

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 2019**

---

Members Present: Chairman Wallace  
Vice Chairman Kessler  
James Holderfield  
Jennifer Becker  
Laura Macklin-Purdy  
Jeff Funke  
Peter Vargulich  
Tom Pretz  
Suzanne Melton

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Russell Colby, Community Development Manager  
Ellen Johnson, Planner  
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner  
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer  
Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**3. Presentation of minutes of the July 16, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.**

**Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Funke and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the July 16, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.**

**4. St. Charles Public Library (St. Charles Public Library District)  
Application for Concept Plan**

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

**5. Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown  
Recommendations for East Side study area**

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

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**  
**Tuesday, August 6, 2019**  
**Page 2**

**6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff**  
a. Pledge of Allegiance Discussion

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

**Motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Ms. Purdy to add the Pledge of Allegiance to the Plan Commission meeting agenda, with review and approval of City Council.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Becker, Purdy, Melton, Funke, Vargulich, Pretz**

**Nays: Kessler, Wallace, Holderfield**

**Absent:**

**Motion carried 6-3**

**Motion was made by Chairman Wallace and seconded by Mr. Pretz to amend the previous motion to direct staff to prepare a change to the Plan Commission Rules of Procedure regarding addition of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Plan Commission meeting agenda.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Becker, Purdy, Melton, Funke, Vargulich, Pretz, Wallace**

**Nays: Kessler, Holderfield**

**Absent:**

**Motion carried 7-2**

**7. Weekly Development Report**

**8. Meeting Announcements**

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, August 20, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, September 3, 2019 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

Tuesday, September 17, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, August 12, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, September 9, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

**9. Public Comment- None**

**10. Adjournment at 9:42 p.m.**



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

---

# Transcript of St. Charles Public Library Application for Concept Plan

**Date:** August 6, 2019

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

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

[www.planetdepos.com](http://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: :  
St. Charles Public Library :  
(St. Charles Public Library :  
District) Application for :  
Concept Plan. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, August 6, 2019  
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 218469A  
Pages: 1 - 83  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of St. Charles Public Library Application for Concept Plan  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of St. Charles Public Library Application for Concept Plan  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the  
St. Charles Plan Commission will come to order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

MEMBER BECKER: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

MEMBER MELTON: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Presentation of the  
minutes of the July 15, 2019, meeting of the Plan  
Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

6 (Ayes heard.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes

10 unanimously.

11 Item 4 on the agenda is St. Charles Public  
12 Library (St. Charles Public Library District)  
13 Application for Concept Plan.

14 For concept plan reviews the Plan Commission  
15 gives applicants an opportunity to come in before  
16 filing an official application and have a concept  
17 plan review.

18 What we do is the applicant will make a  
19 presentation, and the Plan Commission will ask  
20 questions, members of the public can ask  
21 questions, make comments, and then we will sum up  
22 with a summary of our thoughts both positive and  
23 negative for the development proposal.

24 After our concept plan review -- is this

1 going to go to the planning and development  
2 committee for review, also?

3 Okay. It will be a similar procedure with  
4 the City Council through their planning and  
5 development committee. But after that there won't  
6 be any further action taken. The applicant then  
7 has the option to file an application for us to  
8 take official action on this.

9 So after tonight there will still be  
10 subsequent opportunities to be heard when this  
11 comes before us for a public hearing.

12 Any questions.

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So what I  
15 would ask is that anyone who wishes to speak, first  
16 of all, wait to be recognized by me, and if you  
17 could speak up here in front into the microphone,  
18 state your name and spell your name and also your  
19 address for the record.

20 Is there anything from staff before we start?

21 MS. JOHNSON: No.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is the applicant ready?

23 Okay. It's all yours.

24 MR. MCKAY: Good evening. My name is

1 Don McKay. I'm a principal with Sheehan Nagle  
2 Hartray Architects. With me tonight are several  
3 staff members from the library itself, including  
4 the library director, Edith Craig. They're  
5 available to answer any questions that I may not  
6 be able to answer.

7           The St. Charles Public Library occupies about  
8 three-quarters of a block. The other quarter is  
9 taken up by St. Mark's Church. The library property  
10 has been assembled over a number of years. So one  
11 of the things that's unusual about the site right  
12 now is the way the parking is distributed on the  
13 site. So every time they got a new piece of land,  
14 they used it for parking, and so there are currently  
15 three parking lots on the site right now that are  
16 in separate areas and all configured differently.  
17 So when you have especially the diagonal parking  
18 that's located in the northeast corner of the  
19 site, that's diagonal parking in order to maximize  
20 the spaces there, but it makes for almost a  
21 hazardous kind of pedestrian environment when you  
22 leave that lot over there.

23           The library does share a bit of parking  
24 with St. Mark's Church which is located directly

1 south of the library. When St. Mark's heard that  
2 the library was considering a large renovation and  
3 site redesign, they saw it also as an opportunity  
4 to reconsider their site. So we have worked also  
5 with St. Mark's Church to consider the entire block  
6 as kind of one big site and try to figure out what's  
7 the best way to configure the site, primarily the  
8 parking. The fact is that St. Mark's gets some  
9 benefit of parking from the library side for the  
10 big events that they have during the course of the  
11 year, as well.

12           There are also two -- along 6th Avenue  
13 there are two single-family homes located there.  
14 Those were purchased by the library. They have  
15 since been demolished, and so they are part of the  
16 site, as well.

17           One of the other notable features of the  
18 site is that there's a detention area in the  
19 southeast corner of the site. That will be  
20 retained and actually expanded because of the  
21 parking lot configuration, as well.

22           The library has a rather serious challenge,  
23 and that is the result of starting with a really  
24 great old building, the Carnegie library building

1 that was constructed in 1906. You can see it's  
2 outlined here in the upper left-hand corner.

3 The building was added onto in 1964. When  
4 the 1964 addition was put on, the library entry  
5 was relocated. It was located -- you see where  
6 that 1964 is located on the image there. Directly  
7 south of that is where the library entry was  
8 relocated. So that started to kind of marginalize,  
9 if you will, the Carnegie library within the  
10 library building.

11 This situation was made worse when the  
12 second addition was put on at the end of the 1980s  
13 where the octagon is that you see in the lower  
14 right-hand corner. So right now the Carnegie  
15 library is really buried. You know that it's  
16 there, you see it from the outside, but you have  
17 to kind of hunt for it when you're inside the  
18 library building.

19 Here are the images that represent the  
20 architecture both inside and outside from those  
21 three different buildings, and the Carnegie library  
22 is kind of, as you might expect, a wonderful  
23 example of classical architecture, a great old  
24 historic building. The 1964 addition was

1 architecture I would say was fairly typical of its  
2 time. You know, there are some windows, but it's  
3 somewhat dark, very modern, kind of austere  
4 environment both inside and out. The big benefit  
5 of the 1964 addition is that it's a big open clear  
6 floor plan, which gives the library a lot of  
7 flexibility for moving things around. That's  
8 really valuable to have in a public library.

9 The 1989 addition which is shown on the  
10 right, its big feature is the octagon piece that  
11 forms the entry, and it's kind of a semiserious  
12 attempt at doing something in a classical vein  
13 similar to the original Carnegie library, but  
14 their heart wasn't really in it, I think, when  
15 they did that. The 1989 addition also includes a  
16 large two-story space which we think is a real  
17 asset to the library.

18 So as we started to look at this building  
19 and identify what are the challenges and  
20 opportunities, one of the challenges that we  
21 identified was the current corner entry for the  
22 library building.

23 When you come in, it's fairly crowded.  
24 There are service desks on either side. You have

1 to walk quite a ways into the building. It's  
2 friendly in the sense that when you walk in, you  
3 see librarians, there's somebody there to greet  
4 you, but you have to get fairly well into the  
5 building before you really feel like you're in the  
6 library.

7 One of the other challenges, as I mentioned,  
8 is the isolation of the Carnegie library building  
9 itself.

10 And No. 3 that's labeled there is that  
11 two-story space. We think that this is an  
12 opportunity that's really not taken advantage of  
13 in the library right now.

14 So as we started to look at planning  
15 concepts, one of the things we really wanted to do  
16 was reintegrate the Carnegie library into the  
17 daily activities of the building. There's very  
18 strong central access that goes through the  
19 Carnegie library, and our intent was to extend  
20 that access through the building to form kind of a  
21 major pathway through the building, if you will,  
22 and off of that major pathway have secondary ways  
23 of getting into that two-story space and circulate  
24 into the rest of the library building.

1           So the site plan, as you'll see on the  
2 site plan here we're proposing two additions to  
3 the building. One is along the north side of the  
4 building. That's a one-story addition. So that's  
5 along Main Street. So you can see where the  
6 existing library is there, and it's labeled "new  
7 addition." There's a 5-foot setback requirement  
8 there which we are honoring along Main Street.  
9 That's a one-story addition. It's primarily staff  
10 offices and service areas.

11           And then the other addition we're proposing  
12 is a two-story addition on the east side of the  
13 building, which is where the new library entry is  
14 located. It's in red there; it's labeled as  
15 "Public Entry." I'll talk in a minute about some  
16 of the other site features leading up to the  
17 public entry for the building there.

18           On the south side of the building we're  
19 proposing a drive-up window. So that parking lot  
20 that's currently between St. Mark's and the  
21 library right now, we're going to reconfigure  
22 that, I think make it safer than it is now. It  
23 provides for a drop-off area for St. Mark's and  
24 also a drive-up window for the library, which is

1 something that they do not have right now.

2 And then the majority of the site is  
3 reconfigured parking. And we have worked with a  
4 traffic engineer to make sure that we're doing  
5 things to increase the safety as we reconsider the  
6 parking lot.

7 So we're maintaining the two existing  
8 entry points into the site, one that aligns with  
9 Walnut Avenue on the east side and the other that  
10 aligns with 6th Avenue on the south side where it  
11 comes into Illinois Street.

12 One of the other site issues that we're  
13 having to deal with is there are overhead utility  
14 lines that run through the site right now. We are  
15 getting pricing to see what the cost would be for  
16 relocating those below grade, but it may be cost  
17 prohibitive. So we're working our planning around  
18 the possibility of having to keep those.

19 There are some nice -- the way the site  
20 slopes right now, we've got the wetlands detention  
21 area at the south end of the site, but the site  
22 generally slopes up towards that wetlands detention  
23 area. So what that means is that in order to  
24 accommodate the detention required for the parking,

1 we're going to have put in a low-grade storage  
2 tank that will be located in the north parking lot  
3 just off of 7th Avenue.

4           And then one of the other challenges of  
5 the slope on the land right now, there are some  
6 good existing mature trees on the site that we'd  
7 like to keep because they could be a real feature  
8 especially in the new parking lot. We've identified  
9 three of those kind of in the middle of the  
10 parking lot, also some in the lot that's between  
11 the church and the library, and then also some up  
12 along Main Street, as well. So we're working with  
13 our civil engineer and landscape architect to make  
14 sure we can preserve those trees on the site,  
15 as well.

16           The other feature on the site that we're  
17 currently just starting to work on, we had a  
18 meeting with the park district to talk to them  
19 about this possibility, it's labeled as a  
20 "Discovery Zone" down at Illinois Street. So this  
21 would be a kind of natural play area. It wouldn't  
22 be a traditional playground in the sense of having  
23 playground-type equipment there but something  
24 similar to -- there's a park in St. Charles, the

1 Hickory Knolls Park, doing something similar to  
2 that. So it's a very natural character at the  
3 corner entry.

4 And then we're also integrating St. Mark's  
5 parking into our library plan, into our library  
6 site plan, as well. One of the comments in the  
7 staff comments was regarding the exit that St. Mark's  
8 has, the exit point that St. Mark's has from their  
9 parking lot directly onto Illinois Avenue and the  
10 possibility of closing that.

11 It is fairly near the corner at 5th Avenue  
12 there. However, they have a preschool program  
13 there, and anybody who is familiar with pickup and  
14 drop-off for those kinds of programs, there are a  
15 couple of 15-, 20-minute durations, you know, that  
16 happen every day when school is in effect where  
17 that access point is very valuable to them. So  
18 that's a consideration I think to think about,  
19 as well.

20 Focusing on the site around the library  
21 itself, over on the right-hand side you can see  
22 where it's labeled "Public Entry." The way we've  
23 pulled the new building addition -- you can see  
24 there's a plan for the public entry, but the way

1 we've pulled the entry out there, one of the  
2 concerns we've had and that the library has had is  
3 the noise that's along Main Street, and what's the  
4 environment like, what does it feel like coming  
5 into the library with the entry up near Main Street.  
6 So the way we brought in the new addition is to  
7 kind of screen the noise from North Avenue to  
8 people coming into the library.

9 We have a fairly generous plaza area out  
10 in front of the library, as well, where we will  
11 integrate benches, and bike parking, and a  
12 landscape feature there. And the thing that's  
13 labeled "Courtyard" there is actually a sunken  
14 courtyard. This is really valuable to the library  
15 because you'll get a lot of natural light in the  
16 children's area which is currently located on the  
17 lower level of the library, will remain on the  
18 lower level of the library, but this will  
19 substantially change the character of that space  
20 just by getting all that natural light down there  
21 and also providing some outdoor program space for  
22 the library, as well. So that courtyard, the only  
23 way to get to the courtyard is from inside the  
24 library. There's not a way to get to it from

1 outside, so it's a secure area that's part of the  
2 library.

3 You can see in the lot reconfiguration  
4 between St. Mark's and the library we provided for  
5 a drop-off area for St. Mark's. There's also a  
6 place hold for community garden space on the south  
7 side of the library building. That's something  
8 the library has right now and would like to  
9 preserve going forward.

10 I won't go into detail on the floor plans.  
11 I just want to highlight a couple of things.

12 This is the main-level floor plan for the  
13 building. So I'm going to start over on the  
14 right-hand side where it's labeled in red "Public  
15 Entry." So you come into that vestibule, you turn  
16 to the left, and as soon as you do, now you're on  
17 access to the Carnegie library. So you can see  
18 that main pathway that runs from the entry all the  
19 way back through the Carnegie library. We're  
20 proposing to punch a hole in the back side of the  
21 Carnegie library and really integrate it into the  
22 flow of the library, as well.

23 The rest of that area is the lobby space.  
24 We have our stairs, a new elevator there that

1 makes the building accessible in a way that it's  
2 currently not.

3           The other thing I want to highlight on the  
4 plan without going into a lot of detail, the shaded  
5 areas that you see up at the top and on the left-hand  
6 side of the plan, those are the back-of-the-house  
7 staff areas. So it's our intention with this plan  
8 to take the public areas that's shown in white and  
9 really consolidate those into the center of the  
10 building itself. That's something that will give  
11 the library more flexibility going into the future  
12 being able to move things around, as well, and not  
13 have to worry about something that's buried down  
14 in a wing of the building. So that's one of the  
15 other features of the building.

16           A couple of other improvements that we're  
17 making inside, new toilet rooms, a new large  
18 meeting room that overlooks that garden terrace  
19 that goes down to the library so you'll be able to  
20 see that meeting room as you come up to the  
21 library and see that activity there. So I think  
22 our whole intent here is to create a vitality to  
23 the library even before you walk in the door that  
24 you really don't have there right now.

1           The lower level, this is the children's  
2 area. I'll just highlight the terrace garden on  
3 the right-hand side there. So that will be all  
4 windows along that side that will let a lot of  
5 natural light into the children's area there.  
6 Again, the shaded area is the back-of-the-house  
7 area that's located back away from that window well.  
8 The library has a mezzanine, as well.

9           There will also be a new teen area shown in  
10 yellow in the upper right-hand corner there. This  
11 will be a dedicated space to the teens, something  
12 very important in a library design as a way of  
13 engaging that kind of age group that typically  
14 falls away from library usage after their parents  
15 stop bringing them there. This is a way of  
16 maintaining their involvement in the library.

17           But I'll come back to that in a couple of  
18 minutes as I talk about the architecture on the  
19 outside. Because that Carnegie meeting room that's  
20 shown on the left-hand side is really a fabulous  
21 room, and we think there's an opportunity with the  
22 architecture for this teen area that we're  
23 developing on the other side to be a very nice  
24 kind of complementary piece to that Carnegie

1 meeting room that's up on the upper floor.

2           So this is how the site looks like right  
3 now from Main Street. Main Street is such a well-  
4 traveled street, but the library gets a little  
5 lost on the street. So this is the view if you're  
6 on Main Street heading westbound on Main Street  
7 and then also another view as if you're heading  
8 eastbound on Main Street.

9           Carnegie library is still fairly prominent.  
10 We took these pictures on a sunny, shadowy day,  
11 which kind of helps to kind of hide the library,  
12 but I think with the new plan that we're proposing  
13 the library will have much more prominence on  
14 Main Street than it does right now. It will  
15 really raise their identity I think as a civic  
16 building within the community.

17           When we think about how do we add on to a  
18 building like this that has a great old building  
19 to start with and then a couple of additions that  
20 we don't find as stimulating, one of the things we  
21 do is look for ways of working with the good parts  
22 of what are there right now, in this case the  
23 Carnegie library, and see how can we take some  
24 queues from that to develop what we're doing.

1           So as we looked at the Carnegie elevation,  
2           it seemed to us that we could inscribe it within a  
3           square, which may seem like a silly thing to think  
4           about, but we know that good classical architectures  
5           use these types of proportion systems in a very  
6           serious and deliberate way. And when we looked at  
7           the actual elevation and saw that you could, in  
8           fact, inscribe it perfectly within the square, we  
9           knew that was not an accident. So somebody was  
10          really paying close attention to the proportions  
11          of the building itself.

12          Then the diagonal red line that you see in  
13          the center there is also another way of taking a  
14          queue of proportions in this case between the  
15          columns at the front entry to inform how we might  
16          develop our building. So as we started to look at  
17          the new addition on the other side of the building  
18          where our new entry is, this is an earlier version  
19          of it, but we've remained true to this kind of  
20          proportion system where we inscribe within the  
21          square. We're not doing something that mimics or  
22          duplicates the Carnegie building, but we're picking  
23          up on the proportioning system that's there. Now,  
24          this is something people aren't going to notice

1 when they look at the building, but these are the  
2 kinds of things that are kind of subconscious to  
3 make it feel like the building is well integrated  
4 with what's on the site right now.

5 So as we look at the architectural concept,  
6 this is a view that is in development. This is  
7 from the parking lot side. On the right-hand side  
8 there you can see the new entry piece that we're  
9 proposing. So we have a gable roof. It's kind of  
10 a double gable roof, if you will, one gable that  
11 comes out and forms the entry. So you can see  
12 that that entry is -- that open gable piece faces  
13 south towards the parking lot. That also provides  
14 a kind of screening from the sound along Main Street  
15 that I was talking about earlier.

16 And then you see the big windows behind the  
17 courtyard piece there that will open to the meeting  
18 room. Imagine that those windows go all the way  
19 down to the courtyard below and let light into the  
20 children's area down below. There's a guardrail  
21 around that courtyard that's shown there right now.  
22 Then we have these periodic posts or stands where  
23 there are intended to be sculptures on top of  
24 those posts.

1           We know that the St. Charles community is  
2 very supportive of the arts. There are some nice  
3 sculptures on the library property right now and  
4 also within the library, and we just see this as  
5 an opportunity to do something that would help  
6 integrate the library into the community and the  
7 values that this community has, as well.

8           The piece that's over on the left-hand side,  
9 which is the octagon piece, that will become an  
10 outdoor seating area. So our new vending and cafe  
11 area is located inside the library right off of  
12 that. So you can go outside and sit there and  
13 also have access to the courtyard down below.

14           And this is a view coming up to the entry,  
15 kind of a dusk or a nighttime view as you come up  
16 which I think kind of illustrates our intention as  
17 far as trying to make this a very well-lit, kind  
18 of open, inviting-type environment, something we  
19 think that is actually very different from the  
20 current library entry experience coming in. So  
21 what we envision here is that the underside of  
22 that gable piece coming in would be flat and wood.  
23 That would extend inside the building, so a nice  
24 soft wood glow at the entry. That octagon piece

1 on the other side we're thinking about cladding  
2 that with similar wood on the underside to connect  
3 those two pieces together and create a very  
4 different character from what it has right now.  
5 And then over to the left there in this rendering  
6 you can also see where the courtyard space is down  
7 into the children's area.

8 As we look at these, these are computer-  
9 generated models, so they're not really as refined  
10 as some of the renderings, but we wanted to give  
11 you a sense of the overall mass of the building,  
12 including the piece along the north side we're  
13 proposing.

14 So the image that you see on the top, you  
15 can see that the large gable roof, we've got a kind  
16 of raised roof portion facing Main Street there.  
17 That has windows into the teen area, and then kind  
18 of a shedlike roof over the top of that. That is  
19 a continuation of the existing roof that's on the --  
20 one of the older additions to the building, as well.

21 So this is one of the -- this is something  
22 that was not seen by the Historic Preservation  
23 Commission. This is one of the questions or their  
24 concerns is how do we make that transition, and so

1 we think this is a way of addressing it, and we think  
2 it's a big improvement over what we had before.

3 On the right-hand side you can see the  
4 one-story piece that is the service area together  
5 with the library staff offices and other  
6 back-of-the-house functions, as well. So there's  
7 a garage door there that provides access for the  
8 library vans that come in there. There's a little  
9 screen wall that extends out from it; you can see  
10 some service areas; then at the bottom you can see  
11 that one-story addition piece, as well. You get  
12 an overall sense on the bottom, I think, of what  
13 we hope is a complementary relationship, if you  
14 will, between the Carnegie building on the one  
15 side and the new addition that we're proposing on  
16 the other side.

17 This is the last image, just the rendered  
18 images of the proposed north and east elevations  
19 of the building. So the east elevation, again,  
20 you can see on the right-hand side the proposed  
21 new entry addition.

22 These elevations are a little bit difficult  
23 to understand, I think in some ways because they  
24 tend to flatten out what's happening there. So,

1 for example, that little bit of horizontal shed  
2 roof that you see in the background there above the  
3 big windows, that's actually set back a good 30,  
4 40 feet on the building. So the elevations are a  
5 little bit harder to understand in that regard.

6 I think the one on the bottom does show  
7 pretty well the way we're proposing to integrate  
8 that existing roof that's over one of those  
9 additions on the library into the new addition  
10 that we have on the left-hand side for the new  
11 entry piece.

12 So I went through that fairly quickly.  
13 Hopefully -- just trying to hit on the big points,  
14 but I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Questions  
16 from Plan Commissioners?

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a question  
18 just for clarification. So you're removing the  
19 stairs that are there currently when you walk into  
20 the library right now?

21 MR. MCKAY: Yes, we are.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And that's going to  
23 be like a vending -- cafe vending area?

24 MR. MCKAY: Yes, it will.

1           MEMBER FUNKE: I have a question regarding  
2 St. Mark's. Don't they currently drop off on the  
3 north side of the church for the kids in daycare?

4           MR. MCKAY: When I've been there, they're  
5 using that entire circulation.

6           MEMBER FUNKE: I have a concern now that  
7 you're having a book drop in that area that during  
8 the day you have kids that are being dropped off,  
9 so you're creating this traffic pattern that is  
10 already congested with dropping off the kids, and  
11 now you're incorporating book drop-off in that  
12 same area.

13          MR. MCKAY: So one of the improvements  
14 that I think we're making there, this is what it  
15 looks like right now, the shared parking lot  
16 between the two buildings. So it's diagonal  
17 parking. You actually have two drive aisles there  
18 going in opposite directions. It's very tight.  
19 The diagonal parking allows you to tighten up the  
20 spacing that you need, but it's very tight  
21 right now.

22          I think with the reconfiguration that we're  
23 proposing we now -- we're taking out the diagonal  
24 parking. We only have parking on one of the

1 aisles instead of two. So we've provided more  
2 room for you to bypass, for example, if there were  
3 stacking there.

4 So our intent here, even though we're  
5 showing 90-degree parking in this portion of the  
6 lot here, is that this would still be a one-way  
7 lot. So on the south lane of this you would come  
8 in heading westbound towards 5th Avenue so that  
9 you could circulate around to the drive-up window,  
10 and you'd be on the right side of the drive-up  
11 window at that spot, but that aisle is also wider  
12 to allow for bypass.

13 I think your point is well taken. We have  
14 a little more work to do with St. Mark's and  
15 confirm their needs and the circulation on there,  
16 but we know that this is a serious issue.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Going along with his  
18 point there, if you come in off of Illinois going  
19 north towards the library, is it possible to make  
20 a left turn and come back down into St. Mark's?  
21 Is that radius adequate to do that?

22 MR. MCKAY: Yes, it is.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It's tight but it can  
24 be done?

1 MR. MCKAY: Actually, it's pretty reasonable.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Is it?

3 MR. MCKAY: Yes. It's standard, I would  
4 say, nothing unusual.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And Walnut, that's  
6 not a right-in-right-out? That's just --

7 MR. MCKAY: No, I don't believe it is.  
8 You can turn either way coming out of Walnut, yes.

9 One of the things that our traffic engineer  
10 suggested that we incorporate as we develop a  
11 plan, there are kind of two main pathways, two main  
12 vehicular pathways through the parking lot right  
13 now. There's an east/west one where Walnut Street  
14 was, and then there's a north/south one, a new  
15 one that we've created just off of where our new  
16 entry is. The intersection of those is something  
17 where we're probably going to raise the pavement  
18 there and create something so that if you're in a  
19 car, you slow down at that point. Because there's  
20 going to be a lot of pedestrian activity in the  
21 parking lot, and given the fact we have these long  
22 aisles through here for convenience, you know, if  
23 you're in a car, we also don't want to give people  
24 the opportunity to the get their car up to speed,

1 as well.

2 MEMBER BECKER: I'd like to talk a little  
3 bit about the site design in relation to the  
4 pedestrian accessibility. And I'm thinking -- I  
5 don't have a lot of experience with going to this  
6 building, but it seems like it's built for the  
7 pedestrian access and the neighbors who will be  
8 walking to it, and I'm thinking that the shared  
9 parking is great, but there's a lot of parking  
10 that people would have to traverse to get into the  
11 building if they're walking. And I think even  
12 though it's not shown -- you probably haven't  
13 gotten that far -- I think there really needs to  
14 be a pedestrian access plan that is protected so  
15 that people can walk from any way to get into the  
16 building safely.

17 MR. MCKAY: And this is one of the challenges  
18 of surrounding your building with parking. We do  
19 have sidewalks along Main Street and 5th Avenue,  
20 but as soon as you come off of those, you're right,  
21 you have to cross pavement in order to get into  
22 the library. This is a very professional comment.  
23 So far all of our comments have been about, "How  
24 close can I park my car to the front door?"

1           You know, we've tried to address this,  
2 started to address it anyway. It's probably not  
3 as clearly shown on here as it could be, but there's  
4 a row of islands in the parking lot heading north/  
5 south that's aligned with that green strip alongside  
6 where our plaza area is and those are wider.  
7 There's actually a sidewalk there. There should  
8 be crossing patterns on the pavement there to kind  
9 of facilitate that. We're also extending the  
10 sidewalk along the south along the south edge of  
11 the library parking lot, as well, to provide for  
12 pedestrian access.

13           You know, it may be -- so this slide also  
14 shows the parking lot that we have, and we're  
15 proposing 220 spaces on a lot where currently  
16 there are a total of 190 spaces. So that's net  
17 eight gain of spaces on there.

18           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What is it currently?

19           MR. MCKAY: 190 total between St. Mark's  
20 and the library. So 165 on the library parking  
21 lot, 25 on St. Mark's parking lot.

22           So we're proposing a pretty good gain in  
23 the parking on the site here, but, frankly, in  
24 order to better address some of the pedestrian

1 concerns, it would be possible to put more  
2 dedicated kind of pedestrian paths through the  
3 parking lot at the expense of parking.

4 So I think that's something that's worth  
5 taking a look at as we move forward and seeing  
6 what the tradeoff is. Any thoughts on that?

7 MEMBER FUNKE: I agree. I think there  
8 should be some sort of connection to the school,  
9 too. You have a beautiful school to the south of  
10 that, and create some sort of -- maybe it's just  
11 in the pavement, some sort of walkway from that  
12 front door.

13 I know I drop off my daughter at that  
14 school on the north side. That's a prominent  
15 entry, so that connectivity of the library to that  
16 plaza I think would be important, the connection  
17 to the two buildings.

18 I just wanted to go back a little bit to  
19 the designs you have, a reflection of the Carnegie  
20 facade. I was really impressed by looking at the  
21 study of the form of the front. I'm sure there's  
22 a golden rule in there, too. I actually teach a  
23 renaissance architecture class.

24 The opportunity to create that access

1 through to the other side I think is important.  
2 It's a good idea. I just think that if you go to  
3 the front facade again, that new facade that  
4 you're creating, I think you lose that. I think  
5 you lose that form, the original geometry. That  
6 form I think is lost a little bit in the elevation.  
7 And that's a beautiful form, that gable roof, but  
8 then you're covering that form. You're turning  
9 that access 90 degrees at that point, and you're  
10 kind of losing that idea of a central access.

11 So if there's a way that you can reinforce  
12 that study that you did and look at the facade,  
13 even trying to create a balance at the site --  
14 because right now if you look at the entire  
15 facade, you have that octagon along the south end  
16 that's kind of imbalanced. You have this heavy  
17 entrance, and then you have this hollow outdoor cafe.

18 MR. MCKAY: Let me try to address the  
19 question of the orientation. In the earlier  
20 design we actually had the entry oriented facing  
21 directly east so that that access came all the way  
22 out through the building.

23 There were a couple of challenges with  
24 that. One was we didn't have much land between

1 the front door and the parking lot to make that  
2 transition from the parking environment to the  
3 library environment.

4 The other was this concern about screening  
5 the noise along North Avenue, and I think that was  
6 something that when it was first mentioned the  
7 design team probably didn't appreciate it as fully  
8 as we should have. But having been out there now  
9 and spent some time paying attention to it, it's  
10 very loud.

11 But to address your question, I think our  
12 approach to this became not necessarily to reflect  
13 that access on the outside of the building but as  
14 soon as you get inside of the building. So one of  
15 the ways we're going to reinforce that -- let me  
16 go back to the floor plan because this is something  
17 that we have just developed within the last -- oh,  
18 it's shown here now.

19 So when you come in the public entry, when  
20 you come in that vestibule and you turn left --  
21 I'm going to jump now to the mezzanine plan. So  
22 on the right-hand side, that's a long, open slot,  
23 two-story open spot that reinforces that access  
24 again. So I think we're doing everything we can

1 so when you come into the building, that is your  
2 focus when you come out.

3 But I think there were some other concerns  
4 as far as getting into the building, orienting the  
5 entry in a certain way. There were some other  
6 concerns that kind of overrode the idea of  
7 bringing that access all the way out.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: I appreciate the fact  
9 you're screening the entrance from the road, but  
10 you could still do both. You could still have  
11 that idea of entry, that prominence, that  
12 reflection from the western facade, but you could  
13 still enter it from the south. So you can have  
14 this idea similar to your study, your graphic  
15 study of that form. I think that what you're  
16 doing is -- that's a great diagram, but what  
17 you're doing is you're covering it with this roof  
18 that's -- I know what you're trying to do; you're  
19 redirecting pedestrians. But could you go back to  
20 this geometry, this study and kind of bring it  
21 back into that --

22 MR. MCKAY: We'll take another look at that.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: -- that eastern facade?  
24 The ideas are great. I love the flow and bringing

1 people into that vestibule, but my concern is the  
2 east facade because it's so prominent.

3 MR. MCKAY: I think we have a strong idea  
4 with reintegrating and connecting the Carnegie  
5 with this strong access that comes through the  
6 building, and we don't want that idea to get lost.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: No, it's great. I agree.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a couple of  
9 questions. On the -- well, looking at it from the  
10 northeast corner, the entryway, are there any  
11 windows?

12 If you can flip up to through -- next one,  
13 I think. Yes, at the top. Are there any window  
14 on that side where the entry area is, or is this  
15 just a wall?

16 MR. MCKAY: So this is a function of a  
17 computer model.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's fine.

19 MR. MCKAY: You have the shadows cast a  
20 certain way, and it renders the windows as if it  
21 saw the wall. So the areas that you see there  
22 where it looks like there are window mullions,  
23 that's actually all glass there.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

1 MR. MCKAY: Now, on that side we don't  
2 want your experience to be when you walk into the  
3 library that you see all the traffic going by on  
4 Main Street, and so we're going to put some kind  
5 of patterning or something in the glass that is  
6 still translucent and let's all in all the natural  
7 lighting but kind of screens that out.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure. When I'm looking  
9 at it from the side, I know the one thing now that  
10 you notice during the winter that is not as  
11 noticeable during the summer is the loading dock.  
12 And you see one of the big trucks in there --  
13 and it's always florescent; I don't know why --  
14 but it's distracting.

15 And what I still see is the same loading  
16 dock right there, and what I thought I was seeing  
17 was a blank wall right next to it. Now, when  
18 you're adding on the one-story addition, I imagine  
19 you're going to be taking some of those trees down  
20 to do that.

21 MR. MCKAY: That's right.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How many trees are you  
23 removing?

24 MR. MCKAY: Five of the ash trees that are

1 there right now.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And those are what block  
3 it in the summer. Now we have the same view that  
4 we get in the winter year-round with the loading  
5 dock there. Has any thought been given to changing  
6 the location, modifying how it's situated?

7 MR. MCKAY: I think we've got the loading  
8 dock in the right spot. If you look at the site  
9 and what our opportunities are, I think we have  
10 got it in the right spot.

11 We're sensitive to the issue that you're  
12 talking about. The existing loading area really  
13 is almost -- it fronts the street. It kind of  
14 faces the street. So one of the things we're  
15 trying to do here is consciously not have it face  
16 the street by bringing the screen wall out in  
17 front of it, saying what's the right amount of  
18 screen wall.

19 We don't want it to feel like it's closed  
20 in back there, but at the same time we want it to  
21 do a job so driving by it doesn't look like you're  
22 staring in the back end of a loading and trash  
23 area back there right now.

24 So I think by reorienting it the way that

1 we have -- I don't have an image of what this  
2 looks like right now, but like I said, it's kind  
3 of a big open area that really kind of faces the  
4 street. So I think just by virtue of reorienting  
5 it we've made improvement in it, but I think it  
6 still needs more attention.

7 This is, you've pointed out a very -- we're  
8 making a big deal of the fact that the library is  
9 going to have a better civic presence within the  
10 community by kind of opening it up along by Main  
11 Street. We don't want that civic presence to be  
12 the service area for the building.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's exactly my  
14 concern because that's a prominent place. For  
15 people who are coming into St. Charles, you're  
16 turning around a curve, and you see St. Charles in  
17 front of you, and right there is the library. So  
18 it's not like it's, you know, a minor location in  
19 St. Charles.

20 The other -- let's see. What is the --  
21 first of all, on the parking lot, is the lot going  
22 to be owned completely by the library? Because  
23 you were counting both the library and St. Mark's  
24 parking spaces together.

1 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does St. Mark's have  
3 any shared responsibility for maintenance of the  
4 parking lot?

5 MR. MCKAY: Yes. So currently there is an  
6 agreement in place right now for that bit of  
7 shared parking lot that the library and St. Mark's  
8 have right now. So it's going to be a matter of  
9 upkeeping that agreement, but St. Mark's is in  
10 favor of that -- there you go. Would you like to  
11 say anything about that, sir?

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you want to just  
13 state your name.

14 MR. STUDER: I'm Jeff Studer, 1480 Allen Lane  
15 here in St. Charles, and I'm on the council of  
16 St. Mark's Church.

17 Yes, we can confirm there is a shared  
18 agreement for the parking that was put in place  
19 when Walnut Street was closed originally. That has  
20 to do with sharing for blacktop, and snow removal,  
21 and such. So that area is considered shared space.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you have any idea  
23 what St. Mark's regular needs are for parking?

24 MR. STUDER: Well, the current needs are not

1 listed on here because as part of this discussion,  
2 if you notice in the gray area there is some thought  
3 whether or not St. Mark's might make changes to  
4 the facilities for that. If those changes were to  
5 take place -- and that's not part of this project --  
6 we would be looking at an assessment of what the  
7 parking needs would be.

8 Currently our parking needs are met. We  
9 did an expansion a number of years ago by the use  
10 of the shared parking that we currently have on  
11 the north side, the existing parking that we have  
12 on the property, and also another agreement with  
13 Yurs Funeral Home for shared parking there.

14 So our current needs are fully met, and  
15 our goal is to make sure that within this particular  
16 project that our current needs are met, and to the  
17 extent that there is opportunity for more parking  
18 spaces to be available, that would give us the  
19 opportunity to expand at a future date.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And does most of the  
21 entry and exit into the church occur on the north  
22 side where the circle is, or is it on the east side  
23 of the church?

24 MR. STUDER: The north side entrance, that's

1 where our accessible elevator is at today, so the  
2 drop-off there is predominantly at time when we  
3 have services and we have accessibility needs  
4 for that.

5 The preschool entryway that we're currently  
6 using is actually on the south -- well, the south-  
7 facing wall but the area closest to the parking lot.  
8 So the idea with this plan is to route preschool  
9 traffic through our own property rather than the  
10 north side, and the additional parking for people  
11 to do drop-offs would facilitate that.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I heard you say something  
13 about parking -- right now it's diagonal between  
14 the library and St. Mark's Church, and on the plan  
15 it's shown as being perpendicular. Is that what  
16 the intention is for the parking?

17 MR. MCKAY: For that bit of parking lot,  
18 yes. But the intent there is to get wider lanes  
19 than are there right now so that in the event that  
20 you have a car stopped, whether it's for drop-off  
21 or stacking related to the drive-up window,  
22 there's always a way to get through there.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there any concern about  
24 conflict between pedestrians using the church and

1 that parking with it being perpendicular now and  
2 cars are requiring a larger area to pull out, or  
3 does widening the aisle deal with that?

4 MR. MCKAY: I think one of the things this  
5 plan has done is increased the number of parking  
6 spaces to the church on the east side of the  
7 building.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And what is -- does the  
9 library have figures as far as what their current  
10 maximum parking load has been? It seems like 220 is  
11 a lot of parking spaces.

12 And let me tell you where I'm coming from.  
13 Whenever I see green area that's replaced by gray  
14 area, it bothers me.

15 MS. CRAIG: I agree with you. I'm Edith  
16 Craig, the director for the public library.

17 So we did some studies in conjunction with  
18 St. Mark's. We took traffic counts during our  
19 busiest times when we had programs, and then we  
20 had programs consecutively, or at the same time  
21 St. Mark's had a large program, the library did.  
22 And all of our -- every time we have joint  
23 programming, all of our 190 spots are taken. Then  
24 people are parking off street in neighborhoods and

1 use Lincoln School as parking, as well.

2 So we are -- there are opportunities where  
3 we have max'd out our parking spaces. Anytime we  
4 have more than two programs -- we have Sunday  
5 concerts on Sundays that hold -- our rooms hold  
6 about 90 people, and those are filled to capacity  
7 in conjunction with the normal traffic of the  
8 library.

9 So we've done many studies on do we need  
10 more parking, and the answer is always yes. We  
11 usually have about 40 to 50 cars just with staff  
12 on a daily basis, so that automatically takes out  
13 40 to 50 of those parking spaces for just staff.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 40 to 50 for staff?

15 MS. CRAIG: Uh-huh, during the day from  
16 9:00 to 5:00.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Has there been any thought  
18 to -- I don't know, maybe this is something for  
19 one of the Plan Commission members -- some type of  
20 parking that's more environmentally -- has less of  
21 an environmental impact? Has there been any thought  
22 to that?

23 MR. MCKAY: There has. One of the things --  
24 so I mentioned that we have a stormwater detention

1 structure below our parking lot on the north side.  
2 One of the conversations we'll be having with our  
3 civil engineers is whether it's possible to replace  
4 that with impervious -- I'm sorry -- a permeable  
5 paver system above that. It's quite a bit more  
6 expensive it turns out to do that, and the  
7 tradeoff is not -- would be that we'd need an  
8 awful a lot of it.

9 That being said, I think the idea of using  
10 permeable pavers is something we're open to, that  
11 we are exploring. The library has a fixed budget  
12 on the project, and this is going to be one of  
13 those value decisions that get made along the way  
14 about whether we put the money into that or something  
15 that doesn't take -- mitigates stormwater detention,  
16 for example, or put it into something else.

17 I think, as Edith was describing the  
18 parking situation, the number of parking spaces is  
19 being largely driven by special periodic events.  
20 This is not the normal kind of daily use of the  
21 library. But you have two facilities on this site  
22 that have big special events, and it's kind of a  
23 neighborhood location. Right? So if this were  
24 downtown and there was public parking available

1 nearby or something like that, it would be easier  
2 to imagine how to mitigate -- you know, how to  
3 take away some of the parking spaces we have here.

4 As Edith said, whenever you have one of  
5 those big events, you're then asking people to  
6 park on the side streets which is -- it's one of  
7 the nice things about being in a neighborhood like  
8 this, but it's also one of those things that you  
9 have to be careful about where you cross the line  
10 between being a good neighbor and a not-so-good  
11 neighbor.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'll make one more  
13 comment, and then I'll turn it over.

14 I couldn't figure it out when I was looking  
15 at the plans, I couldn't figure out what bothered  
16 me about the entry, the architecture and the roof  
17 line to the entry. I mean, I think that Jeff kind  
18 of touched on a part of it, but I realized when I  
19 drove by and held up the picture and looked at  
20 St. Mark's, and it's that they look the same.

21 MR. McKAY: No, they do not.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, the picture does.  
23 And I'm just -- I know it's computer generated.

24 MR. McKAY: I think -- truthfully, I think

1 they're going to look very different. Just  
2 because it has a steeply pitched roof on it, it's  
3 going to be very different.

4 One of the features of St. Mark's is that  
5 it's in big gable form and comes all the way down  
6 to the ground. They're going to look very  
7 different.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sure they'll look  
9 different. When I see a roof like that, I associate  
10 it with two buildings in town, St. Mark's and  
11 St. John Neumann out on East 64, and that's what I  
12 think of when I see a roof like that. I'm just  
13 saying this more as --

14 MEMBER FUNKE: And Bethlehem, too.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's right. I forgot  
16 about that.

17 MR. MCKAY: I think when you walk up to  
18 this building that you've got on the screen, this  
19 looks very different than St. Mark's.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm just saying I want  
21 to make -- you know, I think for both institutions  
22 to have differentiation between --

23 MR. MCKAY: We agree.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- the feel of them is

1 beneficial.

2 MR. MCKAY: The identity -- this is a  
3 civic building. It needs to have a kind of civic  
4 identity. And one of the reasons we've kind of  
5 pumped up the scale, if you would, on this side is  
6 to give it a presence that it lacks right now  
7 without mimicking the Carnegie building on the  
8 other side and without doing something that's kind  
9 of a modern box on the building, as well.

10 So I can appreciate where your comments are  
11 coming from. I can appreciate the kind of  
12 similarities that you see between the two. I think  
13 the reality is that they're going to look very  
14 different from each other.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Other questions  
16 from the Plan Commissioners?

17 MEMBER MELTON: I have a couple. I just  
18 want to clarify, the existing Carnegie library,  
19 those doors will still remain closed?

20 MR. MCKAY: They will.

21 MEMBER MELTON: Any consideration to opening  
22 them up and creating a courtyard?

23 MR. MCKAY: It's a security issue. The  
24 library, you really just want one public entry.

1           MEMBER MELTON: Well, I wondered if maybe  
2 you could literally create a courtyard so people  
3 could actually go out, sit on those stairs. I was  
4 just looking at the plan wondering because that's  
5 one of the great features of that space is those  
6 stairs.

7           MR. MCKAY: And it's something we talked  
8 about. But, again, the idea of -- so the idea of  
9 an outdoor environment that people in the library  
10 can use that feels like a space you'd actually  
11 want to hang out in, that was something that's  
12 been important since we started this process.

13           We did consider that kind of garden area  
14 out in front of the Carnegie area right now. But,  
15 again, because of the traffic on Main Street, it's  
16 really hard to imagine how you would mitigate that.

17           So our intent is to preserve that and kind  
18 of update it, do some repairs to the area out  
19 there so that it's -- we respect it and it's kind  
20 of kept the way that it is right now. We just  
21 could not find a practical way to really integrate  
22 that as an outdoor space for a library.

23           MEMBER MELTON: My only other thought was  
24 the discovery zone, I don't know how wide that is.

1 I love the idea, by the way. I wonder how the  
2 interaction of having kids there -- it's kind of  
3 at the end of the parking lot right along Illinois  
4 Avenue, and I don't know what the plans are to kind  
5 of create a barrier to kind of contain little kids,  
6 a mom with two kids; one is running one way, and  
7 the other is running the other way.

8 MR. MCKAY: The context with the school,  
9 Lincoln School immediately south, as you mentioned  
10 earlier, that's one of the reasons we identified  
11 this as a play area.

12 It's a good question. I don't have a full  
13 answer for it right now. We have met with the  
14 park district. They seem comfortable, you know,  
15 given what they've done in other situations that  
16 this could be worked out. So we'll continue to  
17 work with them.

18 But I think it being a zone, you know,  
19 that across from the school that encourages that  
20 kind of activity, you know, with kids, that also --  
21 it also begs the question of, well, how do we then  
22 make a safe connection for families between that  
23 zone and the library entry, as well. So I think  
24 those are -- these are all -- in a way these are

1 interrelated issues that have to be looked at.

2 MEMBER MELTON: The only other thing I  
3 wanted to add, I was hoping that I could see an  
4 existing floor plan somewhere in the presentation  
5 because I kept wanting to in my mind remember what  
6 the existing library looked like so I could compare.  
7 That's just a side comment.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other  
10 questions?

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a few questions  
12 and some comments.

13 I guess the whole idea of the detention along  
14 Illinois Street, so right now it's kind of more  
15 towards the corner at 7th. Is it going to expand?

16 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: All the way over to  
18 what used to be lawn?

19 MR. MCKAY: All the way over to 6th?

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: 6th, sorry.

21 MR. MCKAY: No, it will not. It will expand  
22 westward a little bit, but it will also probably  
23 get deeper than it is right now, as well.

24 You know, it's not -- it's not going to be

1 taking on that much more water than it does right  
2 now because it's located on kind of the high point  
3 of the site. So we can't -- we have really tried  
4 to figure out how we could get rid of the underground  
5 storage tank on the north side and get the water  
6 into this area instead, and the geometry of the  
7 site just doesn't allow that.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: So the discovery play  
9 area is going to be one of those that will be at  
10 the existing grade as it is now?

11 MR. MCKAY: Yes. There might be some  
12 berming around it both for security issues and  
13 play considerations.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, I would have to  
15 second the concerns about young children in  
16 relationship to a primary access or continued  
17 primary access to the library from Illinois and  
18 the traffic that's on Illinois heading over.  
19 Fencing to me seems like absolute -- as it already  
20 exists across the street at Lincoln school. I  
21 don't see how there's not an equal comparison to  
22 the safety issues that you could have with young  
23 children. So I'll let you work that out with the  
24 park district, but I think it's a very important

1 factor.

2 I think that the intent of keeping some of  
3 the existing trees is a good intention. I don't  
4 see how you've executed that here at all in this  
5 plan. The trees are located but they don't seem  
6 to have much grade around them to preserve those  
7 existing trees. That's why I was talking about  
8 from an execution standpoint, as well as, as an  
9 example, at the corner of 7th and Walnut, the  
10 large silver maple that's on the south side is in  
11 fairly poor condition.

12 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: So why go through the  
14 effort at this point to do that given all the  
15 other costs that you're doing to potentially only  
16 cut it down later? I think the existing locust  
17 trees that run through the parking lot directly to  
18 the east, all of those seem marginal as far as  
19 health right now. So going through the effort to  
20 preserve those to lose parking doesn't seem to be  
21 of value. Again, just an observation from that  
22 standpoint.

23 There's a couple of large Norway maples  
24 directly to the south. They're not on anybody's

1 forestry list of trees that people want, and while  
2 they're substantial trees, and they are in good  
3 health, again, the efficiency of the parking that  
4 you're looking for, it might be worthwhile to  
5 consider taking them out and doing something new.

6 I think there's already been some  
7 conversation about pedestrian access to the site.  
8 I think that from 7th Street and from Illinois, I  
9 think a more dominant pedestrian access should be  
10 provided. I think that the additional parking on  
11 the west side for St. Mark's should not be put in  
12 place. I think that you should maintain the  
13 sidewalk that's over there and allow people to  
14 walk on that sidewalk up toward the building as  
15 they do now.

16 If you're going to have a shared parking  
17 arrangement, have a shared parking arrangement.  
18 But to sacrifice pedestrian movement, it seems to  
19 be also counterproductive in a way of encouraging  
20 the neighbors to walk to the library from the  
21 south and specifically from the east, but I don't  
22 think this accomplishes that.

23 I think there was a comment in the staff  
24 report that there's supposed to be a 10-foot buffer

1 along 7th Street. There is one now, so I would  
2 say you should keep it.

3 MR. McKAY: There's not a 10-foot buffer  
4 right now. The parking I think is within about  
5 4 feet of the property line.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, not according to  
7 your survey that was in the packet.

8 MR. McKAY: So we're not moving that curb  
9 line any further east than where it's at right now.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: It appears you are.

11 MR. McKAY: We will double-check. That is  
12 not our intent.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think that's a  
14 worthwhile thing, and if you move that whole  
15 parking field 5 feet to the west, I don't think it  
16 impacts what you're doing adjacent to the building  
17 to lose 4 or 5 feet there.

18 MR. McKAY: I agree.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think that there's an  
20 opportunity with your plaza for pedestrians and how  
21 you have the sunken area and then that kind of  
22 splayed-open plaza, I think there's great opportunity  
23 to extend the sidewalk in a very significant way  
24 out towards Illinois Street and create a really

1 comfortable sidewalk that would pull people from  
2 either side of it to that sidewalk to then walk up  
3 to the building and initiate them into the plaza  
4 that you enter there.

5 I'm not sure what the purpose of the  
6 parking is -- I'm sorry -- the sidewalk is on the  
7 south side of the parking lot, but I do think that  
8 the staff's comment about extending the sidewalk  
9 along Illinois so that it goes all the way to the  
10 corner is -- should be invited from all directions  
11 and right now they're not.

12 MR. MCKAY: The reason that we have the  
13 sidewalk along the south edge of the parking lot  
14 is because the grade along Illinois Street makes  
15 it very difficult to connect that -- to finish  
16 that sidewalk along Illinois Street.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think your engineers  
18 should take another look, and I don't think the  
19 trees at the corner are in any kind of health that  
20 if those came down to address the grading that was  
21 necessary, I don't think that would be a loss --

22 MR. MCKAY: We will take a look at it.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- from that  
24 standpoint.

1 Overall I really like what you're doing with  
2 the building. I know we've had some good comments  
3 from another architectural friend here at the other  
4 end. I like what you're doing a lot actually.  
5 It's hard to duplicate something that was done  
6 100 years ago, and usually trying to do so today  
7 is either super expensive or just doesn't come off  
8 very well. So I like the way that's going, and I  
9 would encourage you to do more of that.

10 A question related to the shared parking  
11 arrangement. Maybe this is for the head of the  
12 library. What is your shared arrangement with the  
13 church right now? How many spaces?

14 MS. CRAIG: Currently we share the lot  
15 between the church and the library. We also  
16 allow -- as far as costs are concerned, that's the  
17 only commitment the church has. Unofficially we  
18 have also allowed the church to use our current  
19 south lot for overflow, and they do for church  
20 services when the library is not open.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would say if  
22 maximizing your parking is critical, I think there  
23 are some reasons to make some changes here. As  
24 much as I wouldn't want to encourage you to

1 disengage with the park district on the discovery  
2 zone, I would sooner see you give up the play lot  
3 and have a better layout on the parking and safer  
4 movement for pedestrians than to end up with a  
5 play lot and end up with this lot the way it's  
6 laid out now.

7 But yes, I do like the idea of the discovery  
8 zone play lot, but you have to decide maybe between  
9 that and how many parking spaces you're after as  
10 far as when you have these shared events.

11 Thank you.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Can I say one more thing?  
13 I was just reading in the elevations you have  
14 composite slate shingle roof. Is that the plastic  
15 shingle I'm thinking about?

16 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: So your front entrance,  
18 you're basically turning, you've got a roof that's  
19 facing you. It's okay if it's a couple stories up  
20 in the area, but that's tough when you're one story  
21 above grade. You can actually tell what it is.

22 MR. MCKAY: You can tell what it is.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: So that's another concern I  
24 would have.

1           MR. MCKAY: We're expecting samples. So  
2 we're in the process of a decision. That's a good  
3 comment.

4           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just have a  
5 couple questions, and I'll save my comments for  
6 when we poll the whole Commission. It's actually  
7 about the church and the agreement between the  
8 library and the church.

9           How many parking spaces does the church  
10 have on the property they own now? How many  
11 parking spaces are available on the church -- at  
12 the church now? Do we know that number?

13          MR. STUDER: I believe if we bring up the  
14 current -- okay. You can observe here we have  
15 parking which is parallel parking along the east  
16 side of the property, and that is the 25 spaces  
17 that we refer to in the plan.

18          VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So you  
19 don't own any of the property to the north of the  
20 building?

21          MR. STUDER: The entire north is shared  
22 property. So we use for our services those spots.

23          VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I know it's shared  
24 property, but do you, the church, own any of it?

1 MR. MCKAY: So if you imagine -- if you  
2 took a center line down Walnut Street when Walnut  
3 Street was still there, when that got vacated,  
4 one side went to the library; the other side went  
5 to the church.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So it's the 25 in  
7 that lot to the east plus whatever is on the north  
8 side of the building?

9 MR. STUDER: Right. The 25 does not include  
10 any of the shared spaces. Some of that is our  
11 property; some of it is in the middle zone where  
12 the street used to be, and some of it is entirely  
13 library parking.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there any  
15 shared costs in this between the library and the  
16 church?

17 MR. STUDER: Yes. We share costs,  
18 blacktopping, snow removal.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just for this  
20 project.

21 MR. STUDER: Oh, in the project?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm getting a nod.

23 MS. CRAIG: We're in the process of doing  
24 two separate contracts. One is the construction

1 contract, which is the cost doing everything new,  
2 and then we're working then on a shared maintenance  
3 agreement that then would be perpetual maintenance  
4 costs.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So shared  
6 construction and shared maintenance?

7 MS. CRAIG: Correct.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: If, God forbid,  
9 St. Mark's decides to move, and the church goes up  
10 for sale, what happens to that agreement? Does it  
11 transfer to the new owners?

12 MS. CRAIG: No. But that's because the  
13 maintenance agreement will cover the use of the  
14 library -- of the parking. The church will own --  
15 so when 6th is vacated, they will own whatever  
16 parking spaces. And if you look at that site  
17 plan, if you look at the site plan and you look at  
18 6th, where 6th is, and you put a dashed line  
19 through there, everything to the west of that the  
20 church will own. So that includes those parking  
21 spaces right next to them.

22 So if St. Mark's ever vacates, and the  
23 agreement is null, whoever owns that new property  
24 will be responsible for their maintenance of the --

1 that piece of the property. If they want to use  
2 any of the library parking, then that would be a  
3 new agreement.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because you could,  
5 I imagine, if you wanted to extend the agreement  
6 to another friendly neighbor. That would be  
7 great. But suppose they're not. You've got to  
8 have some way out.

9 MS. CRAIG: Yes. That's why this is pretty  
10 useful because it's defined parking. That parking  
11 space directly in front of St. Mark's will be  
12 St. Mark's parking, physically owned by them.  
13 It's all on their property line.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I'm assuming  
15 that this agreement between the library and the  
16 church really has nothing to do with the City.  
17 Correct? It's an internal agreement. So that's  
18 being negotiated with the church and the library  
19 board, as well. But is it, in fact -- does it, in  
20 fact, become null and void if they move, if that  
21 church goes away or the library moves?

22 MS. CRAIG: The contract will be for sharing  
23 maintenance costs. So, again -- and the use of the  
24 parking.

1           So whatever we agree with St. Mark's, it  
2 will be that they would use X parking lot during  
3 church services. You know, if they want -- and  
4 this will be a continued discussion. If they want  
5 more than just their current parking space, and  
6 they want the ability to use others, there are  
7 some shared maintenance costs for the church.

8           If another person uses that building and  
9 it's a retail space, you know, then it's a  
10 different maintenance agreement.

11           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. I think  
12 it's a great idea that you're doing this, and I'm  
13 glad that it's working out.

14           MR. MCKAY: Can I add a comment that may  
15 address this and a couple of other comments that  
16 have come up? There's been a lot of good comments  
17 made here tonight, and it's hard not to try and  
18 solve the problem while you're staring at it.

19           One idea that comes to mind, if you look  
20 at where 6th Avenue is currently on this plan  
21 right now, see where it says "Utility Line," the  
22 north/south designation for utility line? Across  
23 from that we have parking but a bunch of islands.  
24 What if instead of those islands we made that a

1 solid strip of land that came all the way up so  
2 that when you got to the northern edge of it, you  
3 only have to cross one lane of parking, so to  
4 speak, in order to get onto library parking?

5 The other thing that would do is partially  
6 address your concern, I think, which is to provide  
7 a kind of clearer demarcation, if you will, between  
8 the church and the library with respect to parking  
9 and address this pedestrian concern that we're  
10 talking about, as well.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that kind of goes  
12 to -- and I'll make the comment now since we're  
13 discussing it, but has there ever been any thought  
14 to selling a portion of the parking lot to St. Mark's  
15 so that they have their own parking lot and there  
16 is no need for a shared arrangement? I mean, if  
17 we're redoing the parking lot, this would be the  
18 perfect time to think about doing something  
19 like that.

20 MR. MCKAY: That has not come up for  
21 discussion. I would say based upon my experience  
22 working with municipalities, they never want to  
23 sell a property that they have. You never get  
24 it back.

1           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Part of the presentation  
2 said you're short on funds to do certain things.  
3 Maybe that would be a way to raise some.

4           MR. MCKAY: When we first started this  
5 project, we -- the vision was just a site plan  
6 with the property that the property that the  
7 library owned, and it wasn't until we let our  
8 neighbors know what we're doing and engaged  
9 St. Mark's that they showed interest in being a  
10 part of one unified area. So that's how we have  
11 arrived at this point, with their agreement and  
12 desire to move forward as one cohesive block.

13          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

14          MR. STUDER: I would like to add that the  
15 shared parking arrangement is beneficial to both  
16 parties. That parking which is currently  
17 exclusively owned by St. Mark's is used in some  
18 cases by the library as overflow. So this is  
19 something that's beneficial to both parties. So  
20 selling more spaces to St. Mark's would probably  
21 trigger the need for a shared parking arrangement  
22 more in that direction, as well.

23                 So it certainly can be discussed. It  
24 didn't come up as being germane to this particular

1 project. Both parties have been comfortable, I  
2 think, with the current arrangement. But I think  
3 you should be aware of the fact that as this is  
4 all viewed by the public as one parking lot, it  
5 will be used a shared fashion.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I recognize that.  
7 One of the comments that I will make later -- was  
8 going to make later but will make now is the  
9 thought that would possibly address the pedestrian  
10 issue and the demarcation of the parking lots at  
11 the same time. And that would be to put a  
12 pedestrian path, basically, if you were to draw a  
13 line just to the east side of the discovery zone  
14 up to the main entrance at the same angle that the  
15 parking spaces are taking and have a -- you know,  
16 something you can do with islands, with different  
17 types of paving, a wider path that goes from  
18 Illinois Avenue right up to the entrance across  
19 there parallel with where you have the drive aisle.

20 And I think you would have to reconfigure  
21 the rest of the parking lot around this, but then  
22 it would -- even if not in the ownership, it would  
23 at least appear that there's a demarcation between  
24 church parking, library parking.

1           It doesn't mean you can't share any of it,  
2           but it would address the pedestrian issue; it  
3           would invite more -- it would allow more green  
4           into that area. You could draw students in --  
5           children in from Lincoln; it would be right across  
6           the street from the entryway to Lincoln School.

7           But I think that would address a few of  
8           those issues at the same time. Just a suggestion.

9           So any other questions?

10          MEMBER PRETZ: Comment.

11          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me take questions.

12          Does any member of the public have questions?

13          Sir.

14          MR. ENCK: Jim Enck, E-n-c-k, 517 North  
15          5th Avenue.

16          I have two comments. One was the pedestrian  
17          circulation, and we've got that covered pretty  
18          well now. I'll just start with this, I'm a semi-  
19          retired land planner, and I've done many libraries  
20          and schools. And one of the things that we've  
21          always done on our site plans is to have the  
22          driveways point to the building. Because in the  
23          situation we have right here, kids can get out of  
24          the car, and they're walking between cars and

1 stepping into the drive lane and a car coming  
2 crossways. If they're walking in the driveway  
3 with their parents and the cars are coming, you  
4 both can see one another.

5 So from a safety standpoint, I would  
6 suggest turning the south lot 90 degrees. And if  
7 you look at shopping centers and grocery stores,  
8 none of which I've designed, but typically the  
9 driveways all go towards the building that they're  
10 servicing. So I think that's a safety issue that  
11 you should consider.

12 And the one comment about paving over  
13 green space, in a perfect world those grass pavers  
14 are wonderful. They don't work in the Midwest  
15 because we carry so much salt in our tire wells on  
16 our cars that it drops all the time and kills the  
17 grass. They're great for fire lanes, and  
18 emergency lanes, and things like that, but for  
19 parking in the Midwest, it just does not work  
20 that well.

21 That's all. I just throw that out there.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

23 Other questions, comments from the  
24 audience?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We'll go ahead with  
3 comments from Plan Commission.

4 Going out of order, Tom, do you want to go  
5 first?

6 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes. I just wanted to --  
7 this is a comment as it reflects from the  
8 Preservation Commission. A similar review was  
9 done before that commission.

10 There were three areas of concern, and I  
11 just wanted to say what they were. One dealt with  
12 the roof lines for the public entryway, which was  
13 discussed in great detail.

14 The second was a better blending of the  
15 '89 addition to the new addition. Our recommendation  
16 was a frieze board look, a continuation of that  
17 look, which may answer part of your concern related  
18 to the service area to bring your eyes up and be  
19 able to get it off of that service portion along  
20 Main Street. So that's something that they have  
21 to work on.

22 And then the third area of concern was  
23 concerning the octagon area and maybe a better use  
24 and a better layout of that.

1           But those were the three major areas that  
2 the Preservation Commission had relative to the  
3 plan. The rest of it was, you know, whatever is --  
4 under our typical review, the rest of it seemed to  
5 be acknowledging challenges, and they were addressing  
6 those challenges.

7           That's all I have.

8           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

9           MEMBER BECKER: I'll start -- I'll continue.

10          I just want to reiterate my concern about  
11 the pedestrian access. And in thinking more about  
12 the internal site circulation, I think particular  
13 attention should be paid to the stacking at the  
14 entrances or exits to each side of the property.  
15 And if the internal site circulation is tweaked a  
16 bit, I think you could get some protected stacking  
17 and also help with that internal pedestrian access.

18          And I always bring up bicycle parking, and  
19 if there's a way to integrate that with this in the  
20 pedestrian plan, I think that would be helpful, also.

21          Thanks.

22          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

23          MEMBER FUNKE: I did talk a lot about the  
24 concerns that I had, so I would just reiterate

1 working on the east facade and trying to  
2 incorporate that octagon into the balance of that  
3 elevation. And think about those materials. When  
4 you have the plastic shingle, and it becomes a  
5 prominent material for that entrance, I would be  
6 concerned because you're so close to that roof line.

7 So thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jim.

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Well, I just want to  
10 say adding an addition to this library and trying  
11 to integrate it to three different architectural  
12 styles is a pretty tough challenge, and I think  
13 you've done a very good job.

14 There's a couple things, though, or at  
15 least one. In the entryway, looking at the first  
16 floor plan, I don't know if it's possible with the  
17 existing roof configuration that you have, I like  
18 that you enter from the south side going north  
19 into the building because of traffic noise, I just  
20 wish that -- you know, the terrace garden below, I  
21 think it would be so nice and inviting if that was  
22 duplicated on the other side into the library. I  
23 think like coming in and taking that turn and  
24 there it all is. I think that's incredible; I

1 really like that. But it's not fitting real well  
2 for me from what I see here.

3 But based on what you have to work with, I  
4 think you're on track. I like what was said about  
5 the parking lot. I'm not quite clear what it is  
6 in my mind, but I see what you're saying.

7 And I think it's very important that we  
8 have the sidewalk integration between Lincoln  
9 School and the library. I go to the library a  
10 lot. I see a lot of children walking across  
11 there, and I think based on that we think we have  
12 got more than adequate parking, I think we've got  
13 plenty of space to have a walkway that leads up  
14 to that.

15 That's all I can say. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thanks, Jim. And I'll  
17 just repeat -- well, I made some of my comments  
18 already, but the things that I agree, I agree with  
19 Jeff's evaluation of the cross gable, I'll call  
20 it, at the entryway, I agree with what he's saying.

21 I think as somebody who lost three mature  
22 trees in the last two years, it makes me sad to  
23 think that there are six elm trees that are going  
24 to be removed, and I don't know if there's any way

1 around that, but I certainly encourage preservation  
2 as much as we can of mature trees. But as I said,  
3 I don't know if there's any way to fix that.

4 As far as the -- oh, I also agree with the  
5 comment regarding the front entrance to the  
6 Carnegie library. I know it can't be used as an  
7 entrance, but I do like the idea of being able to  
8 somehow use that space. It's a sizable space. If  
9 you go from the front of Carnegie to 5th Avenue  
10 and from 64 over to the addition there, that's a  
11 space that is basically not usable as it is right  
12 now because people are not -- whether they're not  
13 willing or whatever to walk down the sidewalks  
14 along the library to get to that space. It would  
15 be interesting to see if there is some way to be  
16 able to incorporate that into an outdoor space for  
17 the library.

18 I think it would add interest to downtown  
19 St. Charles to actually see people out there. You  
20 know, people would think, "Hey, maybe that's a  
21 place I want to go in and check out" if they  
22 actually see movement that's happening on that  
23 corner. Just a thought.

24 And I can't emphasize enough the pedestrian

1 access. I do like the idea also of reconfiguring  
2 the parking lot. I realized as you were saying  
3 that that was one of the things that was bothering  
4 me is they were going east/west instead of north/  
5 south. And just imagining my kids having to go  
6 across there, I mean, I'd be a nervous wreck by  
7 the time I got in the library. I know how it is  
8 going to Walmart.

9 I think that that's pretty much it.

10 Tim?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Anything we could  
12 do to help improve the library I think is in all  
13 of our best interests. It's something we need to  
14 all focus on and concentrate on. It is such a big  
15 part of our community.

16 I'm really happy that St. Mark's and the  
17 library are able to work together in this joint  
18 agreement that's helpful for both sides, and it  
19 sounds like it's fair. Nobody has really  
20 mentioned this, but the vacation of 6th and  
21 Walnut, and it makes perfect sense. There's no  
22 reason not to at this point.

23 The sidewalks are a big issue as brought  
24 up in the staff report, very early on in the staff

1 report, coming up with some sort of pedestrian  
2 access across the parking lots has to be done. I  
3 realize this is a preliminary plan or a concept  
4 plan. I realize that the renderings we have are  
5 from the computer and don't really show it very  
6 well, but I expect when you come back that issue  
7 will be addressed.

8 I agree with Peter and others that a  
9 sidewalk along Illinois, we've got to figure out a  
10 way to extend that. We really have to figure out  
11 a way because it's a neighborhood, and that whole  
12 block is still part of the neighborhood.

13 One other thing I'm just going to comment  
14 on. I think that when you drive by that,  
15 especially heading eastbound on Route 64, and you  
16 come alongside that new addition, it's going to  
17 look like a block. From what I see on the  
18 elevation, you can see the roof lines coming up,  
19 and it blends in very nicely, but that's not what  
20 you're going to see on 64.

21 So I don't even know what to do about it  
22 other than to soften -- make sure that the facade  
23 is as soft as it could possibly be. You're going  
24 to be right next to it. If you stop in traffic

1 right next to it, you can practically reach out  
2 and touch it.

3 Also, the other thing that Todd brought up  
4 and I agree, I don't think we realize how visible  
5 that loading dock is going to be without those  
6 trees there. Especially if you're heading westbound,  
7 then you're going to see a loading dock.

8 So work on the screening of that. Perhaps  
9 make it higher, do something translucent so you  
10 don't see the loading dock. Maybe you just see  
11 whatever you're using to block it. And you're  
12 talking about using some sort of screening on the  
13 window at the entrance there, maybe something  
14 similar, translucent on the loading dock area to  
15 protect that a little more.

16 But let's get this done. Let's figure out  
17 how we can get this done.

18 MEMBER MELTON: And I would agree, when I  
19 first saw this, I was excited that we were doing  
20 something with the library because I think it's  
21 needed, and I commend you on your challenge because  
22 it is a challenge, like everybody has mentioned.

23 I will say, too, that I didn't mention  
24 before, when I first looked, I was struggling with

1 the old entrance and the new entrance, and I think  
2 Jeff picked up on the reasons why I was struggling  
3 with that. So I go along with his comments as  
4 things maybe we can take a look at.

5           Again, other than the pedestrian ways and,  
6 of course, my thoughts on the discovery zone and  
7 protection for the kids, I think it's a great plan.

8           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Laura?

9           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: There's not a whole  
10 lot I have left to say. I will just say keep in  
11 mind this is a school neighborhood. I used to  
12 live in the neighborhood, and we always walked to  
13 the library. It would hurt me a lot to see kids  
14 walking through the parking lot to get to the  
15 library.

16           So take a look at Wheaton and Glen Ellyn  
17 and how they utilized green space within their  
18 parking lot because they do a really nice job.  
19 I've been there recently to both of the libraries,  
20 and they do a really nice job of utilizing the  
21 green space and integrating sidewalks within the  
22 parking lot.

23           Also, I will just say the Carnegie room, I  
24 actually got to utilize that door about year and a

1 half ago, and I felt really special. I will say  
2 we did a St. Charles walking tour, and I asked Pam  
3 if we couldn't pretty please use that door and we  
4 did. And it was really amazing because I didn't  
5 even know -- that sculpture, I've seen it, but you  
6 don't really have the opportunity to visit that  
7 front area otherwise; there's no reason to go up  
8 there.

9 I mean, just the whole area, the Carnegie  
10 reading room where there's music, it's just -- if  
11 you haven't -- if anyone hasn't visited that,  
12 please visit because it's absolutely gorgeous. So  
13 if there was more access to that area, it would be  
14 really nice for the library.

15 Other than that, I echo Sue's comments on  
16 the discovery zone and having some kind of barrier  
17 because people do forget, and they drive pretty  
18 quickly down Illinois, and that's why there's a  
19 chain link fence by Lincoln where my kids went,  
20 and I would not like it if there wasn't a fence.

21 So that's pretty much it.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm comfortable with  
23 the earlier comments. I would just echo some of  
24 the comments about the importance of screening the

1 loading along Main Street, whether that's Spando-  
2 glass to kind of feel like it's more an extension  
3 of the facade rather than a brick wall or block wall  
4 or something like that, and the height should --  
5 again, to the greatest extent you can be able to  
6 buffer the largest trucks that you guys typically  
7 have there so that is definitely not something  
8 people see as they're kind of visually pointed at  
9 that part of the building as you kind of make that  
10 little bend to get to 25.

11 I think that the existing driveway cut for  
12 St. Mark's onto Illinois should definitely be  
13 closed. That could easily be turned to the east  
14 to connect to the vacated 6th Street in some  
15 configuration because there's just no point to  
16 doing that. Now that you're going to turn that  
17 all into private driveways, there has to be a way  
18 to make that work.

19 I look forward to seeing how you guys  
20 synthesize all of this input. Thank you.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: If I could just say  
22 one more thing. On the loading dock area, you  
23 might want to consider some nice signage if you  
24 are going to take all those trees down, to actually

1 add a public library sign so people know what it  
2 is that aren't from the area or don't know.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'd just add one thought  
4 on the Carnegie garden. If everybody wants to say  
5 let's turn it into a place, let's fence it,  
6 there's all those security issues that I don't  
7 even want to open up, but one opportunity that  
8 might be -- even though there's some existing  
9 sculpture there now, working with public arts and  
10 having some rotating sculptures so that it's  
11 fresh. Even if it's just once a year depending on  
12 how that works, but if people go by and saw a new  
13 piece or two, at least it would just be a visual  
14 surprise. Because it is a prominent location from  
15 a driving standpoint, and it could just be one of  
16 those things that people notice even if they don't  
17 actually walk up to see it.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Can I add something?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, Jim.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: At the next  
21 presentation I think it would be helpful to see  
22 the south elevation. That might clear some things  
23 up. I don't know -- I can't -- I'm trying to  
24 figure out how that steeped pitch roof is going to

1 tie in when I'm looking at the south elevations.  
2 That would be very helpful.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I'm going to make  
4 one final comment on the loading dock area. It  
5 occurred to me as I was thinking about it that  
6 what draws my attention to the loading dock is the  
7 Books on Wheels -- I don't know what they're  
8 called but the big -- I don't know how tall they  
9 are, but they're tall trucks. Is that where you  
10 park them?

11 MS. CRAIG: We have two and so right now  
12 our outreach van -- our program and outreach van  
13 is currently parked in the parking lot, and the  
14 maintenance van, which is just a little minivan,  
15 is parked in the back loading dock, yes.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Another  
17 thing maybe to give a thought about, especially  
18 when you're reconfiguring the circle drive, the  
19 other thing I didn't mention is if there's a way  
20 to take parking out of that altogether, you may  
21 want to think about it. Maybe there's a reason to  
22 leave it for St. Mark's, but if there would be a  
23 location to park those vehicles back there,  
24 especially with removing those trees, that could

1 be something to think about, as well.

2 All right. Anything else?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Staff,  
5 anything before we move on?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Well, thank you.

8 MR. MCKAY: Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you very much. I  
10 hope this is helpful. Thank you for -- to everyone  
11 for coming out, and that will conclude Item 4 on  
12 the agenda.

13 (Off the record at 8:39 p.m.)

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, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, 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 12th day of August, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois



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

---

# Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update, Recommendations for East Side Study Area

**Date:** August 6, 2019

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

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

[www.planetdepos.com](http://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: :  
Comprehensive Plan Update for :  
Downtown; Recommendations for :  
East Side Study Area. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, August 6, 2019  
8:39 p.m.

Job No.: 218469B  
Pages: 1 - 41  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 5 is Comprehensive  
3 Plan Update for Downtown, Recommendations for East  
4 Side Study Area.

5 Russ?

6 MR. COLBY: All right. Good evening  
7 everyone. Given the time, I'm going to try and  
8 move through the slides fairly quickly because I  
9 want to make sure there's an opportunity for the  
10 Plan Commission to provide some comments and  
11 members of the public to provide comments or ask  
12 questions, but the presentation is the same  
13 material that's posted in the meeting packet. And  
14 some of this the Plan Commission has seen before,  
15 so I'll try to move through these initial sides  
16 quickly.

17 What we've done is based on the feedback  
18 that was received at the comprehensive plan open  
19 house back in April, we compiled a report of that  
20 information that was presented to the Plan Commission  
21 in summary form in June, and we have a full report  
22 listed on the project website that lists all the  
23 feedback related to each of the activities.

24 We're trying to take that information that

1 was received at the open house and translate that  
2 into land use and development recommendations for  
3 the comprehensive plan, and so tonight we'll be  
4 presenting the initial recommendations for the  
5 east side study area and looking for feedback and  
6 comments on that.

7 So just to refresh your memory, this is  
8 the site area we're looking at for the  
9 comprehensive plan amendment. Tonight it's the  
10 east side area we're looking at the.

11 This is a summary of the comments received  
12 from the development visioning exercises during  
13 the open house. These are the ones that  
14 specifically applied to the east side.

15 So what we heard is there's an interest in  
16 preserving City Hall, and interest in seeing the  
17 police station site developed in some manner to  
18 take advantage of the riverfront potentially for  
19 recreation or business uses, and some ideas  
20 offered were a restaurant, hotel, mixed use with  
21 residential. Green space along the river, having  
22 parking on the interior blocks away from the river,  
23 preserving the historic residential buildings  
24 around downtown, and not overdeveloping and trying

1 to preserve the character of the downtown area.

2 We also did a visual preference survey,  
3 and I've included in here the buildings that were  
4 the highest rated for categories. For the  
5 residential category these are the two that were  
6 selected.

7 Some of the comments we received were that  
8 residential adds valuable foot traffic to downtown,  
9 mid-scale buildings are preferred, three-story was  
10 the most common preference, and there's an interest  
11 in multilevel buildings being set back from the  
12 river.

13 We had similar comments regarding  
14 commercial buildings. The primary difference was  
15 that there's some recognition to having active  
16 storefronts, pedestrian friendly, first floors to  
17 the buildings are preferred.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, can I interrupt  
19 you for a second?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: On that last slide are  
22 those just generic photos, or do those exist in  
23 the area?

24 MR. COLBY: These are just generic photos

1 that were the grouping of photos we provided for  
2 the visual preference exercise.

3 The responses we received regarding open  
4 space, streetscape, and parking are shown in the  
5 examples here.

6 There's an interest in having open,  
7 accessible waterfront that has greenscape rather  
8 than all hardscape, and there's an interest in  
9 walking paths.

10 For streetscape, that they're visually  
11 active, plants, colors, textures, and seating.

12 Parking decks, there's a recognition they  
13 may be needed, but the design of the structure is  
14 very important, and wherever possible they should  
15 be located away from the riverfront.

16 So some of the land use recommendations  
17 that came out of the open house recognized that  
18 the area is really a transition from the core of  
19 the center of downtown to park and recreational  
20 areas that exist to the north don't have a lot of  
21 parking in particular on the east side. So that  
22 riverfront in the site area should be open, green,  
23 and accessible, mixed use fronting on the  
24 riverfront open space is preferred with some

1 connections to other recreation activities occurring  
2 along the riverfront. Building height, in the  
3 three-story range, residential transition, and  
4 parking on interior blocks. So these were kind of  
5 the guiding principles of the land use  
6 recommendation that came out of the open house.

7 So the exhibits that have been prepared  
8 are based on this pictometry view which sort of  
9 shows the study area, and you can sort of see the  
10 buildings in three dimensions and understand kind  
11 of the scale as opposed to an aerial photo. So  
12 the plans that I'll show are based on this  
13 pictometry view.

14 So first, the general open house comments  
15 that were provided, this exhibit shows those  
16 comments sort of marked onto an aerial photo. So  
17 the preference for green space along the river,  
18 redevelopment of the police station, preservation  
19 of the City Hall building, locating parking on the  
20 interior blocks, interest in preservation of  
21 residential neighborhoods sort of generically  
22 shown here based on this orange line, and there  
23 were also some comments about improving trail  
24 connections generally within the study area,

1 particularly on the east side of Fox River Trail  
2 that goes through downtown St. Charles, and in  
3 this area it is along the street as opposed to  
4 being a separated trail. So there's a little bit  
5 of disconnect that occurs from individuals who are  
6 traveling on the trail and end up at this location.  
7 And there is a connection this direction across  
8 the river which eventually could be an extension  
9 of the equestrian trail, but this is not the path  
10 that's a continuation on the Fox River Trail.  
11 There's confusion over that. So there's an  
12 opportunity to improve how those are laid out.

13 As I mentioned, there were also comments  
14 about maintaining the character of downtown and a  
15 preference for three-story building height.

16 As had been presented to the Plan Commission  
17 some time ago, we prepared exhibits that showed all  
18 of the existing site constraints on the property,  
19 and there's quite a few on the east side area in  
20 particular.

21 On both sides of the river, there's a fair  
22 amount of 100-year floodplain. On the east side  
23 it's generally limited to areas right now that are  
24 open space or parking lots, so it doesn't have a

1 lot of impact on the buildings that surround the  
2 floodplain versus on the west side where it is a  
3 little more extensive.

4 The bigger constraint on the east side is  
5 all the utility infrastructure that exists in this  
6 area. So highlighted on this exhibit these blue  
7 dots show city water wells that are active, and  
8 the blue lines show all of the water mains that  
9 interconnect the wells with a couple of water  
10 service buildings that exist in this area.

11 So what's going on here is water is coming  
12 out of these wells and is interconnected through a  
13 series of mains. They pass through this radium  
14 removal building, and then they go back to the  
15 reservoir building, and they're distributed out to  
16 the network. There's number different mains here.  
17 I just showed it in simplified form so you can get  
18 an idea where they're located.

19 They also are showing in this blue line the  
20 direction of sanitary sewer flow. There's major  
21 sanitary sewer trunk lines that pass through this  
22 area. There is a crossing of the Fox River in  
23 this approximate location that intersects with a  
24 sewer under Riverside Avenue, and you can see sort

1 of sanitary sewers that also come in that are  
2 connected to this Riverside Avenue sewer.

3 So for electric infrastructure there's  
4 two large substations here. It's an area where  
5 electric lines from ComEd come into the City and  
6 are attached -- connected to the City system. So  
7 there's distribution lines coming in, and there's  
8 City distribution lines going out.

9 So there's a lot of utility uses that  
10 exist above ground in this area of the north end  
11 of the study area, and there's also a lot of  
12 infrastructure underground that's very difficult  
13 to relocate. In particular, the electric and the  
14 sanitary sewer are difficult to relocate. Water  
15 mains are a little simpler to reroute, but because  
16 we have these existing wells, we're trying to also  
17 accommodate access and water main connection to  
18 those wells.

19 It also identifies that there's a fair  
20 amount of parking that exists in this area that  
21 serves more than the police station site. In  
22 particular, there's the parking lot that serves  
23 City Hall, and there's also public parking to the  
24 north of State Avenue that generally serves some

1 of the businesses in the area and also some of the  
2 other city buildings like the Century Station  
3 building across the street.

4           So with these site constraints in mind, if  
5 you sort of look at where everything is located,  
6 try to identify on here what would represent a  
7 developable area if the police station site is  
8 redeveloped. Riverside Avenue is shown as staying  
9 in roughly its same location and configuration.  
10 The reason for that being is for one, it's one of  
11 the major utility corridors to this area. It also  
12 provides access for large utility vehicles that  
13 need access to the facilities up here. It also  
14 provides a more direct connection to this area.  
15 This sort of cul-de-sac where Riverside Avenue  
16 terminates is one of the main access points to  
17 reach some of the trails that connect to this  
18 area, and depending on what happens with the  
19 active river project, this could become a major  
20 access point to some of the facilities that may be  
21 located in this area.

22           So from that standpoint it makes sense to  
23 at least -- whether it remains a public street or  
24 takes a different form, it needs to be an

1 accessway generally in that area.

2 The areas that are shown as developable,  
3 these are outside the floodplain, there's  
4 generally minimal utility conflict except water  
5 main locations.

6 To highlight a couple of things that were  
7 of interest to the Historic Preservation  
8 Commission, one is there's a yellow house here on  
9 State Avenue that is a historic landmark. So  
10 that's something that could be considered if this  
11 area were to be developed.

12 The Historic Commission also highlighted an  
13 interest regarding what I'll call the riverfront  
14 building of the police station, the building that's  
15 right along the existing river trail right now and  
16 is located on the west side of the water well,  
17 which is back in this alleyway between the  
18 buildings. While it's not necessarily a building  
19 that would qualify from an historic preservation  
20 standpoint based on its age, it was noted by the  
21 commission that it's a very visible building in  
22 the community that's sort of been designed around  
23 this location and has some commonality of the  
24 designed municipal center. So it isn't necessarily

1 a building that the commission would support seeing  
2 just reviewed in a speculative manner without  
3 having a plan for what would replace it. So --  
4 and the plans that I'll show you show a couple  
5 different versions of how you can lay things out  
6 if that building was to remain.

7 Also noted on here, the existing City Hall  
8 parking lot, this is necessary to serve the City  
9 Hall building as it exists today. There's potential  
10 that this parking that's located here could be  
11 provided in some other manner, but it would need  
12 to be accounted for either through a parking  
13 structure or some alternate location that could  
14 also be convenient enough to serve the needs of  
15 the City Hall building. So at this point we're  
16 not showing any changes to this parking lot, but  
17 it is -- it's a potential development site if  
18 there were some other way to accommodate that use  
19 elsewhere.

20 So I'll walk through a couple scenarios here.  
21 This first scenario is potential land uses if the  
22 riverfront building of the police station remains  
23 in place.

24 So this riverfront building, if you sort of

1 look at where this portion of the structure stops,  
2 on the back side it's right around this location,  
3 and all of these other buildings that exist are  
4 sort of additions onto an old industrial building  
5 that have been sort of pieced together that now  
6 form the police station. So in this scenario all  
7 of this portion of developed building has been  
8 removed or is available for development.

9 So the concept here would be that because  
10 the well site is located back sort of tucked away  
11 behind this riverfront building that there needs  
12 to be some kind of accessway maintained to that  
13 location. And what that does is that accessway  
14 gets used to create almost like a sort of front to  
15 this development envelope which is shown here  
16 where the structures that are constructed within  
17 this area, whatever form they take can kind of use  
18 this pathway sort of as a front facade that faces  
19 the river. It could function as a pedestrian  
20 corridor, almost like a promenade of a courtyard  
21 that's used by commercial uses along the frontage.

22 It also would create a stronger connection  
23 between the existing open space areas around the  
24 municipal center and Main Street and Pottawatomie

1 Park which right now has a few pinch points as we  
2 walk along the river trail. It also sort of  
3 creates a division between sort of the developed  
4 part of the property and the riverfront shown here  
5 in green. This becomes an opportunity for increased  
6 green space that could be improved for more like a  
7 park area.

8 So the building footprint is shown here,  
9 and this area that's sort of dashed in is sort of  
10 for that portion of the area which could be used  
11 for parking. It would really depend on what kind  
12 of building is constructed, whether it has parking  
13 within the units, say if it were row homes or  
14 townhomes that included their own parking, or if  
15 it was a smaller structure where they maintained a  
16 fair amount of surface parking, or whether there  
17 would be a parking structure. So it kind of  
18 depends on what form the actual development on the  
19 site would take as far as how the parking needs to  
20 be addressed, but based on the feedback we heard  
21 there's a preference to try and place that in this  
22 area on the interior portion of the block.

23 The second scenario -- I should say this  
24 is still the first scenario, but this is an

1 alternate version. If you were to just sort of  
2 break up the developable area to two different  
3 masses -- and this isn't going to say necessarily  
4 there would be two buildings, there would be  
5 two sort of developable areas where you could  
6 establish kind of an interior service corridor and  
7 provide access to both.

8           The second scenario is similar, but if you  
9 remove the riverfront building, you have the  
10 ability to shift over this pedestrian access  
11 corridor and expand the development envelope  
12 further to the west and still keeping this outside  
13 the existing floodplain. You can see this is  
14 still showing the same pedestrian corridor  
15 connection. And similarly, you can also break up  
16 this mass in a couple different pieces.

17           With respect to building height and scale,  
18 there were a lot of comments about -- concerns  
19 about tall buildings being close to the river, and  
20 an interest in not seeing the buildings generally  
21 exceed three stories was the most common comment  
22 that we heard. What this exhibit shows in yellow  
23 are all of the ground-level elevations because  
24 there's quite a bit of grade change as you move

1 from the river up into the neighborhood. So you  
2 can sort of see how this elevation along the river  
3 at about 690 relates to the elevation of 2nd Avenue  
4 which is about 45 feet higher. So when you have a  
5 structure that's placed down on this portion of  
6 the study area that might be 50 feet, you can  
7 imagine how it would relate to the elevation of  
8 2nd Avenue here.

9 So the one thing to note also is that this  
10 red boundary marks the existing zoning lines.  
11 Right now as the property is zoned there's a  
12 50-foot building height that's permitted in the  
13 CBD 1 District, 40 feet in the CBD 2 District, and  
14 50 feet in the PL District. So for reference, the  
15 Century Station building which is located attached  
16 to the fire station, that is exactly 50 feet tall  
17 up to the top roof line. So that's sort of the  
18 tallest building that could be constructed under  
19 current zoning.

20 So then based on the site constraints and  
21 looking at the areas that are developable and the  
22 feedback received on land use, this is the general  
23 layout of land uses that we're proposing. Green  
24 space is identified along the riverfront, a

1 pedestrian use area that could also serve as an  
2 access corridor that's directly behind open space.  
3 There's an interest in seeing some type of  
4 commercial use that could be located along this  
5 corridor. I think whether that's viable for  
6 commercial use sort of depends on what other  
7 activities might be taking place in the area. If  
8 the active river project were to move forward,  
9 this may be a more attractive location for some  
10 commercial uses or some recreational businesses  
11 that have some connection to the activities that  
12 might be going on in the active river area.

13 But this whole area is identified as mixed  
14 use with the commercial potential on the  
15 riverfront and then residential or potentially  
16 hotel use perhaps on the rest of the site. And  
17 this area again is marked as a potential for  
18 parking or residential use if it's a lower density  
19 type of development and residential parking is  
20 provided within the unit. And it identifies the  
21 existing residential neighborhood being preserved  
22 really based on where it's located now. This area  
23 is identified all as utility uses.

24 So in addition to land uses we like to

1 include some recommendations for sort of site  
2 improvements that could be included with a  
3 redevelopment of this area. So I've highlighted a  
4 few on here: Better utilization of the river  
5 trail and open space and creating a more  
6 contiguous green corridor and connect Main Street  
7 to Pottawatomie Park.

8 This area will be usable. It can serve  
9 more as a park space. If the active river project  
10 were to go forward, the approximate location of  
11 the shoreline would still be at the edge of the  
12 river trail, and the additional land area that  
13 might be located to the east of that likely would  
14 be planted with native vegetation or it would be  
15 designed such that it may not be able to have  
16 active use where you couldn't necessarily set up  
17 events or utilize it as you would utilize a grass  
18 space in a park. So this preserves that ability  
19 to use these spaces along the riverfront in that  
20 manner.

21 I talked about the cul-de-sac space north  
22 of Riverside. This could be redesigned or sort of  
23 reimagined as kind of a gateway feature that might  
24 be sort of a combination of pedestrian and vehicle

1 area because this may be really more of a main  
2 entrance to some of the activities that might be  
3 going on in this area.

4 Better screening of utility uses. Right  
5 now it's sort of patchy and sparse. There  
6 definitely could be some improvement of that. I  
7 mentioned trying to find a way to improve the  
8 interconnection of the trails which might be  
9 accomplished depending on how it's treated.

10 And right now there's not much of a  
11 transition between these downtown parking lots and  
12 the neighborhood up on the hill, so if there were  
13 some type of development that occurred in this  
14 part of the study area, it provides an opportunity  
15 for some sort of transitional building like a  
16 townhouse or a row house or something that would  
17 transition better than single-family lots backing  
18 up to parking lots. Granted there's a hill there,  
19 but there's a bit of a use transition.

20 So these are the draft plan recommendations  
21 for the study area, and this kind of reiterates  
22 everything I walked through.

23 Consider repurposing the riverfront  
24 building, that would depend on what kind of plans

1 were presented for the use of the rest of the site.  
2 Enhance the river trail by expanding adjacent open  
3 spaces, establish a river-facing pedestrian  
4 promenade, and also provide access to the well site.

5 Primary land uses, mixed use along that  
6 riverfront promenade, upper floor or residential  
7 uses, and those residential uses may extend to the  
8 east and may cross Riverside Avenue to transition  
9 to adjacent neighborhoods depending on the type of  
10 residential use.

11 The building height should work within  
12 current zoning. Three stories is preferred.  
13 Anything that goes above that would probably need  
14 to be reviewed to ensure that there's some variation  
15 of mass so the structure doesn't appear too large  
16 when viewed from some of the neighborhoods adjacent  
17 to it because right now there's a fairly open view  
18 down to the riverfront, and depending on the size  
19 of the structure, that could be blocked if it's  
20 allowed to be taller than three stories.

21 And the commercial or public parking would  
22 continue to be where it's generally located now  
23 along Riverside Avenue.

24 Some of the improvements I mentioned already,

1 buffering of utility uses, bike/pedestrian trail  
2 interconnection, and the Riverside Avenue  
3 cul-de-sac area.

4 That concludes my presentation this evening.  
5 We're looking for feedback from the Plan Commission  
6 and members of the public who are present. This  
7 is not the only time we'll be discussing this. I  
8 know it's late. We expect we'll be talking about  
9 it at the next couple upcoming meetings, as well.  
10 If there's any questions, I would start there.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions?

12 MEMBER PRETZ: I just had one item. On  
13 your -- the screen that you're showing right now,  
14 you say consider repurposing the riverfront police  
15 building. None of the lines -- there's no line  
16 item to indicate the sensitivity to the landmark  
17 or to the river portion, the portion of the police  
18 station that's along the river. For me, I'd like  
19 to see at least that line item in there, whatever  
20 the wording is. I know it's prominent in your --  
21 I know it's prominent in your presentation, but  
22 this is probably the page that most people will read.

23 MR. COLBY: We could include some  
24 references as to the basis for that language.

1           MEMBER FUNKE: I just wanted to say regarding  
2 parking, there's always a concern I have that when  
3 you do -- as the City becomes more dense, the need  
4 for parking garages increases. Moving forward,  
5 if there's a way that we can incorporate some sort  
6 of use for the parking garage, whether it be on  
7 the first floor -- you know, when you look at a  
8 typical parking garage, a parking deck in the city,  
9 it deactivates the residential retail around it.

10           So if there's a way like to have on the  
11 first floor of a parking deck maybe a zoning clause  
12 where you have to have retail on that first floor  
13 or the opportunity to do a Texas wrap, which is a  
14 residential building that wraps a parking garage  
15 so you're not seeing, you know, a four- or five-story  
16 parking deck with cars. So moving forward I think  
17 that would be a good way to do that.

18           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other comments?

19           MEMBER VARGULICH: I just had a question  
20 regarding the existing veterans memorial, and it  
21 looks like it's being integrated into these  
22 developments. I think there should be a note as  
23 far as incorporating effort to relocate that. In  
24 other words, in this general area maybe a little

1 bit to the north -- you know, there's some open  
2 space to the north, but I would hope that just  
3 doesn't get lost.

4 How did the -- or did you look at the study  
5 that was prepared for the active river project for  
6 the City in how these land uses compared to what  
7 they were projecting could happen on there? I  
8 mean, was there -- how did that work?

9 MR. COLBY: I think, as I mentioned, from  
10 a market standpoint this site as it exists today  
11 is probably difficult to attract commercial use to  
12 it because it is relatively isolated from rest of  
13 downtown. And I think one of the key recommendations  
14 on that market study or observations, I should  
15 say, from the other areas that it looked at was  
16 the business impact was most direct to some of  
17 those businesses that were right in the vicinity  
18 of the project that would benefit from the -- from  
19 the visitors to the improvements that are there.  
20 And that's sort of more looking at it from a  
21 revenue standpoint that having spaces that are  
22 directly connected to these open active areas  
23 would potentially attract businesses.

24 But, also, I think a lot of their focus

1 was transforming the physical improvements of an  
2 area. So this pedestrian use area, this sort of  
3 courtyard would create an environment where you  
4 have the benefit of all the activity that's  
5 occurring within the river, but you also have some  
6 of the related amenities along the shoreline, that  
7 that makes the area more attractive for residential  
8 use. I think the potential for a hotel also is  
9 increased if we have that additional activity in  
10 the area.

11 So it's difficult for us to -- because we  
12 want this plan to make sense whether the active  
13 river project happens or maybe happens in a  
14 different form or happens more slowly because we  
15 know that the City is going to be in a position to  
16 potentially offer this property up for redevelopment.  
17 So it's challenging for us to connect directly  
18 what's being recommended here with the plan without  
19 knowing if that's actually going to happen.

20 So I'm not sure if that directly answers  
21 your question.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes and no. I find  
23 under the draft plan recommendations the first  
24 two items, if the intent is to -- and I think

1 people want to walk along the river flat out. I  
2 mean, you could say there's another promenade  
3 50 feet back, 100 feet back, whatever, if it's  
4 green space or if you keep the existing police  
5 station. Okay. But unless there's really something  
6 happening over there, people want to walk along  
7 the river.

8 And I don't care one way or the other  
9 whether the existing police station is to be kept,  
10 and not to be contrary to historic preservation,  
11 but keeping that building creates a significant  
12 pinch point in the opportunity to expand, and create  
13 a really wide pedestrian way from the City Hall up  
14 to the railroad trestle.

15 So I would not agree that that building is  
16 a significant thing to keep. Not that we should  
17 spend money and demo it today, but I don't think  
18 that it's a valuable resource from the standpoint  
19 of redevelopment and maximizing what can be done  
20 along the river. Because it does compress that  
21 area a lot.

22 So just as an observation.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Peter, can I just say from  
24 the preservation side -- and Russ mentioned it --

1 that the commission would just like to see what  
2 would be replacing it, what's the idea other than  
3 a quick demolition of it. That's where the  
4 sensitivity comes in from the commission side,  
5 Preservation Commission side.

6 So what you're saying is -- you know, I  
7 understand what you're saying, but just quick  
8 demolition is just our position.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: You'd rather look  
10 at that building than a demolition site?

11 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm sorry?

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: You'd rather at  
13 least have that building up there than a complete  
14 demolition site.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: Correct. In comparison to  
16 the other building which the City -- from my  
17 viewpoint I'm guessing the City will probably take  
18 it down.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have to say I  
20 agree with Peter, and I think that the only thing  
21 I see when I look at this is another commercial  
22 development on the river, and I understand that  
23 that's probably its best use. But what I really  
24 believe we need to do is expand that pedestrian

1 promenade so that it is a useable area, a piazza  
2 area.

3           And then I also think that -- you know, I  
4 understand what you're saying not looking at a  
5 demolition site, but if that's going to be the  
6 development goal of that, why not start that --  
7 tear that building down and put that pedestrian  
8 access and start it. We did it over on First Street;  
9 we don't know what's going to happen all the way  
10 up to 64. Why can't we put something there right  
11 away and not have to let that building be a pinch  
12 point? Get started.

13           MEMBER VARGULICH: Just to make sure  
14 there's no misunderstanding --

15           MEMBER PRETZ: I think you're not allowing  
16 for a developer to come in to possibly incorporate  
17 that into the design. So if you tear it down, it  
18 can never be incorporated, and so you're taking  
19 that out of the developer's hand. That's what our  
20 position is, allow a developer to come in and at  
21 least show their plans. That doesn't mean  
22 eventually it's not gone.

23           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I agree with Peter.  
24 I don't think it has any significance, and I'd

1 just as soon see it gone.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: For the both of you, I  
3 just want to clarify that I'm not saying we should  
4 spend any City money to tear down any of these  
5 buildings unless they become an issue because it's  
6 taking 10 years for someone to come and redevelop.  
7 In the immediate term they could be as they are,  
8 used for some other function. But I just think  
9 the hierarchy of priorities should be for a wide  
10 promenade feel from City Hall up to the trestle  
11 where it's pinched unless you're willing to spend  
12 millions of dollars to pull it back, which I don't  
13 doubt anybody is. So that is my -- I'm not  
14 suggesting we tear down things right now.

15 In any case, I think that the site of the  
16 existing municipal parking lot, while it doesn't  
17 seem to -- there's been kind of a touch on, well,  
18 that's potentially a development site. I would  
19 say that it absolutely is a development site.  
20 There's plenty of open space in front of it to not  
21 necessarily satisfy but to give people a feeling  
22 that the building is not compressing the sense of  
23 riverfront along there and open space, and I think  
24 we would be remiss in not encouraging that site

1 for redevelopment understanding we have to address  
2 the parking and how that gets done.

3 But I think that should have more emphasis  
4 given its relationship with or without the active  
5 river project, and the views and the connection, I  
6 think that would be wonderful.

7 I think that the public's reaction to  
8 everything being a maximum of three stories is the  
9 public's reaction. If you look on the west side,  
10 you have Hotel Baker at five stories; you have the  
11 residential tower at six, and I don't see that as  
12 a problem at all personally. So I think that the  
13 idea that we're going to keep making these  
14 recommendations of three-story preferred, I think  
15 is should say three-story is current zoning and  
16 let the market determine what the height is and  
17 run it -- and allow a process of review of  
18 architecture, review of massing, review of view  
19 corridors, all important things, but I think that  
20 should be what we should be after, not telling  
21 everybody we only will accept three-story  
22 buildings on this side of the river. That just  
23 doesn't make any sense to me anyway; I'm sorry.

24 I think there's some missed opportunities

1 for some of the residential structures along  
2 Second Street. 215 and 211 are homes that  
3 probably don't contribute a whole lot to that  
4 street and could be redeveloped into something  
5 else. There could be townhomes there which would  
6 be lovely, and the backs of them would have  
7 wonderful views down to the river. The current  
8 structures that are there now just never took  
9 advantage of that to any degree.

10 I think there's an opportunity potentially,  
11 depending on how the parking is done -- because I  
12 do think you're going to ultimately need a parking  
13 deck, say between Riverside and Second Street and  
14 State in some configuration to be looked at with  
15 some of these other things, but I think having a  
16 connection to Second Avenue at Chestnut is -- be  
17 it a parking deck could be a good way to look at  
18 that. It gives another exit and entry point for  
19 traffic instead of forcing everything towards Main  
20 Street. And when we have big events when a  
21 parking deck would be used, whether it's some  
22 festival or 4th of July, people are always looking  
23 for a place to park, and the more efficient the  
24 traffic, the faster people can leave the festival.

1           Open space -- maybe this is a little too  
2 detailed, but right as you pass -- before you get  
3 to the trestle, that sloped area where the bike  
4 path goes up seems like a great opportunity as far  
5 as redevelopment or an amenity space, whether it's  
6 owned privately or City, to take advantage of that  
7 grade change and have terraces, and it could just  
8 be pedestrian use that would have a view kind of  
9 to the west and south down the river. Because  
10 right now it's just sloped and there's some  
11 planting on it, but if we're talking about widening  
12 the promenade from the railroad trestle down to  
13 the City Hall, that just seems like it could be a  
14 lovely terminus to have a bunch of people waiting  
15 to use that in very flexible, fun ways and taking  
16 in wonderful views down towards Main Street along  
17 the river.

18           And you did say we're going to have some  
19 more opportunities to talk about this. Thank you.

20           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have something to add  
21 that -- Jeff, what did you call it, Texas wrap?

22           MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

23           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The one thing that  
24 occurred to me is where the existing parking lot

1 where it says parking or residential up there  
2 would be to -- I think as you're driving north on  
3 Riverside Avenue you come to the parking on both  
4 sides of the street as you approach the utilities,  
5 and it really gives you an industrial feel, not  
6 really the kind of feeling that you want to get in  
7 that area. But my thought for how to deal with  
8 several different things at once would be to have  
9 some type of residential, a more dense residential  
10 development there that would serve to shield the  
11 utility use, take attention away from it. And the  
12 other thought would be to incorporate parking into  
13 that similar to how it's been done on First Street.  
14 But, you know, to have the parking back to the  
15 utility use, the less desirable side of that  
16 structure, and be able to have the residential use  
17 facing the river, but as I said, part of a dense  
18 residential use to kind of hug that area, I guess.

19 I don't -- I agree with Tim about the --  
20 well, we both do about the police station. I just  
21 don't -- it would have to be demonstrated to me  
22 that there's some significance to that building  
23 that would justify it taking quite possibly the  
24 most valuable space along the river away from the

1 public because I don't get it personally. I don't  
2 know why it was ever put there in the first place  
3 but that's just me.

4 As I said, I think there needs to be a  
5 focus on terracing down to the river. In that  
6 area that says "mixed use commercial ground floor,"  
7 I don't think we would want a 50-foot building set  
8 there. I think it would really take away from the  
9 open space potential for this area but I don't  
10 know -- that's just what my feeling is sitting  
11 here now.

12 Before I finish with Plan Commissioner  
13 members, were there some comments, some questions?

14 MR. RABCHUK: John Rabchuk, 914 Ash Street  
15 here in St. Charles.

16 I understand the difficulty that you had,  
17 and I think Russ and the team have done a pretty  
18 good job at summarizing it all, but the elephant  
19 in the room is the active river project. If you  
20 assume the active river project happens, it  
21 creates a lot more room along the river.

22 If you look at the plans that have been  
23 done and you see the renderings in the concept  
24 plan, like that whole curve up there where it says

1 "Open Space" off to the upper left-hand corner,  
2 all that curve of the river goes away because the  
3 plan calls for the opening -- the land underneath  
4 the railroad bridge to be about 40 feet wide  
5 instead of the 6 or 7 feet now.

6           So you can imagine as that comes down, so  
7 now all of these buildings that you're talking  
8 about, like the police station, existing, you  
9 know, front of the police station, it's quite a  
10 ways from the river. So you're not restricting  
11 that open space necessarily. I'm not saying that  
12 the police station is viable or not. Potentially  
13 it's a restaurant, quite frankly, with a view over  
14 and hotel behind it. You've got that water well  
15 behind it, so you've got to work around that and  
16 have access to it, et cetera.

17           I think the City -- of course, you know my  
18 position on this, but the City has got to make a  
19 decision, either go forward with the active river  
20 project and assume that that's going to happen and  
21 plan accordingly or say, "No, we're not going to  
22 do it. We don't want do it, so we're going to  
23 live with the exiting land mass." To have that as  
24 a variable creates so many open questions that

1 you're kind of just throwing paper in the air, I  
2 think, is my comment.

3           So I think it's time to decide what -- and  
4 that's not for you to do necessarily as Plan  
5 Commission, but the City itself has to make that  
6 decision, and if it does, then that defines or  
7 helps to define a lot of what can be done instead  
8 of just throwing darts at a wall.

9           Thank you.

10           MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, John, we've been  
11 asked to assume that the active river project is  
12 not going to happen.

13           MR. RABCHUK: Okay. And if that's true,  
14 then plan accordingly and don't plan -- don't say,  
15 well, if we do this or if we do that. I mean, all  
16 of these access points to go into Pottawatomie  
17 Park without the active river plan become moot  
18 because the park district does not want traffic in  
19 that open space. They'll prohibit bicyclists  
20 from -- not pedestrian traffic but bicycles and  
21 other things. So worrying about the open space  
22 opening up into Pottawatomie Park is a moot  
23 question at that point in time.

24           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I agree. I think it's

1 a condition precedent to everything we're doing  
2 here. We have to know if we're going to be talking  
3 about how to arrange open space along the river.

4 MR. RABCHUK: Exactly. It creates quite a  
5 bit more land. I think it's a number of acres when  
6 you consider both sides. It opens up all the  
7 development opportunities -- obviously, I'm biased --  
8 but on the west side, as well. But here in  
9 particular it creates -- now you're talking that  
10 like the parking lot behind City Hall and that  
11 open space next to it, that could be a performance  
12 arena facing the river, et cetera because you'd  
13 have quite a bit more green space. You could do  
14 all kinds of things with it.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom?

16 MEMBER PRETZ: I just wanted to touch upon  
17 the comment made relative to the multideck and an  
18 entrance coming off of Chestnut. One of the  
19 difficulties that, Peter, you may not be aware of  
20 is Second Avenue has no parking, Third Avenue has  
21 no parking, Chestnut has a half a street. The  
22 bridge where it's located at to go over the old  
23 railroad tracks, that is somewhat of a hazard area  
24 because of the blind side of not being able to see

1 the cars going over off of Chestnut, and recently  
2 they just shifted the parking on Chestnut in order  
3 to try to accommodate some of the traffic flow  
4 because of the amount of accidents that have  
5 occurred there in the last five years.

6 So while a multideck garage may make sense,  
7 access coming off of Chestnut may mean -- from a  
8 police standpoint may not make the most sense, but  
9 an access coming off of State and Second going  
10 onto a deck, yes.

11 And I think the last thing, one other  
12 point concerning the height and restriction, I  
13 think where the three-story comes in is that the  
14 general feel between the east and the west side of  
15 the river is that the east is -- because of its  
16 elevation is more of a residential feel because of  
17 the distance between 5th Avenue coming down to the  
18 river is all residential, basically all  
19 residential.

20 And on the west side the feel is you have  
21 the river and Route 31. It's a narrow area and  
22 it's a different feel as you take a look at those  
23 buildings. So five and six story on that side may  
24 be okay because of the way the valley goes and the

1 look and the general feel, but I think that's  
2 where people have been coming from relative to the  
3 size. And I think in the recommendation it says  
4 in there based on the existing zoning and then,  
5 obviously, for variations of size and mass if a  
6 developer comes in. So there is an outlet to be  
7 able to allow for the larger buildings.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other comments,  
9 questions?

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'm hoping we can  
11 revisit this.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Say it again.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I hope we can revisit  
14 this. It's just getting a little late. Sorry.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there any issue with  
16 tabling the discussion to a future date?

17 MR. COLBY: No. We were anticipating this  
18 being discussed at additional meetings, as well.  
19 This is just a draft, so it's going to evolve as  
20 we go on forward the next a couple meetings.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Sounds good.

22 (Off the record at 9:21 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, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, 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 12th day of August, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



---

Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois



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

---

# Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion

**Date:** August 6, 2019

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

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

[www.planetdepos.com](http://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: :  
Additional Business from Plan :  
Commission Members or Staff; :  
Pledge of Allegiance :  
Discussion. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, August 6, 2019  
9:21 p.m.

Job No.: 218469C  
Pages: 1 - 15  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 6, Additional  
3 Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff.  
4 Do we have a discussion regarding the Pledge of  
5 Allegiance at our meetings?

6 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, we put it on here from  
7 the last meeting, and the only thing that I would  
8 say is the Plan Commission is the public hearing  
9 arm of the City Council. The City Council does the  
10 Pledge of Allegiance. I believe that we should  
11 be in step with them and add it to our agenda. I  
12 know City Council also adds a prayer. That's not  
13 part of this.

14 And quite simply, I would like to make a  
15 motion that we add the pledge as an item on our  
16 agenda on the review and approval of City Council  
17 if they have any objections.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't think it's  
19 up to the City Council to decide these things.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't think so. I think  
21 it's a matter of procedure. The Plan Commission has  
22 the ability to make that decision on their own,  
23 unless City staff thinks otherwise.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a few

1 comments.

2 One of them -- I'd like to speak directly  
3 to your contention that we're an arm of the City  
4 Council and that maybe we should be in step with  
5 them. I think it's inappropriate for us because  
6 we're not an arm of the City Council. We're one of  
7 two quasi-judiciary committees in the city. We're  
8 mandated by the State. We operate using rules of  
9 evidence or evidentiary -- we're not truly  
10 evidentiary rules, but we use findings of fact,  
11 and I think it's inappropriate and not part of our  
12 mandate, it serves no purpose to our mandate as  
13 the way we make determinations of applications  
14 before us. It's not like the City Council at all.  
15 The City Council is -- can make subjective  
16 decisions. We can't.

17 That's one of the things -- I have  
18 three items.

19 I think it creates unnecessary controversy.  
20 There are people who might be opposed to it but  
21 can't say they're opposed to it for fear of being  
22 controversial. I know that you've seen in the  
23 news -- I'm sure you have -- it is very controversial  
24 all over the Midwest, in Aurora; St. Louis Park

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

6

1 Minnesota; St. Louis, Missouri. This is a big  
2 issue, so I believe it might be an unnecessary  
3 controversy.

4 Finally, I've asked a number of friends,  
5 and we've talked about, "What do you think? Is it  
6 something you would do?" And most people tell me,  
7 "Why not? What do you care?" Okay. But I think  
8 that's another reason not to mandate it. I think  
9 the Pledge of Allegiance should be done with  
10 feeling and fervor for what it means, and when you  
11 mandate it as a regular item in an unrelated  
12 venue, it loses its impact.

13 So those are the three arguments I would  
14 have against it. I will say, though, that I'm not  
15 for it but I won't oppose it. But I'm not for it  
16 for those reasons.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Knowing that this was  
18 coming up, having been educated in constitutional  
19 law, I actually looked into some of the Supreme  
20 Court cases on this, and there's nothing that  
21 prohibits us from doing this.

22 But one of the thoughts that I had, which  
23 I should have written down and been better  
24 prepared with my remarks on this, was to have

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

7

1 somewhat of a precommentary to the Pledge of  
2 Allegiance, which I wish that they would do in  
3 other contexts, as well.

4 I think standing for the Pledge of  
5 Allegiance is an exercise of First Amendment  
6 rights, but an equal exercise is not standing for  
7 the Pledge of Allegiance, which I think is  
8 everyone's right to do, as well. And I don't -- I  
9 think that if it's given in the context of a  
10 voluntary exercise as opposed to a mandate, I  
11 don't -- I'm not of the thought that any  
12 government should mandate their citizens to pledge  
13 allegiance to anything. So I think it needs to be  
14 very clear what the context of a pledge of  
15 allegiance would be.

16 So those are my thoughts.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: From an amendment  
18 standpoint, I believe that the First and Second --  
19 people can do whatever they want because that's  
20 why they're written that way. My perspective is  
21 not making it a mandate that everybody get up and  
22 do that. It's more the recognition of the pledge  
23 itself.

24 Regardless of whatever our -- whatever

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

8

1 direction we're given by the State or whatever  
2 body, the reality is that our City Council feels  
3 comfortable, and they can do their own -- you  
4 know, their own rules and mandates themselves, but  
5 if it's good enough for them, and considering the  
6 responsibility we have for our reviews and things  
7 like that, it should be good enough for us however  
8 we do it.

9 I'll leave it at that.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes?

11 MEMBER BECKER: Just to add some personal  
12 background, I've been staff to two plan commissions,  
13 West Dundee and City of Elgin. Pledges are said  
14 but now, as a working committee, no pledges are  
15 said. Just some information as to how others do  
16 it. So it doesn't seem to be any kind of a set  
17 precedent, just cultural.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Do you need a  
19 second? Because I would like to second that we  
20 say the Pledge of Allegiance.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry?

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I would second that  
23 we say the Pledge of Allegiance.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any further

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

9

1 discussion?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think  
3 everybody's mind is pretty made up.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tim.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

8 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: No.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

20 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, no.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

10

1 by 6 to 3.

2 MR. COLBY: So what was the motion exactly?

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It was to incorporate  
4 the Pledge of Allegiance into our meeting.

5 MR. COLBY: Okay. So --

6 MEMBER PRETZ: With review and approval by  
7 City Council.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We don't need  
9 review and approval.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: The reason that I mention  
11 that was that -- okay -- never mind.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let's clarify.

13 MR. COLBY: I was just going to say, if  
14 you'd like it to be a regular item on the Plan  
15 Commission agenda, it would be appropriate to add  
16 it to the rules of procedure as one of the items  
17 that's listed on each agenda. So that would be a  
18 separate action the Plan Commission would have to  
19 take once we draft that.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So just to  
21 clarify the motion and the procedure in changing  
22 our procedure, it would be to incorporate the  
23 Pledge of Allegiance, and I guess we could do it  
24 by a subsequent motion to provide direction to

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

1 staff on how to modify the rules of procedure.

2 Can we vote on that at the next meeting to approve  
3 those rules of procedure?

4 MR. COLBY: Yes. We can prepare a draft  
5 based on the discussion.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So I guess  
7 I would need a subsequent motion clarifying what  
8 we had previously voted on. Is there a second?

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: (Indicating.)

10 THE COURT REPORTER: Who seconded?

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I did.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: To clarify, I made a  
13 motion to direct -- after clarifying what the  
14 motion was, they're going to amend the rules of  
15 procedure and prepare that for us to approve at  
16 the next meeting.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This motion's  
18 already approved, though?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It is but I guess you  
20 can do mine as a motion to amend to clarify the  
21 previous motion that we are directing staff to  
22 prepare a change to the rules of procedure to  
23 present to the Plan Commission at the next meeting  
24 to incorporate the Pledge of Allegiance.

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

12

1 MEMBER PRETZ: And I say yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We don't need a  
4 second.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: He seconded that.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: He seconded that?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So I guess  
8 we're really amending the first motion.

9 So everyone clear on that? Can we vote  
10 on it?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

12 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: No.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

24 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

13

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, no.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes  
5 by a vote of 7 to 2. I voted against my own motion.  
6 All right. I think we're clear here.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's all right.  
8 Robert would be appalled.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Weekly development  
10 report.

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Nothing? All right.

13 Meeting announcements. We have upcoming  
14 meetings. Do we have agenda items for the  
15 upcoming meetings?

16 MR. COLBY: Yes. The comprehensive plan  
17 certainly.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure. And keep in mind  
19 in advance the September 3rd meeting is not here,  
20 but it is across the street.

21 Moving on to page 2, public comment. Our  
22 public left.

23 Is there a motion to adjourn?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the  
3 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at  
4 9:42 p.m.

5 (Off the record at 9:42 p.m.)  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

Transcript of Pledge of Allegiance Discussion  
Conducted on August 6, 2019

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, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, 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 12th day of August, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois