

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2016**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chairman Tim Kessler
James Holderfield
Tom Schuetz
Brian Doyle
Dan Frio
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Michelle Spruth

Members Absent: Tom Pretz

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

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the August 16, 2016 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the August 16, 2016 Plan Commission meeting.

4. Petkus Property, 27 acres north side of Smith Rd. (Albert Petkus)
Application for Concept Plan

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos - Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING

5. Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 S. Tyler Rd. Units N-2 & O (Raul Laracuente)
Application for Special Use

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, September 20, 2016
Page 2

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos - Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Doyle to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Spruth, Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Frio, Macklin-Purdy, Wallace, Kessler

Nays: None

Absent: Pretz

Motion carried: 8-0

MEETING

6. Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 S. Tyler Rd. Units N-2 & O (Raul Laracuate)
Application for Special Use

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos - Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Schuetz to recommend approval of a Special Use for a Place of Worship for Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 S. Tyler Rd. Units N-2 & O (Raul Laracuate) with two conditions: 1) The maximum number of people at any given church service shall not exceed 45; and 2) Church services shall not be held before 7:00 p.m. on weekdays or before 12:00 p.m. on Saturdays.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Spruth, Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Frio, Macklin-Purdy, Wallace, Kessler

Nays: None

Absent: Pretz

Motion carried: 8-0

7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, October 4, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, October 18, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, November 22, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, September 20, 2016
Page 3

- b. Planning & Development Committee
 - Monday, October 10, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Monday, November 14, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

10. Public Comment

11. Adjournment at 9:16pm



PLANET DEPOS[®]

We make it >> *happen.*[™]

Transcript of **Meeting: Petkus Property, North Side
of Smith Road**

Date: September 20, 2016

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos, LLC

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

Internet: www.planetdepos.com

Worldwide Court Reporting | Interpretation | Trial Services

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: :
Petkus Property, 27 acres, :
north side of Smith Road :
(Albert Petkus) :
Application for Concept Plan. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, September 20, 2016
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 97799A
Pages: 1 - 87
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

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

Report of proceedings held at the location of:

ST. CHARLES CITY HALL
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
(630) 377-4400

Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a
Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

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

PRESENT:

- TODD WALLACE, Chairman
- TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman
- BRIAN DOYLE, Member
- DAN FRIO, Member
- JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member
- LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member
- MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic
Development Director

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

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: Spruth.

MEMBER SPRUTH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

MEMBER FRIO: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 3 on the agenda is
presentation of minutes of the August 16th, 2016,
meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

5

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
2 seconded. All in favor.

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Before we move on with
7 tonight's business, since this is our -- this is the
8 first meeting since September 11th, I would like to
9 invite you all to take a moment of silence and
10 remember.

11 (Moment of silence observed.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

13 Item 4 on the agenda is the Petkus Property,
14 North Side of Smith Road (Albert Petkus) Application
15 for Concept Plan.

16 I'd like to welcome you all here tonight, and
17 I want to give a summary of what the Plan Commission
18 is and what we do.

19 We are tasked by the City Council -- first
20 of all, we're appointed as volunteers to serve on
21 the Plan Commission, and we're tasked by the City
22 Council to review applications that come before us
23 and conduct public hearings.

24 That's not what we're doing tonight. This

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

6

1 is actually prior to a public hearing because there
2 hasn't been any application filed.

3 So what we do as a courtesy to people who are
4 considering making an application is we'll conduct a
5 concept plan review. And at this point in the
6 process, the developer presents what they may come
7 before the City with, and we provide constructive
8 comments both in favor of and not in favor of in the
9 potential application.

10 So the way that we're going to run this
11 tonight is, first of all, the developer is going to
12 make a presentation, and following the presentation
13 members of the Plan Commission will ask questions of
14 the developer. Following that anyone in the audience
15 who wishes to may ask a question.

16 After that, at the end of the process the
17 Plan Commission will give comments to the developer
18 on what they do and do not like about the plan.
19 This enables a developer to go back and incorporate
20 those changes before making a final application with
21 the City.

22 We have a court reporter here in the room,
23 and she can only take down one voice at a time. So
24 I would ask that anyone who wishes to speak first be

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

7

1 recognized by me, and when speaking, I would ask
2 that you come up to the lectern and state your name
3 and your address and then ask questions or make
4 comments as you see fit.

5 Now, there are a lot of people here tonight,
6 and it's not our intention to have this go until
7 midnight. So I would ask for a courtesy in making
8 comments brief, asking questions that are on point,
9 and if someone else has already asked a question or
10 made a comment that you intend to make, it's been
11 made and heard by the Plan Commission, and I would
12 ask that you just let it be at that. Unfortunately,
13 we don't have time for 100 different people to make
14 speeches. So I would just ask that you give us the
15 information that you think is important and allow
16 other people to do that, too.

17 And then after this -- sorry -- I lost my
18 train of thought. After this meeting we will take
19 no action. We will conduct this hearing -- this
20 meeting, this concept plan review, and then we won't
21 do anything further. It will be before the planning
22 and development committee of the City Council for a
23 similar meeting. That's on, I believe October 10th.
24 It will be similar to this one, and that will be a

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

8

1 time to be heard by City Council members.

2 So as I said, we don't do anything following
3 this meeting. As soon as the applicant feels that
4 they are in a position to come before the City, they
5 will file an application, and at that point we'll
6 have a public hearing, and that will be another time
7 to be heard.

8 That being said, when an application comes
9 before the City, we consider what the application is
10 asking for. At this point in time, we can give the
11 developer suggestions as to what that application
12 would be. And I would ask -- the smart thing to do
13 is to keep to the zoning ordinance, the zoning
14 classification, what type of application you'd like
15 to come before the City because that's what we
16 consider. We don't consider anything regarding
17 policy, just regarding the application itself.

18 Any questions?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Seeing none,
21 staff, anything before we begin?

22 MR. COLBY: No.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And how long do
24 you expect your presentation to take?

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

9

1 MR. CARRARA: 10 to 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I'll be
3 timing you.

4 MR. CARRARA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
5 Commissioners. My name is Kevin Carrara. I'm with
6 the law firm of Rathje & Woodward, and I represent
7 the property owner on this concept application.
8 Thank you for your time this evening, and we look
9 forward to your input as we work through this
10 process.

11 Before we begin the meat of the presentation,
12 I'd like to take a few moments and try to address
13 what may be some misconceptions or misunderstanding
14 as to our concept application.

15 In meeting with the surrounding neighbors
16 prior to coming before you tonight, we determined
17 that we think there's a misunderstanding in the
18 reading of our concept application. Any reference
19 to a PUD or a planned unit development, as we're
20 aware in the zoning world, those initials mean
21 something, and we believe they've been confused with
22 the initials HUD or the Housing and Urban
23 Development department of the Federal government and
24 have even gone so far as to confuse it with us

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

10

1 seeking approval of Section 8 housing before you
2 this evening. I think, as the Chair recognized,
3 none of that is before this Commission today.

4 I think you've read our application. I
5 think staff will agree with us, nowhere at any time
6 have we discussed any type of Section 8 housing nor
7 have we discussed any HUD housing programs. That's
8 not why we're here this evening. We're here this
9 evening for your input on our concept application
10 for a planned unit designation and RM rezoning.

11 With that a little bit of backdrop, I'll go
12 ahead and introduce the team tonight to explain our
13 concept to you.

14 First, I have Al Petkus. He's the property
15 owner. The Petkus family has owned property in the
16 area since the 1950s. In fact, most of the area you
17 see around the green screen, all the houses and
18 commercial developments were built on land that was
19 at one time probably the Petkus family's dairy farm.

20 Al purchased the first half of the 27 acres
21 in 1998 from his family, and he then purchased the
22 remaining half in 2002. The property is not for
23 sale. It's not being marketed. We're just here to
24 try to get information and work with the City through

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

11

1 this concept process.

2 As the Chair said, should this process ever
3 get to an application or at some point an actual
4 development, the developer will have to go through
5 the planned unit process, have the public hearings,
6 prove the necessary standards that would be both
7 within the annexation agreement, as well as the
8 zoning code for whatever the end use may be a part
9 of the development at some point in the future.

10 Now, there's been some concern that people
11 suggest we're not being truthful with the City, that
12 we have some kind of deal hidden away in our pocket.
13 That's not the case. Some have said, "Why are they
14 spending so much money to get to the process if
15 there isn't anything down the road?"

16 Well, it's a very simple question, and Al will
17 be the first to admit it. He's not a builder; he's
18 not a developer; this is his first foray into this
19 process, and he doesn't understand the zoning context.
20 When we first met with him, he didn't understand what a
21 PUD was either. He didn't understand what RM-3 was.
22 We had to work through that process. So Al wanted
23 to hire the experts to help him understand that.

24 One of the understandings he wanted to try

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

12

1 to get a baseline on is the 2014 boundary line
2 agreement between the cities of Charles and West
3 Chicago and what impact that boundary line agreement
4 and some of the terms and conditions within there
5 have on his property. He wanted to understand those
6 variables and what that meant, but he also wanted to
7 understand the engineering variables that should
8 development happen in the future, can it be
9 sustained on this property.

10 So with that little bit of background, today
11 we have -- with me this evening I have Rich Olson
12 and Joe Abel. They're the land planning side of the
13 team. They're here to help explain to you the how
14 and why our request for annexation, the planned unit
15 development, and the underlying zoning make sense.

16 Additionally, we have Chuck Hanlon and
17 Chris Lindy from WBK Engineers. They're here to
18 help explain the reasons why the engineering also
19 makes sense in terms of the planned unit development
20 and zoning classification that we are seeking.

21 Now, this is probably a perfect time for me
22 to then go ahead and transition over. I'm going to
23 bring up Mr. Abel. Joe Abel, some of you may have
24 seen him before you. He's been a planner for over

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

13

1 40 years. He's been involved with the initial
2 drafting of ordinances, the implementation of
3 ordinances, amendments to ordinances at both the
4 municipal and county level. He's been a key party
5 in preparing concept plans for municipalities as
6 well as counties. He has served as a staff member
7 of the Lake County Regional Plan Commission and
8 ultimately was the director of the DuPage County
9 Regional Plan Commission and the director of their
10 department of development.

11 Joe's going to come up, and he's going to
12 explain to you how he begins the zoning analysis to
13 determine whether the requests that we're asking for
14 can be validated under the guidelines that planners
15 use to make those decisions.

16 Joe, can you come on up?

17 MR. ABEL: Good evening. As the attorney has
18 said, I have been doing this for quite some time,
19 and I'm very familiar with their area, as being
20 planner of planning for DuPage County for 17 years.
21 The plan that we developed with the County was
22 rather unique. This was back in the '70s, and it
23 included not just the incorporated area, but it was
24 a plan for every municipality. It took us about

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

14

1 seven years to get it signed off on. And one of the
2 communities was St. Charles, the part that is in
3 DuPage. We also planned a mile-and-a-half in every
4 direction. So I've been very familiar with this
5 site starting in 1970. So it's been an ongoing
6 relationship with this area and with the city of
7 St. Charles.

8 I was asked to do a land use capacity study.
9 I do a lot of this work in terms of determining what
10 is the highest and best use of the property not only
11 for court cases, but I do an awful lot of work for
12 condemnation cases, and it's my role in the
13 condemnation case, either representing government or
14 the property owner, to determine what is the highest
15 and best use, and then the appraisers use that to
16 determine value.

17 So that's basically what we're looking at
18 tonight is in terms of what represents the highest
19 and best use from a zoning and planning standpoint
20 for the subject property.

21 The location, I'm not going to spend a lot
22 of time on that, but you're here for a reason. You
23 know your community better than me, obviously, even
24 after I've been involved this length of time. But

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

15

1 we are just directly north of the Walmart facility.
2 We are directly east of the Oliver Hoffman property;
3 many of you are familiar with that. I did have a
4 small involvement in that case back -- I forget how
5 many years it's been now. So I was also involved in
6 that with the Walmart, spent a lot of time on the
7 DuPage Airport. So this entire area is very, very
8 familiar.

9 The slide you're looking at shows the 27-acre
10 parcel, and you can see the residential areas that
11 surround the property to the north. The northwest
12 we have the Kingswood subdivision, and I'm going to
13 switch to another exhibit which will show you, more
14 importantly, all the jurisdictions that are involved
15 here. We have the city of St. Charles; we have the
16 city of West Chicago, and we have the County that
17 still has unincorporated land in this area.

18 THE COURT REPORTER: Can you speak into the
19 microphone?

20 MR. ABEL: Sure.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can you pull the
22 microphone down a little? Thank you.

23 MR. ABEL: All right. More importantly, now
24 we come to the existing land use and the zoning.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

16

1 This is the kind of map that normally we prepare
2 either for testimony on a condemnation case for
3 highest and best use for a rezoning case, or working
4 with a municipality, as our attorney said, I've
5 probably prepared over 100 comprehensive plans,
6 zoning ordinances, and have done the redistricting
7 for communities of their entire zoning. So there
8 are certain rules that we follow, and especially in
9 a court case there's -- I'm sure you've heard the
10 term LaSalle factors. One of the most important
11 factors most judges rely on is the existing land use
12 and the zoning surrounding the subject property.

13 So I'm going to start with to the north. As
14 I said, we have the Cornerstone Lakes subdivision,
15 which is in the city of West Chicago. West Chicago
16 continues to the east along the city of St. Charles
17 Pheasant Run Trails. On their eastern boundary is
18 also the city of West Chicago, and then you can see
19 that the subject property in the area, the long
20 narrow piece that goes from Smith Road down to
21 North Avenue is also still in DuPage County. It is
22 zoned OR. It's zoned OR because the comprehensive
23 plan that I was responsible for developing and
24 keeping up to date for 17 years always indicated

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

17

1 that this area would be nonresidential and would be
2 either commercial or office and research.

3 As you come around to the -- directly south
4 there are some OR in there with an office use and
5 then US Bank, and then directly south on the south
6 side of Smith Road is the Walmart property, which
7 has a long, rich history in itself.

8 Directly to the west is the Charlestowne
9 Mall which is now called The Quad, and that's probably
10 the most dominant land use feature other than the
11 Walmart that's existing at the present time.

12 Now, as you circle around to the west side
13 of the subject property, we have the RM-3 zoning
14 that was put in place as part of the Oliver Hoffman
15 solution, I guess is the best way to refer to it,
16 and then directly to the west of that is additional
17 land set aside for community business and then the
18 regional center which is zoned BR, which is your
19 regional business.

20 The rules that I want to go over with you
21 are pretty typically used by planners. I'm sure
22 your staff eventually, if you ask them, will agree
23 with most of these. I've used them, again, as I
24 said, over and over in all kinds of cases, and

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

18

1 they've normally been supported in motion decisions
2 that have been ruled on.

3 The number one rule is, especially in this
4 particular situation, considering the City of West
5 Chicago. As was mentioned, there is an agreement, a
6 boundary agreement between St. Charles and the City
7 of West Chicago. I'd at least like to say I take
8 credit for your entering into that because one of
9 the last things I did in the 17 years, after years
10 and years of municipalities constantly fighting one
11 another for land, it was determined that maybe it
12 was time to be rational and not giving the store
13 away to get something in your community, and we
14 eventually convinced all the municipalities in
15 DuPage County to enter into a boundary line agreement.

16 We actually did the first cut-up. We took
17 the entire county and gave our professional opinion
18 from the county standpoint where land should go.
19 After that municipalities worked on it, and I'm proud
20 to say almost every municipality in DuPage County
21 has a boundary line agreement with their neighbors.

22 So at this point the subject property is
23 within your planning jurisdiction, and as part of
24 that boundary line agreement, there were certain

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

19

1 conditions that had to be met. From a planning
2 standpoint the most important for me was the
3 transition from the single-family area to the north
4 and the subject property.

5 My first rule is that similar usage should
6 face one another, and you'll see that we have the
7 subject property facing additional land that's in
8 the county zoned OR, but on your comprehensive plan
9 that strip right up to the boundary line between
10 St. Charles and the south end of Pheasant Run is
11 designated for multiple-family development. So the
12 subject property and the north third of the property
13 is zoned -- or is recommended for zoning into the
14 multiple-family RM-3 district.

15 The setback that's there has a density
16 requirement of 7.5 dwelling units per acre.
17 Interestingly enough, in your own zoning
18 classification, whether it's the RM-2 or RM-3,
19 townhouses, attached housing can go to about -- I
20 think it's 10, but it works out to 10.13 dwelling
21 units per acre. In this agreement that 300-foot
22 strip cannot exceed 7.5 dwelling units per acre. So
23 there is a built-in transition.

24 So in addition to the idea that wherever

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

20

1 possible land use transitions should take place at a
2 rear line, we've got the perfect situation here in
3 terms of the subject property because it does back
4 up to single-family.

5 You'll hear later that there are also some
6 drainage problems in there that are going to be
7 resolved within that 300-foot area. Your own
8 ordinance requires in addition to the 300-foot
9 setback for this density that there has to be a
10 30-foot landscape buffer.

11 So you've got rear yard transition taking
12 place; you have a 30-foot landscape buffer, and then
13 you have control over the density within that
14 development. You'll see that the density is not
15 going to play a big role because based on a land use
16 study that we did, we determined that based on the
17 RM-3 zoning and the type of development that's close
18 to the subject property that that area will almost
19 have to be exclusively used for detention, but I'm
20 going to leave that up to the engineers to talk about.

21 So in reality, in my mind as I analyzed how
22 to make the proper transition from every direction
23 on this property, the north is probably the best
24 transition. Number one, it's a rear lot line.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

21

1 Number two, there's a landscape buffer, and,
2 number three, there's a land use density that's even
3 less than would be permitted under your zoning
4 ordinance.

5 The transition in terms of the type of
6 transition -- now we're talking about multiple-
7 family as opposed to commercial. What you have here
8 is the classic development along North Avenue, which
9 is basically intense commercial development. And
10 normally we follow the rule of thumb that you go
11 from the highest intensity back to the lowest
12 intensity.

13 So as I looked at this exhibit, realizing
14 that the blue represents your high intensity
15 commercial development, and then in addition that
16 one-third that's on the south side of Smith Road
17 that's in the county is shown on your comprehensive
18 plan for additional multifamily became a no-brainer
19 so to speak in terms of zoning and planning
20 standpoint that the subject property should be used
21 for multiple-family development.

22 Looking directly to the east you can see you
23 go from BR, which is the very intense regional
24 business, then to the community business, then to

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

22

1 the RM-3 which is the multiple-family, and then to
2 the subject property, which you can see is almost an
3 exact continuation of that RM-3. So the existing
4 RM-3 that's in the city of St. Charles, now you go
5 to the east, the subject property is RM-3, and then
6 you swing to the south and you're in RM-2, and the
7 buffer is already there within the 300 feet.

8 So in a nutshell, from my standpoint making
9 a professional recommendation as to the most
10 appropriate zoning classification and the most
11 appropriate use is first, multiple-family and then
12 the RM-3 zoning classification.

13 All of the standards will be met. When we
14 did our land use capacity study, everything also
15 fell in place in terms of adequate utilities, access.
16 We're on a main road, and you'll see an exhibit
17 indicating that the subject property can either be
18 developed as one unit, but in my professional opinion
19 it will probably wind up being done in two units.

20 And the range is everything. As you know,
21 the RM-3 includes single-family, two-family townhouse,
22 multiple-family. In fact, there's very little
23 difference between the RM-2 and the RM-3 other than
24 number of dwelling units per acre, which is needed

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

23

1 in terms of taking care of the utilities, things of
2 that nature, and that it fits into the description
3 I made. In terms of height, there's really only a
4 difference of 5 feet in terms of the structures
5 themselves.

6 So, again, in my professional opinion the
7 RM-3 meets all of the criteria. I feel -- I won't
8 take you through all the factors, but I think it
9 meets all of the factors that are used in determining
10 what is the highest and best use of the property and
11 the proper zoning.

12 At this point I'll let our next speaker go
13 into how that 300 feet will be used. I always have
14 to bring up one comment, and most of us know what it
15 is. That 300 feet is the distance of a football
16 field. So sometimes you hear a number, and most
17 people in the audience will think, well, 300 feet,
18 that's not much. But when you think about it in
19 terms of the length of a football field, that's what
20 we're going to be talking about here in terms of the
21 distance between the rear yards to the north, and
22 that's not even the first structure; that's just to
23 the buildable area line, and some buildings will be
24 more than that.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

24

1 There's also, as you'll hear, some wetland
2 on the subject property in that 300-foot area. So
3 even if there should be a couple buildings that will
4 be to the east of some development that might go
5 into that 300-foot area, that would still be about
6 180 feet.

7 So the setback will be 80 percent 300 feet
8 in depth and about 20 percent 180 feet in depth, and
9 you'll see that in more detail when the engineer
10 will talk.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. CARRARA: I'm going to now bring up
13 Chuck Hanlon; he'll go through the engineering side
14 of this concept. Chuck.

15 MR. HANLON: Thank you, Kevin. We appreciate
16 the time to present to the Plan Commission this
17 evening.

18 As Kevin had mentioned, Mr. Petkus, the
19 owner, is a land owner that is seeking knowledge on
20 the property and will be seeking annexation zoning
21 to at some point prepare the property to be marketed
22 with an end user developer coming back to the City
23 to finish off a more detailed PUD process.

24 So following the zoning analysis and working

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

25

1 towards the land use capacity study, one of the more
2 interesting dynamics of this property that you need
3 to know about is the tributary off-site drainage is
4 significant, and the impacts to both the Petkus
5 property and some of the existing impacts to the
6 neighbors in Cornerstone Lakes that abut property on
7 the north is what I want to explain to you now.

8 So if you look at the diagram, that red area
9 outlines the 234 acres of a tributary drainage.
10 Where the big red arrow is, that's the point where
11 all of that acreage enters onto the Petkus property
12 really at a single point. It's not always a running
13 creek, but at times following large rain events it
14 turns into a creek for several days after that
15 happens.

16 On one hand most of that upstream property
17 as you can see is developed either residential or
18 commercial. A little more than half the mall
19 property is tributary to the west side of the Petkus
20 Property. So on one hand it's all done within storm
21 water management basins certainly. On the other
22 hand what storm water management basins do is they
23 let the water out, as they should, slowly over a
24 longer period of time. So that's why that water

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

26

1 keeps coming days and days, three days after a rain,
2 and the sun is shining and you're still seeing this
3 water across the Petkus Property as well as moving
4 into the residences in Cornerstone Lakes.

5 Just to follow this sort of black arrowed
6 line, the drainage turns directly north; it goes
7 west, and if you notice, the arrows are north of the
8 Petkus Property because that water is actually
9 moving east through the neighbors' yards, and then
10 it turns into a 60-foot corridor which was designed
11 for overland flow as well as a storm sewer, taking
12 it into the Cornerstone Lakes storm water management
13 basin to the very linear basin that widens out to a
14 larger pond here, all of this being the headwaters
15 to Norton Creek.

16 So as we go in a little bit closer on the
17 property, what's very important to understand with
18 the off-site drainage that enters, again, at the
19 location of the red arrow runs directly north, and
20 this outlined blue shape is really the area where
21 water is ponding and then sitting sometimes for
22 days, again, after a heavy rain.

23 That area used to drain directly north, but
24 after the construction of Cornerstone Lakes and The

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

27

1 Knolls, that north overland flow that was all
2 farmland was in a sense blocked by the homes and
3 really kind of traps the water, overlapping in the
4 Petkus Property predominantly but also overlapping
5 into the neighbors' lots.

6 This ridge line, this high point prevents
7 this water from overland flowing to the east, and
8 what we want to show you -- and in many years of
9 doing this, it's rare to see this type of such an
10 obvious drainage problem that straddles this common
11 property line between the Petkus Property and the
12 developed Cornerstone Lakes property where there's
13 such a good, obvious solution to be able to mediate
14 that and fix that problem that exists today.

15 It's really very simple. We will have a large
16 storm water management basin that's oriented
17 longitudinally in an east/west direction. And where
18 it goes into the yards and sort of has a dead-end,
19 other than going into the storm pipe, the overland
20 flow exceeds sometimes what is comfortable for
21 somebody to have on their property for standing
22 water. We will sort of break through this high
23 point with the excavation of the storm water
24 management basin and channel that water and

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

28

1 bypass -- all of this outside flow will be channeled
2 into a new storm water management basin that's
3 dedicated and designed to manage that water. That
4 water will be stored and metered out at a slow pace
5 like all storm water management basins are, and the
6 overland flow connection to a storm pipe then would
7 connect into the Cornerstone Lakes system to take
8 the water into the designated channel up into the
9 drainage way again heading to Norton Creek.

10 All that being said, though, the new impervious
11 areas that are created through the development of the
12 Petkus Property will be detained with computations
13 as they should be based on the ordinances that are
14 in place to store water, something that the Plan
15 Commission has certainly used on any development
16 process.

17 So, again, we have we believe a really good
18 way to mediate the existing drainage problems that
19 are there today. That leads us back to sort of a
20 land use discussion of this north line, as Mr. Abel
21 mentioned, at this point would be about 300 feet.
22 The boundary agreement speaks to 300 feet, just to
23 make sure we're understanding. The boundary
24 agreement specifies no more than 7.5 units per acre

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

29

1 within 300 feet from the Cornerstone Lakes common
2 property line. It turns out that that's about the
3 same depth that we have for the storm water management
4 basin. It's a very large space in that area.

5 That creates a green belt along the northern
6 line that starts out at 300 feet on the western
7 portion of the property and may be reduced to half
8 that distance or so plus or minus on the eastern
9 half of the property. As you go through this area,
10 then you come into this wetland which also creates
11 another buffer to the residential development that's
12 to the north.

13 We looked at access points which work both
14 we believe for this property, as well as looking
15 across the street to the future undeveloped property.
16 There probably only wants to be one new intersection
17 in this area, and we wanted to make sure that it would
18 both work for this property as well as potentially
19 the property to the south side of Smith Road in the
20 future.

21 This plan was put together based on initially
22 looking at the unit count. The 416 unit count you
23 should also understand comes from doing the math on
24 the land area, the northern tier, that 7.5 units an

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

30

1 acre, south of there the 300 feet discussed by the
2 boundary agreement. South of that point we take the
3 rest of the acres multiplied by 20 units an acre,
4 which is the RM-3 zoning, which leaves about
5 15.65 dwelling units per acre gross for the
6 property.

7 So the reason we looked at that number is
8 based on the zoning that we are requesting, that's
9 the absolute maximum allowed by just doing the math.
10 It's rare that any development hits that number
11 exactly or hits that maximum number, but in order to
12 submit the application, to go through the land cash
13 sheet, to look at impervious area, to look at traffic
14 concerns, we need numbers. We have to make some
15 assumption on the numbers, and we went to the
16 absolute maximum that it could be, understanding
17 that it would most likely be below that number, but
18 this seems to be the best way to make an analysis of
19 the balance of the property.

20 So any impact that we're looking at in a
21 sense is to the maximum. Any reduction of units
22 would certainly be a lesser impact than that. So
23 that's where the 416 number comes from. We created
24 the land use capacity as a physical one way out of

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

31

1 many ways that the property could be laid out in the
2 future just to illustrate what it would look like if
3 you had 416 multifamily units on the property.

4 We believe it's very likely with creating
5 kind of a spine in the middle with a shared entrance
6 structure that there could be two developments and
7 two future developers, even more reason to understand
8 the property as a whole to go through the process
9 with the City, to coordinate with the Village of
10 West Chicago on the drainage aspects, as they have a
11 lot of standing with their residents in that location,
12 as well as the boundary agreement specifies that we
13 work with West Chicago and that really makes sense,
14 to understand the overall needs of the property and
15 infrastructure needs in the case that all that
16 information can be passed down to anybody that might
17 look at the property for development in the case
18 that we have a west side and an east side developer
19 in the development that might be two different
20 groups, we understand the global needs of how the
21 property is served through infrastructure.

22 We will note that this property also requires
23 a lift station. So for a 27-acre parcel taking on
24 the off-site drainage, taking on the bypass of the

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

32

1 south-side drain, the oversizing of the storm water
2 management basin, the extra cost related to that,
3 the extra land dedicated for that, the expense of
4 the lift station on a 27-acre piece of property are
5 some overburdened costs of the development and would
6 be offset by the density request on the property but
7 certainly justified from a zoning standpoint Mr. Abel
8 has gone through.

9 I just want you to understand the evolution
10 of where the plan came from, and, again, I'll just
11 leave the slide up of the property location and have
12 Kevin say what he wants.

13 MR. CARRARA: Thank you, Chuck.

14 Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I think we've
15 tried to keep it somewhat brief but give you some
16 bit of history as to what our process was to come
17 before you and continue to receive your input, as
18 well as the input of City Council as we move forward.

19 So we stand ready to address questions if
20 you want us to address those now. Just let us know
21 how you'd like to proceed.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

23 Plan Commissioners, questions?

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a question. It

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

33

1 goes back to the point you made about the units per
2 acre. I know you explained it, but I just want to
3 hear it again.

4 The total size is 27 acres, and if we divide
5 416 by 27, you get 15.4 per acre; right? What I
6 don't understand is, the 300-foot barrier across the
7 front. There's no houses in that area, so aren't
8 you squeezing more homes into a smaller area? I
9 just can't quite see what you're saying there.

10 MR. HANLON: So, actually, this is the
11 300-foot line right here. In this particular plan
12 we have two buildings and maybe one-third of the
13 southern building that's here. Again, it's done by
14 acreage, but if I take that acreage, which is
15 9.17 acres of the property is in that 300-foot zone,
16 times 7.5, which is the maximum --

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: You take out of the 27?

18 MR. HANLON: Yes. Then the RM-3 maximum
19 density of 20 units per acre is multiplied by the
20 balance of 17.42 acres, which yields 348 units, and
21 when you add those two numbers, you have the 416.

22 So there are units within that 300-foot
23 area. Only the eastern portion of that 300-foot
24 area has units in it.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

34

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I guess when I reviewed
2 this I didn't have this plan before me, and I was
3 looking at 27 acres and dividing by 416 units. It
4 just seems to me like you're just squishing it into
5 a smaller area. That's point I'm trying to make.

6 MR. HANLON: The 300-foot area has -- again,
7 we wanted to illustrate the maximum allowable density
8 knowing that if somebody comes back with a very
9 specific plan, a developer or two groups, one for
10 one-half, the other for the other half, it will
11 probably be something different. The other uses,
12 assisted living, memory care, those facilities are
13 certainly possible on one-half of the property,
14 as well.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes, I had a few questions.
16 You had mentioned that 300-foot area, the reservoir
17 would contain most of the surface drainage; is that
18 correct? Most of the runoff?

19 MR. HANLON: Well --

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: You have a reservoir or a
21 pond, whatever you want to call it.

22 MR. HANLON: The entirety of the 27-acre
23 farm drains directly to the north. So all of the
24 drainage for the after-developed condition will be

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

35

1 contained within that storm water management basin.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: My question is, how will
3 that affect Norton Creek?

4 MR. HANLON: Currently the 234 acres that I
5 showed that is just moving through the property
6 unchecked right now, there's nothing holding that
7 back other than the upstream detention. That's
8 going to be directed into the storm water management
9 basin.

10 Right now the farm field drains completely
11 unchecked. When you run numbers, farmland drainage
12 is similar to concrete; it just runs off the farmland
13 very quickly. So right now there's no detention for
14 27 acres, and the 234 acres is moving through the
15 property days on end after a storm.

16 All of that, on-site and off-site, will be
17 directed into the storm water management basin with
18 a very restricted outflow based on ordinance .01 CFS
19 is the maximum outflow allowed. And that really
20 results in the fact that there will be less water at
21 a lesser rate moving north to that reservoir and
22 creek. So there will be an overall reduction as it
23 leaves the property.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I guess my purpose for

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

36

1 asking the question is I understand the surface
2 through the neighborhood will be reduced significantly.
3 That sounds great as far as reducing erosion,
4 whatever. But as far as Norton Creek, will it
5 affect Norton Creek in a negative way in any way?

6 MR. HANLON: Well, in this area of the
7 property, again, after a large rain event there's
8 water moving, but there's also many times where it's
9 perfectly dry. This is the headwaters to Norton
10 Creek but not to the point where -- so it's not
11 like -- we're not cutting off sort of an ongoing
12 stream.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's my question.

14 The other question I have is, you mentioned
15 one entrance and maybe two owners or two developers
16 there. What are your thoughts on emergency vehicles
17 and fire and police coming in one entrance? It
18 doesn't appear as though there's another exit.

19 MR. HANLON: We do have -- this one is kind
20 of highlighted, but there is another curb cut onto
21 Smith Road. We absolutely understand we need two curb
22 cuts onto Smith Road from a traffic management
23 standpoint, and we would not have a -- an emergency-
24 only connection sometimes are difficult; you have to

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

37

1 have a gate with key. So we would advocate a
2 permanent second access point. It may be at the
3 moment we feel that that second access point would
4 be served better as right-in/right-out only, but it
5 would be open all the time.

6 If there are two developers and
7 two developments, certainly the west development would
8 have rights to flow through the east development and
9 use that second access. So it would be for the whole
10 property, but absolutely there should be two curb cuts
11 onto Smith Road.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Thank you.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a question.
14 I'm just curious, was this ever brought to the
15 attention of West Chicago to have West Chicago annex
16 this property?

17 MR. CARRARA: No. The boundary line
18 agreement specifically set forth that in the future
19 the two municipalities have decided that this parcel
20 as well as some of the others will be handled by the
21 City of St. Charles.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And is there verbiage
23 in there that you could read us getting into a little
24 bit more detail about that as to why?

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

38

1 MR. CARRARA: As to the why, that may be
2 better handled by your City staff, but I believe the
3 verbiage basically said that St. Charles will be
4 responsible for this property and a few others that
5 were identified within the boundary line agreement.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ or Rita.

7 MS. TUNGARE: Sure. The City entered into a
8 boundary line agreement in 2014 with the City of
9 West Chicago, and at that time, as indicated by the
10 applicant's attorney, there was a determination made
11 as to which parcels could potentially be annexed
12 into which jurisdiction, and this property falls
13 within our jurisdiction in St. Charles.

14 We have representatives from the City of
15 West Chicago here, as well, who are present if there
16 are any questions about the boundaries.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: If I may, we're
18 looking at this slide up here, and in this slide we
19 show buildings and a roadway, parking lots, et cetera,
20 et cetera.

21 I just want to be clear. This is just a
22 concept plan. There is no plan for any of those
23 buildings, or any of those parking lots, or any of
24 those curb cuts. This is just a concept plan to

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

39

1 show what -- to show what could go there.

2 MR. CARRARA: Thank you, Mr. Kessler. Yes,
3 this is just a concept, as you heard both Mr. Abel
4 and Mr. Hanlon testify to as to why we wanted to get
5 to the allowable units. Because we had to determine
6 how big that detention pond was going to be, how we
7 were going to deal with the lift station, and some
8 of those other issues. So we wanted to show you
9 that under the average -- I think we've heard about
10 15 units an acre based on the boundary line setback
11 of the 300 feet that you could fit those units
12 within there. This is just merely one designation
13 of how you could get those units in. It's by no
14 means are we asking for that or are we suggesting
15 that that should be what it is in the future. That
16 was just one situation that we put on paper to show
17 that it could be done.

18 As we've talked about, in the future it
19 could be two people, and more importantly, it's very
20 rare, as you suggested, that things ever get to the
21 maximum number with additional -- maybe an additional
22 curb cut, or an additional roadway through, or a
23 connection point somewhere else. Whoever that final
24 end user is is going to have to satisfy both you and

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

40

1 the City Council as to what that final plan would be
2 under the planned unit development, meet all the
3 standards, meet all the standards that would normally
4 be part of that development.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Did you -- have you considered
8 traffic capacity yet along Smith Road? I wondered
9 if you could bring up page 5 of your concept plan
10 proposal.

11 MR. CARRARA: Page 5 of the book?

12 MEMBER DOYLE: It's in the packet that we
13 received, yes.

14 MR. CARRARA: I don't believe we have that
15 slide readily available. Yes, we have addressed
16 traffic, and Mr. Hanlon could step up and answer that.

17 MEMBER DOYLE: Why don't you just wait for
18 Russ to show that.

19 MR. CARRARA: Okay.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: While Russ is bringing that
21 up, we have a letter here that was placed on our
22 desks here from a member of the community,
23 Ronald H. Yeager, who was not able to be here
24 tonight and asked that certain things be included in

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

41

1 the record of the meeting. Having read it, most of
2 the comments refer to traffic along Smith Road and
3 concerns about traffic along Smith Road.

4 Particularly one that caught my eye was
5 backups in northbound traffic in the morning towards
6 Norton Creek elementary school and cut-through
7 traffic -- I think I read it this way, that some
8 motorists choose to turn right and use the Pheasant
9 Run trails subdivision sort of to get around some of
10 that backup because they go through the subdivision
11 and then take another right turn onto Smith and
12 bypass the people who are in line. That's the way I
13 read it.

14 MR. CARRARA: Is this the correct slide?

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes. Thank you.

16 So I'll keep this high level. Part of the
17 question that we have to consider tonight is the
18 appropriate -- to what degree RM-3 is appropriate
19 for this parcel, and traffic is always a factor in
20 terms of determining capacity.

21 Do you have any preliminary information --
22 obviously, you've not conducted a full traffic study
23 yet, and that would be part of a formal application,
24 but based on your experience, based on your knowledge

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

42

1 of this kind of road, Smith Road, can you comment on
2 what your thinking was regarding traffic capacity?

3 MR. HANLON: I'll let you know where we are
4 and where we're not.

5 You're right; we've not done a completely
6 full traffic study that would get much beyond the
7 outskirts of the property. I will tell you on every
8 level for a concept submittal we're way ahead in
9 terms of engineering in terms of the storm water
10 management to put together that physical plan, to
11 understand the lift station and a number other
12 things. We're way beyond what we'll say is typical
13 for a concept level because we needed to understand
14 especially the drainage issue that's out there.

15 On the traffic issue, our traffic engineers
16 in the office -- I don't have their memo with all
17 the numbers on it. What I can tell you is when they
18 run the numbers, again, on the 416 completely
19 maximum potential units based on the math, they're
20 just shy of requiring a left-turn lane. They're
21 right on the cusp of that. But I think most people
22 are aware Smith Road has been constructed as a
23 three-lane cross section north of the entrance to
24 Walmart all the way up to the railroad tracks at the

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

43

1 intersection with Powis Road.

2 So it's already a three-lane section
3 frontage on the Petkus Property; it's just a matter
4 of restriping the continuous center lanes there. So
5 if you run the numbers, you're on the cusp of
6 needing a left-turn channel dedicated. This is a
7 matter of painting, restriping, so there's no reason
8 you wouldn't do that.

9 They also ran the numbers on let's say a
10 right-turn deceleration to get into the property,
11 and they're far below numbers that would suggest
12 that you would need, for example, a dedicated right
13 turn into the property.

14 So the left turn wouldn't really be a
15 discussion. That's already built into the Smith
16 Road capacity. In terms of what's happening -- we
17 have not gone beyond looking at the property. That
18 will certainly be done at some point. It's a regional
19 road; it's not a road that we can reconstruct
20 certainly. You've got a railroad crossing that's
21 down two lanes right at Powis. In terms of the
22 larger picture, that's the first impediment to
23 looking at what do you do with Smith Road, changing
24 those two lanes by the crossing, and, of course,

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

44

1 you've got a widened cross section as you approach
2 Route 64 on the south.

3 So to serve the property a left-turn lane is
4 physically already there and just a matter of
5 striping it out. A right turn lane doesn't seem to
6 be necessary at this point. Otherwise, the overall
7 capacity, yes, sure the peak times there's traffic.
8 The bigger picture will be looked at at some point,
9 but, again, we're at concept and we did a pretty
10 good level of due diligence but have not expanded on
11 the traffic.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have one. On the
14 sheet you presented us with that's page 20, I think
15 it is, I'm just curious about when you talked about
16 the 300 feet inside the property -- maybe staff can
17 explain this or you -- what is meant by the 300 that
18 goes around -- I mean what's that to us?

19 MR. CARRARA: That's our abundance of
20 caution. We're required under your ordinance to
21 notify property owners within 250 feet. We went out
22 to 300 feet just to make sure we didn't miss anybody
23 with the public notice for our meeting that we had
24 with the neighborhood as well as tonight's meeting.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

45

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I see. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Does anyone in the
5 audience have any questions?

6 MR. BANAS: I don't have a question, but I
7 did have some comments.

8 Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you very
9 much for this opportunity to make some comments here.
10 For the record, my name is name John Banas. I'm
11 alderman of Ward 7 of West Chicago, representing
12 Cornerstone Lakes, your neighbors, together with
13 Alderman Ligino-Kubinski, who represents the
14 Cornerstone Lakes subdivision, part of Ward 7. I'm
15 here before you this evening representing
16 West Chicago officials. Mayor Ruben Pinada and
17 Alderman Ligino-Kubinski could not attend this
18 evening because of prior commitments.

19 Since reviewing a copy of the concept plan
20 two weeks ago, West Chicago elected officials have
21 received over two dozen calls and e-mails from
22 residents within the Cornerstone Lakes subdivision
23 all expressing concern over the desired zoning for
24 the site owned by Mr. Petkus.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

1 Since this proposal is just at the concept
2 review stage, there's not enough information for
3 West Chicago staff to do a detailed analysis to
4 determine if the plan complies with the boundary
5 agreement between our two cities. However, the
6 desired zoning is simply not appropriate for the
7 entire site.

8 The St. Charles comprehensive plan reflects
9 that the majority of the site be zoned RM-2 like the
10 Pheasant Run trails development. The comprehensive
11 plan also shows that the southern one-third of the
12 site as RM-3 zoning, which is the zoning district
13 being sought here for the entire site, which does
14 not conform to the comprehensive plan, which is
15 St. Charles' long-term vision for the area.

16 The zoning designation and the contemplated
17 land use mix in St. Charles' comprehensive plan is
18 what was contemplated when the two municipalities
19 entered into the boundary agreement and what is only
20 transitional zoning moving from the single-family
21 homes in the Cornerstone Lakes subdivision to the
22 commercial area further south along Smith Road.

23 The multifamily zoning designated for the
24 southern one-third of the Petkus parcel when combined

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

47

1 with the parcel to the west and the south of it
2 which already has a multifamily zoning designation
3 provides for a large enough and appropriately sized
4 area to allow for the transition from a quality
5 townhome development on the balance of the Petkus
6 site to Walmart, IHOP and The Quad.

7 So on behalf of Mayor Pinada and Alderman
8 Ligino-Kubinski I hope the Plan Commission concurs
9 with these concerns and provides feedback to the
10 owner of the site that he should adhere to the land
11 use mix designated in the comprehensive plan which
12 provides for a much lower density development on the
13 northern two-thirds of the site.

14 Thank you so much for your time. I can
15 appreciate it being a former planning and zoning
16 commissioner myself.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question
19 for you. Are you representing the City of West
20 Chicago right now? Are you speaking for the City of
21 West Chicago right now?

22 MR. BANAS: I'm speaking for Ward 7
23 residents.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I though you said

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

48

1 the mayor.

2 MR. BANAS: Well, the mayor is involved,
3 as well.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. But are you
5 speaking for the City of West Chicago, or are you
6 speaking for Ward 7?

7 MR. BANAS: I'm speaking for Ward 7 right now.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Great. Do
9 you know, is your --

10 MR. BANAS: Our development director is here
11 this evening.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is your development
13 department talking with our planning department?

14 MR. BANAS: You know, I don't know.

15 MS. TUNGARE: Yes. Our staff has had
16 conversations with West Chicago.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

18 MR. DEPAEPE: May I approach the podium?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, sir.

20 MR. DEPAEPE: A little while ago I heard
21 them saying that there was --

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you could just state
23 your name.

24 MR. DEPAEPE: My name is Joe Depaepe. I

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

49

1 live at 2790 Foxfield Drive, West Chicago.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

3 MR. DEPAEPE: A little while ago I heard them
4 state that there was not much difference between the
5 two zonings. Well, there is. There's about 200 units.
6 One is 416 if they required an R-2. If they went to
7 an R-1, it would be 200 units on that same property.
8 So that's quite a different number.

9 I also wanted to call your attention, there
10 is an agreement between the cities October 2nd --
11 October 7th where it clearly states the intent of
12 this contract is, among other things like space
13 preservation, whatever, population density is on the
14 fourth paragraph of page 2 of that contract. Should
15 there ever be litigation or a squabble between the
16 two cities, the arbitrator in this case would
17 certainly look at this contract, and the intent of
18 this contract when West Chicago signed it was
19 obviously to avoid this same exact type of project
20 going on at that location.

21 I also don't know what the hurry is to zone
22 this if they don't have anything proposed. Why
23 don't they get something proposed and then bring it
24 back and say, "Yeah, we have something here we'd

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

50

1 like to put together, and we'd like to have the
2 zoning." They're going for the zoning, which would
3 limit you in the future from being able to determine
4 what goes on your own property because then they
5 would have carte blanche to pretty much do whatever
6 they wanted to.

7 So those are some concerns that I have. The
8 other thing that's a little bit concerning is that
9 300 feet they're talking about. That 300 feet doesn't
10 go all the way across the property. You take in the
11 back yards of those properties, and you're going to
12 have more than about 100 feet of property between
13 the one portion of this project and the neighbors.
14 So it does encroach on it.

15 The intent of this contract is very, very
16 clear. I've read it twice, and I underlined
17 several, several spots where the intent is clear,
18 and should it go into an arbitration situation, the
19 intent of this contract would be pertinent to the
20 decision on that.

21 So I just wanted to make you aware of all of
22 those things, and I appreciate you giving me your
23 time. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

51

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you for that
2 and thanks for taking the time to read through that
3 contract. There's not a lot of people that would
4 enjoy it.

5 MR. DEPAEPE: Interesting reading.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Sure. Anyway, I
7 just want to make it clear, this is a concept plan
8 and they've come before us suggesting or asking what
9 do we think about RM-3. There is no rush to pass
10 anything zoningwise in any way tonight. There is no
11 formal application to set the zoning, to vote on the
12 zoning.

13 So we're at the point where you're reading
14 the contract; we take it into consideration; we give
15 them what we think, our advice. In two weeks they're
16 going to have another meeting with the planning and
17 development committee where they will actually give
18 their input on what they think they should do with
19 zoning, and then it's up to the applicant to come
20 back at some future date that's not been established
21 yet and decide what they want to apply for as far as
22 zoning.

23 So there is no rush at this point and we're
24 just having -- this is like having a conversation

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

52

1 about it. So but I appreciate the fact that you
2 took the time to read through that. Thank you.

3 MR. DEPAEPE: Thank you for your time.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions or
5 comments?

6 Yes, sir.

7 MR. HENKIN: My name is Brad Henkin,
8 2311 Challen Court in Cornerstone Lakes.

9 I'm not going to belabor some of the things
10 that were already talked about. I would talk about
11 electricity. We've had many issues in that
12 subdivision. I don't know where the electrical
13 scenario would come from. That's something that
14 they need to look at. Many outages. We have
15 two separate units, one that uses half of
16 Cornerstone Lakes that's in St. Charles, the other
17 one that's in West Chicago, and in either case
18 they're not the greatest, and they pop off all the
19 time. So I don't know where the capacity would come
20 from to do something that would have 416 units.

21 Other things that I think we all have to
22 look at is on a tax base. Being a real estate broker,
23 there really isn't as much money in the fact of
24 doing something that is an apartment complex and

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

53

1 usually with incentives as opposed to doing something
2 like a townhome community that would definitely fit
3 more into what we're trying to accomplish in the
4 area. You also I think get a better tax basis on
5 the townhome community. That also helps Norton Creek
6 school, which I know we are lower in the number of
7 kids going to that school as opposed to my child
8 which was the first graduating class from grammar
9 school. So we were there when it was built. I just
10 feel we need look at all the different factors that
11 are coming.

12 The other thing I do have a question on and
13 maybe they can answer that is, based on the
14 property -- I know the retention pond you're planning
15 on putting in there. When you build all those
16 buildings and everything else, you're going to have
17 less places for the water to seep down. And I know
18 you'll divert it, but if you have less places for it
19 to go down and you divert more water theoretically
20 into that drain tile or drain system that they're
21 going to put there, would that then give us that
22 overflow that we're possibly looking at in
23 Norton Creek?

24 So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

54

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

2 All right. Anyone else?

3 Yes, sir.

4 MR. KOLIMAS: Good evening. My name is
5 Ron Kolimas. I live at 1885 Cool Creek Drive in
6 Majestic Oaks in St. Charles.

7 I'm kind of confused about the presentation
8 talking about RM-3, I guess zoning. Are we talking
9 about apartment buildings? What specifically are we
10 talking about? Apartment buildings, townhomes,
11 condominiums? Can you answer that question?

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Would you like to
13 answer it?

14 MR. CARRARA: Sir, Mr. Chairman, I believe
15 under your RM-3 zoning classification, that allows
16 anything from single-family up to apartment buildings
17 and a number of things in between. Additionally,
18 there are some uses identified within the boundary
19 line agreement that are considered permitted uses
20 that are the assisted living and a bunch of other
21 ones that are enumerated within the boundary line
22 agreement.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's all covered in the
24 zoning ordinance.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

55

1 And correct me if I'm wrong, Rita, but the
2 biggest difference is the allowable density of the
3 two, with RM-3 allowing up to 20 dwelling units per
4 acre and RM-2 allowing up to 10.

5 MR. KOLIMAS: When I did look at the drawings
6 before, I saw big buildings which looked like
7 condominiums, townhomes, apartment buildings. It
8 didn't look like single-family housing to me at all.
9 So my natural thought would be it's going to be
10 apartments or condominiums.

11 Being a homeowner in that particular area, I
12 can speak for some neighbors here that really
13 wouldn't care for that type of development near our
14 properties, our single-family dwellings. If it was
15 a single-family detached dwelling project with
16 single-family homes, I think we'd be agreeable to
17 that, but I just want to let you know how we feel
18 over at Cool Creek Drive in Majestic Oaks and that
19 we're having problems now selling our homes since
20 the values have gone down over the last four or
21 five years, and having an influx of more property on
22 the market would hurt us all.

23 So we're very concerned about the type of
24 properties that go in there and the price point of

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

56

1 the properties. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. Anyone else?

3 MR. DEPAEPE: If you don't mind me saying
4 something again, I was hoping I wouldn't have to get
5 up here again, but nobody has talked about the traffic.
6 Again, if you want my name, it's Joe Depaepe,
7 2790 Foxfield Drive, West Chicago.

8 In the morning I see lines of cars taking
9 their children to school, and they're coming out of
10 Cornerstone Lakes and they're turning left. That
11 traffic would be impeded greatly by another 800 cars
12 or 600 cars minimum coming out of this proposed
13 project and headed straight for that school, and all
14 the people in Cornerstone Lakes are going to try to
15 get out into that traffic, and it's going to be a
16 constant stream of traffic.

17 It is a traffic jam and it's quite concerning
18 to a lot of the people that live here. So nobody
19 addressed that and I wanted to make sure that was
20 brought up. Thank you again.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. Any other
22 questions?

23 Yes, ma'am.

24 MS. KRAUS: Hi there. My name is

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

57

1 Colleen Kraus. I am a resident of Cornerstone Lakes.
2 I have lived in West Chicago for 18 years. I have
3 certainly worked with the District 303 on boundary
4 changes and ran a referendum that actually brought
5 us higher taxes. Sorry everybody.

6 But, anyway, I'm here to talk about -- you
7 made a comment, Mr. Doyle, about the traffic for
8 Norton Creek. And I can tell you that the traffic
9 line, the line up through our subdivision and then
10 not only that but then on Smith Road there's parked
11 cars waiting for that 3:00 bell to ring. So the
12 traffic is definitely an issue between the drop-off
13 time and the pick-up time for the kids at
14 Norton Creek.

15 As far as the traffic throughout the
16 subdivision, what I'm concerned about is we do have
17 a large amount of cut-through traffic that comes
18 through Cornerstone Lakes from, you know, Majestic
19 Oaks, Charlemagne, Kingswood, and they come through
20 the subdivision to exit out -- we've got two
21 different exits onto Smith Road.

22 What I'm concerned about is those people
23 that are going to be leaving that subject property
24 and that will cut through our area so that they

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

58

1 cannot have to hit all of the lights on North Avenue
2 where they're at the Walmart or a couple of lights
3 along the way through the mall, and that could
4 greatly affect, of course, Cornerstone Lakes, but
5 then going right along Foxfield through the
6 Charlemagne and Kingswood area.

7 So just something that I wanted to bring up
8 to you, as well. Thank you very much for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

10 Anyone else?

11 Yes, sir.

12 MR. PATEL: Thank you. My name is
13 Hetal Patel. I live at the Cornerstone property in
14 West Chicago.

15 I know that they were showing on the map
16 two different zonings -- right? -- two different
17 types of buildings that can be built. One of them
18 there's a 300-foot space where you're talking about
19 the pond, but on the other side there is not that
20 spacing; there's a little bit less than that.
21 There's a dotted line that shows 300 feet is going
22 to be above that line. Can you explain that a
23 little bit?

24 MR. HANLON: I'll see if I can.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

59

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Am I correct in thinking
2 that the intergovernmental agreement says that there
3 is a maximum of 7.5 dwelling units per acre allowed
4 on the 300 feet of the property?

5 MS. TUNGARE: That is correct. It talks
6 about maximum residential density of 7.5 units per
7 acre and a maximum building height, as well, within
8 a 300-foot distance.

9 MR. HANLON: So to answer your question, the
10 300-foot line that we keep hearing a lot about is
11 not -- it's not a building setback requirement; it's
12 a density requirement. So within that 300-foot
13 band, the maximum number of dwelling units is going
14 to be 7.5 units per acre within that 300-foot area.

15 So it's not a building setback line. It's
16 very coincidental that on the west side of the
17 property the space needed for the enlarged storm
18 water -- the oversized storm water management basin
19 to take the bypass flow through, it just happens to
20 require about 300 feet, as well. As Mr. Abel
21 mentioned, that's the depth of a football field.

22 So from the rear property line -- I don't know
23 that I've ever seen a transition between two parcels
24 being 300 feet. That's an incredible distance for a

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

60

1 setback line.

2 As you go to the eastern part of the
3 property, we still have the need for the storm
4 management basin to kind of keep moving east to be
5 able to link up with the overland drainage that goes
6 through the back yards of Cornerstone Lakes, and
7 that setback will certainly be greater than the
8 minimum 60 feet required for the landscaping setbacks,
9 which is 30 feet required in the boundary agreement,
10 plus 30 feet required by the St. Charles ordinance,
11 for a total of 60.

12 We need more depth there to make the storm
13 water management basin work. It's by pure
14 coincidence that the 300 feet in the agreement lines
15 up with the 300 feet of the physical space necessary
16 for the size storm water management basin that needs
17 to be created through that area.

18 So, yes, we do have -- in this, again, one
19 example of many possible development scenarios we
20 wanted everyone to understand what the translation,
21 the physical translation could be of the public
22 policy document that states in the boundary
23 agreement that it's limited to 7.5 units per acre
24 within the 300 feet. The storm water management

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

61

1 basin is the biggest required footprint as you go
2 through the engineering analysis on the property
3 that begins to already limit that development, but
4 those 2 1/3 buildings represent 7.5 units an acre.

5 I hope that answers your question.

6 MR. PATEL: It kind of does, kind of doesn't.

7 MR. HANLON: So it's not a building setback;
8 it's a density line.

9 MR. PATEL: I agree with the gentlemen and
10 the folks that have talked about traffic flow and
11 property value. One minor thing was that the
12 parking spots you guys are showing here -- I know
13 it's a proposal, and, obviously, it's going to
14 change, but at any point do you guys think there's
15 going to be a parking tower over there? Because
16 that doesn't look like it's going to fit 400 or
17 600 cars.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. HANLON: In this particular scheme there's
20 underground parking below the buildings, as well.
21 And that's not saying it's fully -- it could be
22 halfway underground. If someone were to --

23 THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear you.

24 MR. HANLON: Between the surface parking and

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

62

1 there would be one level of parking at the base of
2 each building most likely halfway underground.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to bring
4 up -- you're making a very good point, Mr. Patel,
5 and the gentleman over here said the same thing and
6 the point I made earlier. We're looking at a
7 concept drawing that has a number of three- and
8 four-story buildings on it, and it looks as if it
9 could appear to somebody as if this was a plan but
10 it's not. The likelihood that something like this
11 would be built is probably slim. But in addition to
12 that, before anything could be built on this
13 property, they would have to come back before the
14 Plan Commission and planning and development to
15 approve any densities, or building heights, or any
16 of those things that would allow them to build on
17 the site.

18 So I know -- I can understand why somebody
19 looking at this would say, "I don't want that," but
20 I think what they were attempting to do was to show
21 what maximum possible could occur there.

22 We're not here to decide whether or not
23 we're going to go allow it. As I've said before,
24 this is just a concept plan, and we're going to give

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

63

1 them feedback based on the zoning, densities, things
2 that we might agree or disagree with. But before
3 anything came back -- they can't build this because
4 it's not been applied for or approved by the City of
5 St. Charles.

6 So I just want to make that clear, but those
7 are very good questions because it would appear that
8 would be the case even though it's not.

9 MR. PATEL: On another note, would there be
10 secondary or tertiary options that would be given
11 out? The proposal says it could be townhouses,
12 single-family houses. I assume you guys are going
13 to bring that out to the table next time around or so.

14 I received some head shaking that way, so I
15 don't know what to think.

16 MR. CARRARA: Mr. Chairman, again, we're not
17 seeking approval for any use. We're seeking the
18 zoning classification which will allow a number of
19 uses. The end developer and the market will dictate
20 what that end use will be for both the Plan Commission
21 and the City to consider.

22 MR. PATEL: Thank you again.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

64

1 Sir?

2 MR. GLENN: Good evening my name is John Glenn.
3 I reside in St. Charles, and I'm the president of
4 the homeowners association of Kingswood. I'm not
5 really speaking in that capacity for the board
6 tonight, but I just wanted to make note that I did
7 receive -- or at least our board members received
8 two phone calls from residents wondering what the
9 heck is going on after they received the mailing,
10 which is -- probably about 20 of our units are
11 adjoining within the 300-foot area.

12 So I guess I'm just pleased to see a good
13 turnout to hear what's going on. It's the very
14 early stages. Our association has a long history
15 with the City of working through the process, and we
16 look forward to if this is developed it being done
17 in the best possible way.

18 I would like just to correct for the record,
19 the man addressed the association did not receive
20 notice because the boundary addresses were
21 incorrect. The address P.O. Box 433, St. Charles,
22 is a post office box we no longer use. So our
23 correct mailing address is Kingswood Townhomes
24 Homeowners Association, care of Northwest Property

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

65

1 and Financial Management, 780 Tek Drive, T-e-k, in
2 Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014.

3 And I'd particularly like to thank
4 Commissioner Kessler for a clear explanation of the
5 process. For most people it's a very educational
6 situation. Rumors are scary -- rumors hurt property
7 values and we need clarity. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

9 Yes, sir.

10 MR. BUNDY: My name is Ryan Bundy. I live
11 at 2730 Lehman Drive, West Chicago, adjacent to the
12 property.

13 I just wanted to go on the record and say
14 for the last 18 years the entire water system that
15 they pointed out in one of the slides has drained
16 into our back yard. Working with the City of
17 West Chicago and the developer of Town and Country
18 Homes to change some of the intakes in our yard over
19 the past couple of years -- 18 years -- I just
20 wanted to -- no matter what is developed here, they
21 have -- it should be noted that the drainage needs
22 to get fixed. It needs to be done right.

23 I have some concerns about oversized intakes,
24 what that might mean, if the drainage is not done

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

66

1 properly how it could affect -- continue to affect
2 our properties and other adjacent properties. So I
3 just wanted to state that.

4 We spend countless times -- anytime there's
5 a rain storm my wife has to go out there for about
6 45 minutes and rake corn silk out of the storm sewer
7 so that it doesn't flood our back yard.

8 No matter what happens in this development,
9 the drainage system really needs to be done right.
10 I just wanted to say that.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

12 All right. Any further questions, comments?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If we're
15 done, then we can go back to the Plan Commission
16 unless the applicant has something else to add.

17 MR. CARRARA: No. We're willing to hear
18 your input.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Staff, anything?

20 MS. TUNGARE: Nothing further.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. In that case
22 what we'll do, at this point is I will poll the
23 Plan Commission members to provide feedback to the
24 applicant, what they like about the proposal and

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

67

1 what they don't like, suggestions that would be
2 helpful in coming up with an application.

3 So let's start on that end.

4 MEMBER SPRUTH: Actually, talking about the
5 detention basin, a question came up that might be
6 within your application. Certainly, it's within
7 your calculations. I was just wondering, what size
8 storm event have you sized the detention pond for?

9 MR. HANLON: As required by ordinances of
10 the City and is pretty conventional, most are sized
11 for a 100-year storm event, and beyond that it would
12 overflow as every other storm water management basin
13 is designed to do in the area.

14 MEMBER SPRUTH: Just to go back on what I
15 like and what I don't like in the application, I
16 think you can see this is well attended. There's a
17 lot of interest in the community both in West Chicago
18 and St. Charles, so the applicant should note that
19 as part of the -- any future consultation should
20 this application go forward.

21 Regarding the zoning, I do think that the
22 density in the zoning is too high and it should be --
23 this site should be looked at a little further in
24 regards to the zoning.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

68

1 What I do like is the surface water management
2 features and the detention basin. Although, you
3 consulted within -- you exceeded your consultation
4 range of 50 feet, as this is well attended, you
5 should look to consult further afield for anything
6 in the future, making sure that you have the right
7 addresses for any future consultation, a longer
8 period of time.

9 I believe this area does need to be
10 developed. There is a need for development for
11 suitably sized residences within this area.

12 I think that the surface of the detention
13 basin can be a feature within this area, so maybe it
14 would need to be considered to enhance that area
15 when you revisit designing that.

16 So yes, my main concern is regarding the
17 density of the housing, and I think that needs to be
18 looked at again.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jim.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a concern we
21 really haven't talked about, but I'll put it out
22 here right now.

23 On page 7 of the memo that we received from
24 you -- from staff in regard to policies about land

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

69

1 use, on the bottom of page 7 it says, "Prioritizing
2 infield development over annexation and development."

3 What I'm talking about here is that presently
4 the City has a high density development that's going
5 forward on the west side, and as it says here, it is
6 recommended that the City prioritize infield
7 developments over annexation and development of
8 property outside the city limits.

9 So I'm just thinking from my point of view,
10 not what the City Council might do or whatever, but
11 since there is a high density on the docket, so to
12 speak, you might want to consider to look at this in
13 terms of RM-1, RM-2, or a combination of both, which
14 I don't know if that would mean anything down the
15 line, but I just want to put it out there.

16 I think you've done a good job in terms of
17 meeting people with the perimeter of the community.
18 I'm concerned, too, about the impact to schools. We
19 haven't really talk about that, and perhaps it's too
20 early in the ball game to think about that just like
21 you haven't done an in-depth study about traffic,
22 but how that's going to impact District 303's
23 educational system I think is a concern, too, that I
24 have. I just had a concern. I'm not sure what it's

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

70

1 going to be, but I just want to put that on the table.

2 Outside of that I have no other comments.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

4 Brian.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: So I want to thank you for
6 your presentation and the public comments. I think
7 that the concept plan, the format of the concept
8 plan, obviously a lot of time and thought went into
9 it, and I appreciate the professionalism of the plan
10 that you put forward.

11 I especially appreciate the thought that you
12 put into the storm water detention and drainage
13 issue. It's something that obviously is a problem
14 in the area, and the open space provided by the new
15 drainage detention and the 300-foot buffer of the
16 residents to the north is an asset to the plan, I
17 believe.

18 I think the main challenges for you going
19 forward are going to be density and traffic.

20 So, first of all, regarding density, our
21 comprehensive plan, as a number of people pointed
22 out, currently indicates on the land use plan on
23 page 40 that the top two-thirds of the parcel would
24 be RM-2 -- I believe it's RM-2, but it's color coded

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

71

1 to be -- it says single-family attached, but I'm
2 assuming what that really means is RM-2, the dark
3 yellow. Is that correct?

4 MR. COLBY: The single-family attached is a
5 land use designation, and the description of that
6 type of housing is similar to a townhome development.
7 It doesn't necessarily correspond to a zoning
8 district, but it's a form of development, and that
9 would be permitted in either the RM-2 or RM-3 district.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: So the context of the
11 conversation here has been about RM-2 versus RM-3.
12 So I'm assuming that that dark yellow refers to, for
13 the sake of this discussion, RM-2 and the bottom
14 part of the parcel RM-3. If you add the extra
15 density restriction in the top third, the 300 feet,
16 I just did a quick calculation. If you take 9 acres
17 at 7.5 dwelling units per acre, that's 67.5 units;
18 9 acres at 10 dwelling units per acre for RM-2,
19 that's 90 dwelling units, and then the third 9 acres
20 at RM-3 is 180 dwelling units per acre, for a total
21 of approximately 238 dwelling units for the whole
22 parcel versus 416.

23 So I think that as you go forward with an
24 application, for the whole thing to be RM-3 the

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

72

1 first question that the Plan Commission and the City
2 is going to ask is, why should we revisit the land
3 use categorization, the comprehensive plan and place
4 out. If you suggest going for a PUD application,
5 what extra amenities and benefits to the community
6 is that PUD application bringing that might justify
7 the intensified land use. That's the thing I always
8 look at, what's the tradeoff.

9 The biggest concern I have is traffic, and
10 as I look at the street structure in this area and
11 around this area, if my friend the chairman of the
12 housing commission were here, he would go off on a
13 tear about how the grid structure is democratic, and
14 this is absolutely the opposite of that.

15 And it really does create a huge problem from
16 a planning standpoint because you can't get anywhere
17 from anywhere else if you get stuck. You can't go
18 down like in the city of Chicago or other traditional
19 areas in the city where you can zip over and find a
20 new route. If you're stuck, you've got to cut through
21 a residential area. There's only one way in and one
22 way out, and I think that presents a real challenge
23 to developing this site at its full and best use
24 because the traffic issue is going to be a problem,

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

73

1 particularly because of the patterns of transportation
2 with the school. I have a 10-year-old, and when we
3 take my child to school in the morning, parents are
4 backed up for blocks, and blocks, and blocks to drop
5 off their kids and pick them up.

6 So I would really encourage you to look at
7 that issue not just in the immediate vicinity of the
8 entrance to the proposed development but up and
9 downstream at Norton Creek Elementary, what's going
10 to be the impact of an extra 400-plus households,
11 and is there capacity in the surrounding street system
12 to support that and people to have the quality of
13 life they want.

14 And the last comment I want to make is about
15 housing types. I think this is important. This is
16 for everyone in the room, not just for the applicant.
17 The comprehensive plan also says a lot about wanting
18 to encourage diverse housing types and meet diverse
19 needs of our residents. RM-3, which is already in
20 the immediate vicinity, and RM-2 which is contemplated
21 by our comprehensive plan includes multifamily
22 housing; it includes attached townhomes; the
23 assisted-living centers are contemplated in the
24 boundary agreement. So to me it's already a

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

74

1 foregone conclusion that multifamily housing is on
2 the table for city of St. Charles, and the constraints
3 upon multifamily housing are not whether or not it's
4 in character for the city of St. Charles -- I believe
5 it is -- it's whether or not the surrounding
6 infrastructure can support it.

7 I'm a strong proponent of our inclusionary
8 housing ordinance, and I would like to see you really
9 take a hard look at what that says when you come
10 back to us and consider whether or not that is the
11 type of application you're putting forward to us.

12 Thank you.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes. I just have a couple
14 comments.

15 My initial questions on the retention pond,
16 I know it's already been said, but I guess what I
17 wanted to mention on that subject matter was to say,
18 you know, I do like the idea -- I knew you'd have to
19 have it there for drainage for your land, but I think
20 it's a great idea to hopefully consider the other
21 neighborhoods and work with those neighborhoods to --
22 like the one gentleman mentioned, you really need to
23 make sure you look at all the ramifications of doing
24 that retention pond not just for your land but how

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

75

1 it affects way downstream.

2 So if you could consider that. And, also,
3 with the reservoir or retention pond, if you could
4 incorporate some kind of interest for the property
5 to enhance usability, whether it be for some kind of
6 recreation -- I'm not sure what to call it; I'm not
7 sure how big that's actually going to be, but if
8 there could be something considered, that would be
9 terrific.

10 When it comes to the density, I would like
11 to consider -- or ask you to consider to make it
12 much more interesting, that part of the property be
13 a higher density, significantly higher density than
14 the other portion of the property. And I think that
15 would provide much more interest and make it more of
16 a community feel, whether it be an urban-type
17 feel -- I don't know, I'm just going to say
18 brownstones or something along those lines like you've
19 got downtown Chicago, something of more interest.

20 Many years ago I was in a different
21 industry, and this particular design kind of looks
22 like 20, 30 years ago. And I know this is only a
23 concept, but I just really want to emphasize that if
24 you could really put your design hats on and think

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

76

1 of something much more urban and would provide more
2 open space and more interest for the land and then
3 the other side, if you will, not as high density.

4 I think it would maybe take some of the worry
5 from some of the neighbors if there were a higher
6 density in one area versus the other. And,
7 obviously, you'd take the neighborhood into
8 consideration, and maybe the higher density would be
9 on the south side of the property as you enter it
10 and then gets less density as you move north,
11 something along those lines. So I appreciate it.

12 Last but not least, considering how the
13 neighborhood -- it goes without saying, you know,
14 make it pedestrian friendly, try to incorporate
15 something within the neighborhood so everybody is
16 together, if you will, and you're not segregated
17 apart.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

20 Tim.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'll go.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'm going to keep
24 this brief.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

77

1 Smith Road is also a way to get to 59, as
2 you all know. There's a shortcut; GPS systems will
3 tell you to take Smith Road. So that, coupled with
4 the increased traffic, is a concern of mine.

5 I've been there at 3:00. I've been there --
6 I have kids in the school system or did have, and
7 I've seen the traffic there in the mornings and in
8 the afternoons. So that coupled with the possibility
9 of people taking that to 59 is a concern of mine.
10 So I do ask you to consider that.

11 And I am in agreement that I personally
12 don't find this concept attractive. I recommend
13 that you come to us maybe with a couple different
14 ideas on your concept plan next time. Density is
15 definitely a concern.

16 In terms of the impact on the schools, I
17 think that is something that we do need to consider.
18 And, also, I don't think that all these people would
19 be here from the community if what they saw or the
20 fact that this is going to be isn't a concern. So
21 possibly another neighborhood meeting would be --
22 when you have a new idea would be appropriate.
23 There are a lot of neighbors, a lot of neighbors in
24 Cornerstone Lakes and the surrounding neighborhoods,

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

78

1 and I just think that might be appropriate to
2 consider.

3 So I'd say traffic and the RM-3 zoning are a
4 concern of mine.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

6 Dan.

7 MEMBER FRIO: It's kind of nice going
8 almost last.

9 I have a question. I don't know if I missed
10 this. Are you looking to rezone and then build, or
11 are you looking to rezone and sell to a builder?

12 MR. CARRARA: Our client is not a builder or
13 a developer. He's looking to annex, seek the PUD
14 designation at the zoning, and then at that point if
15 he decides to take it to market, the people will at
16 least have an understanding of what uses they can
17 bring back to you.

18 I think a number of you agreed you'd like to
19 see some kind of plan, and you'll have that opportunity
20 with whoever the end user is bringing that back to
21 you, you can address the feature issues and all
22 those other issues and some of the density issues.
23 Those are all concerns that you will control as part
24 of the public hearing process whoever should bring

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

79

1 that to you in the future.

2 MEMBER FRIO: That's what it sounded like,
3 you were just getting it prepped for market, and I
4 appreciate that as a real estate investor you're
5 trying to make as much money as you can and I get that.

6 The concern I have is pretty much with a lot
7 of the other people sitting up here I think RM-2 is
8 the best fit. Why? Pressure on the roads.
9 Unfortunately, you're in the spot -- you're kind of
10 tucked away in a spot that you really can't do much
11 with to a point for access. If you are on North
12 Avenue, it would be a moot point.

13 The gentleman who is a real estate agent, I
14 agree with you, as well, the revenue produced by the
15 apartment buildings. The community will get a
16 bigger bang for its buck; the community will get a
17 bigger bang for its buck on non-4-unit apartment
18 buildings on a revenue base.

19 The price point was another kind of deterring
20 factor for myself. The pressure on the schools,
21 especially the High School, it's already pretty
22 populated. So if we added another 400 units times
23 3 people per unit, you've got another 12, 13,
24 1400 people. You're talking hundreds of kids. Love

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

80

1 kids but that adds a lot of pressure to the schools.

2 What I like about it is you're doing something
3 with the property, and you're getting it prepped for
4 market, which is awesome because it beats a vacant lot.

5 The other thing is taking care of the water
6 system that a lot of the neighbors had issues with.
7 I'm sure that the City is going to make that a
8 priority if and when this gets developed.

9 So, again, I'll repeat myself. I'm more for
10 the RM-2 because of the density and basically where
11 it's located, and then the other issues that I said.
12 So that's my point.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, one of the
15 benefits of going at the end is I don't have to say
16 too much. I appreciate everything that the other
17 Plan Commissioners have said. As was pointed out,
18 many of those issues will be discussed when a formal
19 application does finally come before us and are all
20 of concern.

21 Primarily, I would say to you I do have some
22 density concerns. I'm not go to weigh in on RM-2 or
23 RM-3 because when the application comes before us,
24 it will be with the PUD, and we will have some control

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

81

1 over the final density of the project at that time.
2 I don't want to limit us or the developer to a
3 specific type of building because there is going to
4 be a PUD, and we can say in a PUD, even if it is
5 RM-3, we only want 10 dwelling units per acre. So
6 that's the flexibility that the PUD will give us.

7 So I am -- I'm not for the 20 dwelling units
8 per acre, but I'm not going to weigh in on the
9 RM-2, RM-3.

10 And then, of course, the water management.
11 I know that staff -- engineering, Chris is working
12 and will be working with the developer, and I
13 suspect -- and I don't know if this has occurred --
14 with the City of West Chicago, is there some
15 intergovernmental thing that has to happen? Maybe
16 you can speak to that. I don't know how this is
17 going to be resolved -- you don't need to speak to
18 it, but I don't know how it's going to be resolved,
19 but I'm suspecting that you will have that resolved
20 to the satisfaction of the City of Charles, the City
21 of West Chicago, and all the surrounding residents.

22 So that's all I have to say.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I think any
24 of you that have been here at previous Plan Commission

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

82

1 meetings know that we, being a Plan Commission, and
2 the City Council recognize and support property
3 owners' rights to develop property, and I think that
4 this process is starting out on the right foot
5 because we are having some back and forth, we're
6 giving our opinions to the developer and listening
7 to neighbors, and I hope that that continues through
8 the rest of this process.

9 I agree with Tim but I do want to put more
10 of a focus on the comprehensive plan, and I think
11 that this particular parcel is interestingly unique
12 in that I believe it's the only one in our
13 comprehensive plan that is actually divided into
14 two future land uses, and I think that that speaks
15 to the intent that it should be a transitional
16 parcel and transitional scaling down in density from
17 the south to north.

18 Obviously, there's a requirement on the
19 northern 300 feet of the property to do that, but I
20 would suggest that that be brought further down. I
21 don't know if, you know, the ultimate goal would be
22 to divide -- you know, basically, in your planning
23 divide the property into thirds and have the
24 southern third the most dense, the northern third the

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

83

1 least dense. But something along that line I think
2 would receive the most support because certainly
3 you're going from an area that would support more
4 dense use to one that's particularly sensitive
5 to that.

6 So I have -- so in short, I think that
7 20 dwelling units per acre, it would take a lot of
8 convincing to convince me that that fits with what
9 the comprehensive plan provides. I would need to
10 see the plan, but I would think something closer to
11 an RM-2 density would be more appropriate. I think
12 possibly looking at the way Pheasant Run Trail is
13 set up with different types of units with different
14 density focuses may be something to look at in
15 designating where to put the higher density and
16 lower density units in concert with each other.

17 I think that when an application does come
18 back, there would need to be a comprehensive traffic
19 study. I would like to see the traffic study
20 include not only the current layout and the way the
21 roadway currently is but also to include possible
22 future improvements, the railroad crossing to
23 provide a better traffic flow because I think that
24 that would have an impact on the amount of traffic

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

84

1 flow coming out of the site not only to the west but
2 also to the east.

3 I don't know if there have ever been plans
4 to make the intersection with Powis Road a better
5 alternative route, but that's something that the
6 traffic study could probably address, as well as a
7 potential additional connection at the northeast
8 corner of Cornerstone Lakes. I don't know if that's
9 ever been suggested, and I don't know whose
10 jurisdiction that would be, but I think that would
11 also have an impact on more traffic flow to the
12 east. That's the particularly sensitive area as far
13 as traffic goes.

14 And I also -- if a traffic study came before
15 us, I would want to see that it was done during the
16 school year and include ratings at the beginning and
17 the end of the school day so we get an accurate idea
18 of what the maximum traffic flow is in that area.

19 Beyond that, those are all of my comments.
20 Thank you for coming before us, and just to remind
21 everyone, there will be no further action taken on
22 this by the Plan Commission. We're done with the
23 concept plan review, and the next time it will be
24 before us is -- the next time it will it be discussed

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

85

1 is it at the planning and development committee
2 meeting of the City Council on October 10th, and
3 then when an application is filed, it will be back
4 before us for public hearing.

5 So thank you all for coming out. I
6 appreciate the comments.

7 Sir, do you have a question?

8 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a correction to make
9 to my comment.

10 I commented earlier that I thought the
11 comprehensive plan, if you break it down 9 acres, by
12 9 acres, by 9 acres yields 238 units. I have my
13 math wrong. It was 338 units. 338 units is what I
14 believe the comprehensive plan, based on my quick
15 math, yields versus your 416.

16 So it's a little -- not quite as large a
17 discrepancy as I said during my comments. I just
18 wanted to make certain that's on the record.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. All right.
21 Thank you everyone and I'd ask -- you're certainly
22 welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting, but we
23 do still have agenda items, so I ask that you take
24 any conversations out in the hallway, please.

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

86

1 Folks, if you'd please take your conversations out
2 in the hall, I'd appreciate it.

3 (Off the record at 8:53 p.m.)
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

In Re: Petkus Property, North Side of Smith Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

87

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 25th day of September, 2016.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



PLANET DEPOS®

We make it >> *happen.*™

Transcript of **Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer,
525 South Tyler Road**

Date: September 20, 2016

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos, LLC

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

Internet: www.planetdepos.com

Worldwide Court Reporting | Interpretation | Trial Services

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: :
Maranatha House of Prayer :
525 South Tyler Road, Units :
N-2 & O (Raul Laracuenta) :
Application for Special Use. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, September 20, 2016
8:55 p.m.

Job No.: 97799B
Pages: 1 - 23
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

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

Report of proceedings held at the location of:

ST. CHARLES CITY HALL
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
(630) 377-4400

Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a
Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

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

PRESENT:

- TODD WALLACE, Chairman
- TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman
- BRIAN DOYLE, Member
- DAN FRIO, Member
- JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member
- LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member
- MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner
- RITA TUNGARE, Director

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

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: Item 5 on the agenda is public hearing, Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road, Units N-2 and O. This is an application for a special use with a public hearing. We will accept evidence from the applicant subject to questions from the Plan Commission and members of the public.

MR. LARACUENTE: It's not going to be as exciting as the other one.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So before we begin, anyone who wishes to give any testimony or ask questions, please be sworn in, if you can raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. And if you can just state your name, spell your last name, and state your address for the record, please.

MR. LARACUENTE: Raul, R-a-u-l; Laracuate, L-a-r-a-c-u-e-n-t-e. My office is -- do you want my residential address? 1907 Jeanette Avenue, St. Charles, Illinois.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And go ahead and let us know what your application is.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

5

1 MR. LARACUENTE: What we're trying to do as
2 a church -- Maranatha House of Prayer, we've been
3 here for over 3 1/2 years gathering in the Hilton
4 Garden Inn -- started at the Holiday Inn Express and
5 moved to the Hilton. We have been doing a lot of
6 things for the community, and now we feel it is a
7 good time for us to move into a place that we can
8 continue to grow.

9 We've been doing a lot of stuff with the
10 kids in school. At the beginning of the year, we
11 gather as many kids as we can book bags and school
12 supplies for the needy kids in the area. We give
13 them to Geneva, as far as Cleveland, Ohio. Wherever
14 there's a need that gets presented to us, we try to
15 help them out.

16 We've been helping out with some of the
17 members of the community, families, needy, homeless,
18 young people that we find, we try to help them as
19 much as we can. So now we feel acquiring this
20 space, we'll be able to lease it for a couple years,
21 we'll be able to grow our space and be able to have
22 some more of a permanent spot rather than being in a
23 hotel, having to move all this stuff around every
24 Sunday and Tuesday night.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

6

1 So we feel we can be more of a blessing to
2 the people as we get our own place.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You have services
4 Sundays and Tuesday evenings. Is that when you
5 gather?

6 MR. LARACUENTE: Correct.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: How many members?

8 MR. LARACUENTE: We have about 15 faithful
9 members. We have about 30 people that have come
10 around. Most of our focus has been to encourage
11 people to go back to the churches and be a blessing.
12 We haven't really been focusing on trying to grow.
13 We've just been trying to encourage people. We have
14 our prayer service on Tuesday nights and our Sunday
15 services.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So those are the
17 only events that you have?

18 MR. LARACUENTE: Correct.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: How many square feet
20 is this, do you know about?

21 MR. LARACUENTE: 18 -- almost 1900 feet in
22 the total I think it is. So the front has a
23 conference room area which will be Genesis, the
24 children's room area; we have a receptionist area

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

7

1 and the back area, which I think is O, will be the
2 main center.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You said that you
4 distribute things to children in need.

5 MR. LARACUENTE: Correct.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you collect those
7 things at your location?

8 MR. LARACUENTE: We put the mission before
9 the people of the church, and most of the things the
10 church ends up buying.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I guess my question
12 is, will this be a collection place where things
13 will pile up and you deliver them?

14 MR. LARACUENTE: No, that will not be the
15 case. As the need appears, we go ahead and buy it
16 from Walmart and take it to the middle person and
17 they distribute it. There's no carts or locations
18 or anything like that.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There's nothing
20 going on except on Sundays and on Tuesday evenings?
21 What a waste you have to pay for a whole month.

22 MR. LARACUENTE: I know.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: That was kind of my question,
24 if you guys had any other programs or activities

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

8

1 throughout the week that you gather for that you'd
2 be using the space for aside from those times when
3 there's worship services.

4 MR. LARACUENTE: The only service we have
5 during the week is a Tuesday night service. Our
6 goal is to have a Friday night service for the young
7 people, and we're trying to reach out to some of the
8 kids that are in need and all the kids and try and
9 give them a positive outlet to do something on a
10 Friday night, and we give them something to do.

11 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So my question, you
12 currently have 15 members, and the capacity of your
13 building would be 45; is that correct?

14 MR. LARACUENTE: Correct.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So you have two times,
16 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday and 10:00 or whatever Sunday?

17 MR. LARACUENTE: Sunday morning.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: As far as parking, I know
19 in the staff note it says nobody else is parking
20 there because the other businesses are closed with
21 the exception of the salon and some other -- I guess
22 I read as much of the staff notes as I could, but
23 was there more parking than necessary when nobody
24 is there?

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

9

1 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Correct. So there's a
2 total of 180 parking spaces in the business park,
3 and we calculated what the parking requirement is
4 per current zoning ordinance based on the size of
5 all of the uses in the business park and what uses
6 those are, and there's actually a deficient number
7 of parking spaces for all of those tenant spaces.
8 However, we also looked at the hours of operation of
9 those businesses, and since basically none of those
10 businesses are open during the times this unit will
11 be used, there will be almost 180 spaces open
12 theoretically.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So just a few extra.
14 Really the question is, so if you exceed 45 members,
15 that's your capacity, so what happens then?

16 MR. LARACUENTE: Basically, what the fire
17 marshal told us is if we were to increase above 45,
18 we have to change the door lock in the back. So
19 then he said if we increase more than the 45, we
20 change the door locks. So it's a push lock.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So that's really the only
22 challenge of exceeding 45?

23 MR. LARACUENTE: But even if it were to
24 increase the size to 60 or something like that, we'd

1 just have a second service on Sundays. Because it's
2 empty. We have pretty much the blessing of the
3 association of the place. They said that as long as
4 it doesn't interfere with the stuff during the day
5 that they do, which is not even -- my wife might go
6 there during the day, but it's not like we're going
7 to have any services.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: It will be real quiet
9 for you.

10 MR. LARACUENTE: Definitely. We made sure --
11 before we even started the process we went there on
12 Friday night; we went there on Tuesday night; we
13 went there on Sunday morning and there was nothing
14 happening.

15 MEMBER SPRUTH: Have you looked into
16 partnering with other churches for I guess the
17 vision they see?

18 MR. LARACUENTE: Correct. We are -- I'm
19 friends with River City Church on Kirk Road, Trinity
20 Church right here on 7th, and an Aurora church
21 called The Warehouse Church, and we have been
22 partnering with them. We pray. We have a group of
23 men that we collaborate, and we talk about certain
24 things that we're doing. Once every two months we

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

11

1 have a prayer meeting that we do for the city. But
2 yeah, we do end up getting together if there's a
3 need or if there's a vision on any fund or something
4 like that.

5 MEMBER SPRUTH: As part of the parking, have
6 you looked into discussion whether or not you can
7 use other church facilities like some of you are
8 partners instead of getting a new building having
9 within your network other churches who can provide
10 space for what you see? Like I was thinking of
11 something like on Stearns Road with Christ
12 Community, and I think that's two churches in one,
13 that type of thing.

14 MR. LARACUENTE: Yeah, we have contacted
15 them. On Sundays it's kind of tight for us because
16 they do have their schedules, and they go all the
17 way to 12:00 or sometimes 1:00 and we tend to -- for
18 the members that are coming to the church, it's
19 easier for them to come in the mornings, and the
20 kids and everything else. Most of it -- we have
21 members from Naperville, Northlake, as far as
22 Chicago that come to the church. So for them it's
23 easier in the morning.

24 So we went and reached out to River City

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

12

1 Church. They tell us it has to be more like 2:00 p.m.
2 So having our own place would give us the flexibility
3 on Sunday mornings to do whatever we need do.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything else?

5 MR. LARACUENTE: Did that answer the question?

6 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes. Thank you.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to make a
8 motion that we close the public hearing.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any discussion on the
11 motion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

15 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

23 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

13

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The public
6 hearing is closed.

7 Moving on to Item 6 is action on the
8 application for special use.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to make a
10 motion to recommend to the planning and development
11 committee approval of the application for special
12 use for the Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler
13 Road, Units N and O by Raul Laracuenta.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

15 MS. JOHNSON: There are two recommendations
16 conditions of approval. I don't know if you want to
17 add those to the motion.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Subject to the
19 conditions of approval recommended by staff.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That's the
22 motion on the table, to recommend with resolution of
23 staff comments. Is there any discussion?

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Just one point of discussion.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

14

1 So it's actually not resolution of staff comments;
2 it's two conditions, that the maximum number of
3 people in a given church service shall not exceed
4 45, and church services will not be held before
5 7:00 p.m. on weekdays or before 12:00 p.m. on
6 Saturdays.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is that a correct
8 statement of the motion?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Further
12 discussion on the motion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, anything
15 else from staff?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. Tim.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

19 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

15

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

3 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Good luck.

10 MR. LARACUENTE: Thank you. So it's okay?

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We recommend approval to
12 the planning and development committee.

13 Can he give you a call and you'll discuss
14 what the next step would be?

15 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. This will be on the
16 planning and development committee agenda on
17 October 10th, and we can talk about that.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There are two
19 more steps.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It has to be approved by
21 the planning and development committee, and then it
22 will be approved subsequent to that at the City
23 Council.

24 MR. LARACUENTE: Sounds good. Thank you for

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

16

1 your time.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any additional business
3 from Plan Commission members?

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Move to adjourn.

5 MR. COLBY: A couple of announcements.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Sorry.

7 MR. COLBY: I think the Commission is aware
8 that we have the Prairie Center application under
9 review, and we're looking at dates for scheduling
10 that for public hearing, and at this point we're
11 looking at October the 18th as the first public
12 hearing date that can be scheduled for.

13 The reason I'm bringing this up is we have
14 some other applications that are before us that we
15 need to look at scheduling, and looking ahead the
16 first Plan Commission meeting in November is on
17 Election Day. So that meeting is not planned to be
18 held, but then the second meeting in November is the
19 week of Thanksgiving because the meeting schedule is
20 pushed back somewhat.

21 So two things I wanted to ask. One, would
22 the Plan Commission have any interest in scheduling
23 a special meeting the beginning of November potentially
24 on November the 1st, which is actually the first

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

17

1 Tuesday of November; it's just the first day of the
2 month, so you follow the Council meetings, and it's
3 not a regularly scheduled meeting. If there's
4 interest in scheduling for that date, it would give
5 you some flexibility with other applications and
6 trying to get them scheduled.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is election day
8 November 8th?

9 MR. COLBY: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the reason -- just so
11 you know, we used to hold meetings on Election Day,
12 and it was suggested several years ago that we not
13 do that. You wouldn't have any interest in --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What do the other Plan
16 Commissioners think? Well, I guess discussion would
17 be whether to have a meeting on November 1st or
18 November 8th.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: I think what I'm hearing is
20 that there is no meeting planned -- scheduled for
21 November 1st.

22 MR. COLBY: There's no meeting scheduled for
23 either date. We've left November 8th off of the
24 meeting calendar.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

18

1 MEMBER DOYLE: Which would normally be
2 our --

3 MR. COLBY: Right.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: So there's October 18th and
5 then after that the next meeting is when?

6 MR. COLBY: The next regularly scheduled
7 meeting is November the 22nd, which is the week of
8 Thanksgiving.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How does Plan Commission
10 feel about altering the calendar to November 1st and
11 November 15th and taking off November 22nd? Would
12 that help?

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Makes more sense.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Does that make sense
15 for staff?

16 MR. COLBY: Assuming we can make those dates
17 work. I know November 1st we don't have any public
18 meetings scheduled because it's the end -- or it's a
19 week that starts in the last day of the month. I'd
20 have to check on the 15th, but if the Plan Commission
21 is open to that, we could look at doing that.

22 MS. TUNGARE: 15th might be difficult
23 because we have planning and development committee
24 on the 14th. So that would put two meetings back to

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

19

1 back but it's doable.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do any Plan
3 Commissioners have any objection to November 1st?

4 (Nays heard.)

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So that's good to go.
6 Do any Plan Commissioners have any objection to
7 November 22nd, which is the Tuesday of Thanksgiving?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Personally I would prefer
9 not to have a meeting the week of Thanksgiving.

10 MS. TUNGARE: Let's leave it on November 1st.
11 We'll have a conversation about November 15th, if
12 that's feasible or not, but at least we'll have one
13 meeting in November.

14 MEMBER SPRUTH: And that would be for
15 Prairie Center?

16 MR. COLBY: For October 18th, if that's
17 scheduled, that would be the only item on the agenda.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And are we anticipating
19 multiple continuances of the public hearing?

20 MR. COLBY: Well, that's to be determined.
21 We're not anticipating the public hearing being
22 completed in one evening, but we would anticipate at
23 least a second date.

24 MS. TUNGARE: I would anticipate at least

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

20

1 two public hearings on that project.

2 MEMBER SPRUTH: So if we stopped the public
3 hearing, what time would we stop that at. How late
4 will we go?

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 9:00. In the past when
6 it's been evident that things are going to go to
7 multiple public hearings, we aren't going to sit
8 here until 1:00 in the morning. We're going to cut
9 it off and put it over to the next day.

10 MEMBER SPRUTH: At 9:00?

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Isn't that kind of what
12 we aimed for in the past, held it at 2, 2 1/2 hours?

13 MS. TUNGARE: It's your prerogative.
14 Anywhere between 9:00 and 10:00.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You start and we all
16 agree we're not going to do any of this midnight or
17 1:00 a.m.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's abuse.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: After 9:00 they have to
20 start paying us, and the City wouldn't let us do that.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: This is a bona fide
22 application? This is not a concept plan?

23 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Just curious. The last time

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

21

1 we had this application in front of us we continued
2 the public hearing 10 times; right? I think it was
3 10 different --

4 MR. COLBY: It was close to that number over
5 a long period of time. There were periods where
6 there was no activity.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: But we don't expect it to go
8 that long this time?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What year was that?

10 MEMBER DOYLE: 2009.

11 MS. TUNGARE: It was five years ago.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But I will say
13 something, I think that this Plan Commission
14 compared to that one -- I think we have more control
15 over our meetings now than we did in the past. I
16 think we have a better handle on working with the
17 audience, making sure that things don't get out of
18 hand. I think we've gotten better at it, so I think
19 it's going to be a little bit easier than it was
20 in 2010.

21 MEMBER SPRUTH: Thank you for that pep talk.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: You were there then and
23 you're here now.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm much older now.

Hearing: Maranatha House of Prayer, 525 South Tyler Road
Conducted on September 20, 2016

22

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I won't be able to make
2 the October 4th meeting.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does anyone know for sure
4 that they would not be able to make October 18th?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else, Russ?

7 MR. COLBY: No.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Ellen?

9 MS. JOHNSON: No.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Rita?

11 MS. TUNGARE: No.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
13 motion to adjourn?

14 MEMBER DOYLE: So moved.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded. All
17 in favor.

18 (Ayes heard.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: St. Charles Plan
22 Commission is adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

23 (Off the record at 9:16 p.m.)

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, 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 25th day of September, 2016.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017.



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois