: On the west
21 side, it sounds like there is an easement that's
22 in place or an agreement with the buildings to the
23 north as far as access. So that's good just to
24 understand.

1 In general, I probably would not support
2 an additional entrance on Dean Street. It seems
3 unnecessary.

4 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The current
6 location looks -- is very awkward, where you have
7 to pull in and make an immediate right, left, or
8 people are trying to leave by that entrance, and
9 they're trying to align their car so that they can
10 see traffic coming from both east and west
11 directions.

12 So that location looks very awkward
13 because the drive lengths to the right-of-way
14 seems very short and awkward to turn. The
15 geometry seems very odd there.

16 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I think having
18 the two access points, one to the --

19 MR. SLATEN: We could come off that.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- over to the
21 east --

22 MR. SLATEN: Yep.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- is good from
24 a circulation --

1 MR. SLATEN: Yep.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- but it's also
3 good from a life safety standpoint and all of
4 those; and if you could just use the entrance that
5 you currently have on Dean that's shared access to
6 go north as the entrance, I think that would make
7 more sense rather than adding an additional one.

8 MR. SLATEN: That would make perfect sense
9 to me, yep.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So I think
11 there's some stormwater issues --

12 MR. SLATEN: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- that have to
14 be looked at. I think you've had some initial
15 conversations.

16 MR. SLATEN: I have.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sure with
18 respect to having more parking or less parking
19 becomes a function of how much do you want to
20 spend --

21 MR. SLATEN: Exactly.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- on underground
23 storage --

24 MR. SLATEN: Right.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- versus open,
2 you know, types of detention --

3 MR. SLATEN: Right.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- or permeable
5 pavors or things like that.

6 MR. SLATEN: Yes, exactly.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So those are
8 things that I'm sure your civil engineer can help
9 you with and help you run numbers --

10 MR. SLATEN: Yep.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- or yourself
12 to sort out where is the balance.

13 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And then clearly
15 then things like our landscape ordinance and all
16 of those things would come into effect, which it
17 appears this site layout doesn't seem to
18 accomplish those things.

19 MR. SLATEN: It doesn't. It doesn't.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: You know, but as
21 a use, I am comfortable --

22 MR. SLATEN: Okay.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- that this
24 could be good, but I would be more in favor of an

1 amendment to our ordinance so that we can define
2 exactly how that would work in this zoning
3 district --

4 MR. SLATEN: Okay.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- rather than
6 a --

7 MR. SLATEN: A PUD.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- a PUD.

9 MEMBER WIESE: I have a question then. So
10 if we did that and then someone -- just say this
11 did spark something a couple years down the road.
12 If someone wanted to come and do something but it
13 didn't quite fit within the amendment, could they
14 then apply for a PUD?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure.

16 MEMBER WIESE: So there's still an
17 opportunity even if we just set limitations within
18 an amendment, that it doesn't necessarily stop
19 something different happening.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Correct.

21 MEMBER WIESE: Correct. Okay. I just
22 want to make sure I understand that.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

24 MEMBER MOAD: I believe if you have an

1 amendment, it does create some limitations around
2 how those properties can be used.

3 MR. SLATEN: Makes sense. Yeah.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. Within
5 this zoning district. Right. Obviously, that was
6 never the intention for it, but given some of the
7 uniqueness that you're talking about, I think that
8 that -- I think that would be better done in an
9 amendment rather than a PUD.

10 To me you have a lot to justify on why you
11 allow that, you know, in a PUD versus just an
12 amendment with a definition that supports what
13 you're trying to do, but then also if it becomes
14 something that's duplicated, that we can all be
15 comfortable with.

16 MEMBER MOAD: That's a way for it to
17 remain zoned the way it is zoned versus changing
18 the zoning to something that doesn't --

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right.

20 MEMBER MOAD: Right.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, there's
22 not much public, so I'd say we have an
23 opportunity --

24 MS. THEISEN: You're talking about the

1 apartments, just do an amendment instead of having
2 it be able to be residential.

3 I would prefer, as part of the owner, is
4 that it be residences because I don't know that
5 you're going to stay here or we're going to stay
6 here.

7 MR. SLATEN: Right.

8 MS. THEISEN: I don't want to be tied into
9 not being able to rent those apartments.

10 MR. SLATEN: Right.

11 (Crosstalk.)

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Excuse me. Hold
13 on. One person speaks at a time. If you want to
14 speak, please come up. You have to come up.

15 MS. THEISEN: Pam T-h-e-i-s-e-n. I'm from
16 Malcor.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: You have to come
18 to the microphone, please.

19 MS. THEISEN: Just like I just said, from
20 my understanding, you were talking about doing an
21 amendment just so that they could be rented to the
22 owners that are going to be having the property.

23 I would prefer that we have the option to
24 rent it to whoever at any time. So if that is not

1 included in the amendment -- you know, I can't
2 guarantee that, you know, they're always going to
3 be there.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: That would be tied to the
5 zoning.

6 MS. THEISEN: Pardon?

7 MEMBER FUNKE: That would be tied to the
8 zoning, so you would be allowed to, yeah, with the
9 amendment.

10 MS. THEISEN: All right. So we would have
11 residential. Okay.

12 MEMBER BECKER: So, what, we're
13 contemplating rental units that are not tied to
14 the owner or the operator of the business? I have
15 a little bit of problem with that.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. In doing
17 an amendment, it would be something that would be
18 discussed and worked through with staff. This is
19 not something that would be tied directly to their
20 application. We would have to do them separately.

21 The idea is that they're pushing us to
22 consider it. Now, whether we want to limit it to
23 live/work units where they have to be on -- they
24 have to be somebody who is renting the building,

1 if you will, to have a unit or to use the
2 residential unit, that would all be worked out as
3 part of the amendment.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: So when you're presenting
5 the space, the space is one space, the residential
6 and the industrial or the office; is that correct?
7 They're not separate.

8 MR. SLATEN: It would be separate. I
9 mean, well, it would be all in the same building,
10 yes. Is that what you're asking? But like my
11 carpenter is not going to be able to walk into my
12 living room. Right. You know, it would be within
13 the space whether I start from the first floor and
14 go to --

15 MEMBER FUNKE: So you would have separate
16 vertical transportation for the office --

17 MR. SLATEN: Yes.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: -- and for the residential.

19 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. Whether it be stairs
20 for mine or an elevator that dumps them off. They
21 can go in and go all the way up to the --

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Keep in mind when you're
23 thinking about that, and then you're going to have
24 two sets of stairs for each use. Right. So you'd

1 have four stairs for one building, right, or one
2 section.

3 MR. SLATEN: So you'd have two. Right.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: You need two exits for
5 each use. Right.

6 MR. SLATEN: Right.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: If they're separated.

8 MR. SLATEN: Right. Now, when you say
9 separated, I mean, it's in the same building, but
10 you're saying if there's a wall that separates it,
11 a demising wall.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

13 MR. SLATEN: I mean, you would still have
14 an exit door with that to get you out and to get
15 to the stairs that everybody is using.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: Right. Exactly.

17 MR. SLATEN: Yes. Understood.

18 And then I apologize. You're saying --
19 because I never took it the way that if something
20 happened to me, they wouldn't be able to rent it
21 out. Just so I'm clear, instead -- in lieu of
22 doing a PUD, we would do an amendment that would
23 not be decided now.

24 We would start -- now, that we know we can

1 move forward with a real drawing, and then it
2 would be discussed with the Commission and say
3 here's what these limitations would be, and it
4 would be a conversation; is that correct?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, I think
6 that as far as you going forward --

7 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- that would be
9 something to discuss with our staff. Okay.

10 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. Right.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And exactly what
12 that would entail.

13 MR. SLATEN: Right.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: What all the
15 expectations are as far as documents and studies
16 and all of that. So that you would clarify with
17 them. Okay.

18 MR. SLATEN: Right.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Not with us.

20 We're just suggesting this high level for
21 this concept plan that an amendment to the
22 ordinance would allow that. The idea of tying
23 residential units to this zoning district would
24 then be possible --

1 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- going
3 forward.

4 MR. SLATEN: That's what I mean. Yeah.
5 Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So you will be
7 able to rent them out independent of whether
8 somebody -- you know, as a live/work unit as we're
9 kind of throwing that idea out. Okay. That still
10 has yet to be determined --

11 MR. SLATEN: Understood.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- if that would
13 be possible.

14 MR. SLATEN: Okay.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And at least for
16 this body, we have some people who have already
17 voiced that they don't like that idea. Okay. But
18 there still would be much to work out, and I would
19 start with our staff.

20 MR. SLATEN: For sure. Understood.

21 MEMBER BECKER: Well, I think the
22 ramifications for doing a general amendment, in
23 thinking about that, you'll have a much wider
24 application. And so we have to think about that.

1 What does that mean for the City as a
2 whole if we open rental units not regulated within
3 manufacturing districts. That's a big
4 conversation, and so you have to decide if you
5 want to do it this way or this way and what that
6 means for your timing. But that's a big
7 discussion, I think.

8 MR. SLATEN: I thought we really liked
9 this idea. I'm not feeling too good now here.

10 MEMBER BECKER: Yes. It's just the
11 mechanism of how you get there. How you get
12 there.

13 MEMBER FUNKE: What she's saying is that
14 the shared use --

15 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: -- I mean, it's all in one,
17 in one structure. Right.

18 MR. SLATEN: Yeah.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: So the office -- they have
20 an apartment to that office. They're attached.
21 They're not separated.

22 MR. SLATEN: Got you. So when we sit down
23 maybe -- you know, like I said, I'm so open. If I
24 have to separate -- you know what I'm saying. I'm

1 very open. I just want to put my feet in the
2 ground in my town, establish our home base instead
3 of renting, you know, and get signage up and keep
4 doing what we're doing, so.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

6 MR. SLATEN: Okay. I feel better.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any last
8 comments that we have since there's no public?

9 MR. SLATEN: Yeah. Thank you.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any last
11 comments?

12 (No response.)

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.
14 Thank you very much.

15 MR. SLATEN: Thank you, guys. Have a good
16 night.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So
18 whether anybody noticed or not, there's a topic of
19 election of officers.

20 So Todd resigned. And as the vice chair,
21 I get to chair, if you will, this meeting. But, I
22 think what would be appropriate is decide on if we
23 want to reelect, if you will, a commissioner, the
24 chairman of this Commission, and then also the

1 vice chair. Okay.

2 So are we ready to do that?

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I mean, I don't
4 know how this is done since I did something wrong
5 tonight. I mean, I would like to make a motion
6 for election of officers for Commissioner
7 Vargulich to be our chair.

8 MEMBER MOAD: And I would second that.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Second.

10 So now --

11 MEMBER FUNKE: I'd like to nominate
12 Commissioner Purdy to vice chair.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Really?

15 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes. I think you would be
16 great.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I think you would
19 be more suitable.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Russ, can you
21 help just with the mechanics? Do we need to do
22 the chairperson first and then vice chair, or do
23 we do them both at the same time?

24 MR. COLBY: Yes. Well, the motion has

1 been made for the chair. It would be appropriate
2 to take action on that.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We have a second
4 for that. So we should vote on that, and then
5 we'll --

6 MR. COLBY: Yes. And Then you can discuss
7 who has an interest in being vice chair.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Very good.
9 Okay. Thank you.

10 All right. So we'll go ahead and vote on
11 the motion. If that's okay, Jeff.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We'll delay the
14 vice chair. So we have a motion for myself as the
15 chairperson. So we can -- do we have a voice
16 vote? Okay. So let's go back to --

17 All right. So Laurel.

18 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen.

24 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

Transcript of Dean Street Mixed-Use Project
Conducted on July 20, 2021

1 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer.

2 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So
4 that takes care of that.

5 So now we can go on to the vice chair.
6 All right. So now, who would like to be that
7 person?

8 MEMBER BECKER: I'll second it.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: I don't know.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So do we have --

11 MEMBER FUNKE: I nominated --

12 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. So we
13 will keep --

14 MEMBER FUNKE: I nominate Commissioner
15 Macklin-Purdy to vice chair.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Why?

17 MEMBER FUNKE: I think you're amazing.
18 You'd be amazing at it.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So any --
20 we had a second.

21 MEMBER BECKER: Yes. We have to have a
22 second, so we can discuss it.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Second. Do we
24 have a second to that?

Transcript of Dean Street Mixed-Use Project
Conducted on July 20, 2021

1 MEMBER BECKER: I did second, so we can
2 discuss it.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Any
4 discussion?

5 MEMBER MOAD: Only does she want it.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I want to know why.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: I just think that you do a
8 great job during the Planning Commission meetings,
9 and you're part of the community, and I think you
10 have a lot of experience.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I know nothing
12 about procedure --

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I don't either.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: -- obviously.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: We'll learn together.

16 We'll learn together.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Will you be okay
19 with this, Laura?

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes. I'll be okay
21 with it if I learn procedure.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. In the
23 meantime --

24 MEMBER FUNKE: There's a bump in the

1 raise.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: You get a higher
4 per diem.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Are you writing
6 this down?

7 THE REPORTER: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It's casual.
9 Well, since there's nobody else here, it's easy to
10 be this way. All right. So we have a motion and
11 a second. I'll take a vote. Okay. Can we do
12 that?

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Sure.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.
15 Laurel.

16 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura.

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen.

22 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer.

24 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Me, yes. All
2 right.

3 MEMBER BECKER: One thing I would like to
4 suggest is we have some new members, and we're
5 kind of getting reacquainted with the new
6 leadership and power structure, and you're talking
7 about -- and you're talking about, you know, not
8 knowing procedure.

9 Maybe we have a work session. We have the
10 great book, but the great book is only as good as
11 how much you read it; and so, you know, maybe we
12 have -- if there's not something on an agenda one
13 session, we use that as an open meeting work
14 session and get acquainted with things that, you
15 know.

16 Because like you're not supposed to make a
17 double negative motion, those kind of things --

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

19 MEMBER BECKER: -- and calling the motion
20 and, you know, how the process is and refresh
21 ourselves on that.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: I think that's a great
23 idea.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Are you okay with
2 that, Russ?

3 MR. COLBY: Yes. We can schedule kind of
4 a training seminar.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: There was a
6 training seminar when I first started.

7 MR. COLBY: Yeah. We haven't done it in a
8 while. So it would be a good idea I think to do
9 another one. We are still -- we do have a
10 vacancy. So we're waiting for someone new to be
11 appointed. So we probably want to wait until
12 after that occurs so they can be part of it.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Good. All
14 right. So with that, additional business?

15 MS. JOHNSON: Sorry. I do have one item,
16 just a housekeeping matter. We've noticed that
17 some of the binders have been walking out of here
18 after meetings. So just a reminder that the
19 commissioner binders that are on your seats should
20 stay here.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Great. Thank
22 you. We have the weekly development report.
23 That's all good. Thank you, staff, for that, and
24 thank you for some great reports today, very

1 helpful.

2 And I think our next meeting is the 3rd
3 of August here at 7:00 o'clock.

4 MS. JOHNSON: We do have items for that
5 meeting.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So do we have
7 agenda items that you know of?

8 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, for August 3rd, we do.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Excellent.
10 Item 12, public comment. That's done.

11 Anything from here? You're good. All
12 right. Perfect. All right.

13 Well, then I suggest that --

14 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll make a motion to
15 adjourn.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- a motion to
17 adjourn.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll make that motion.

19 MEMBER WIESE: I'll second it.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Second. The
21 Plan Commission is complete at 9:32 p.m. Thank
22 you.

23 (Off the record at 9:32 p.m.)

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 26th day of July, 2021. My commission expires: May 16, 2024



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois