

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2020**

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

Members Absent: None

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

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the September 9, 2020 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Vargulich and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.

5. Oliver-Hoffman Resubdivision (Joe Segobiano)

Application for Concept Plan

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

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

7. Weekly Development Report

8. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, October 6, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, October 20, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, September 22, 2020
Page 2

Tuesday, November 3, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers – To be cancelled

- b. Planning & Development Committee
 - Monday, October 12, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Monday, November 9, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment at 8:15 p.m.



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

Transcript of Oliver-Hoffman Resubdivision, Application for Concept Plan

Date: September 22, 2020

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: Oliver-Hoffman :
Resubdivision, Application :
for Concept Plan :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, September 22, 2020
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 272058
Pages: 1 - 66
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

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

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSSELL COLBY, Assistant Director of
14 Community & Economic Development

15 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

MEMBER BECKER: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

MEMBER MELTON: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Please rise for the
Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Before we begin,
2 if you're participating via Zoom and wish to make
3 a comment, there are two options you can utilize.
4 At any time you can comment via the Q and A button
5 on the bottom of your screen. Type your comment
6 in the box, and your comment will be read to the
7 chamber during the public comment portion of the
8 meeting.

9 If you'd like to make your comment out
10 loud, please wait until the public comment portion
11 of the meeting and press the button at the bottom
12 of the screen to raise hand. Once your hand is
13 raised, staff will recognize you and ask you to
14 unmute your mic, and your mic will remain unmuted
15 for the duration of your comments. Once you're
16 finished, staff will re-mute your mic. If you
17 have any additional questions, you'll need to
18 re-raise your hand.

19 Does anyone have any questions?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 4 on
22 the agenda is presentation of the minutes of the
23 September 9th, 2020, meeting of the Plan
24 Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
4 seconded. All in favor.

5 (Ayes heard.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 5 is
9 Oliver-Hoffman resubdivision, application for
10 concept plan. This is a concept plan review which
11 the Plan Commission conducts prior to the
12 submission of an application to save applicants'
13 the cost and time of going through the application
14 process prior to getting feedback.

15 So during this meeting we will -- the
16 applicant will make a presentation, and members of
17 the Plan Commission, members of the audience will
18 ask questions, provide feedback; and then the
19 applicant will be able to take that back and
20 utilize that in submitting a formal application to
21 the City.

22 Are there any questions on that?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. At the end of

1 the meeting, the Plan Commission will not take any
2 further action on this since it's not an
3 application. This is just for the purpose of
4 providing feedback to the applicant or to the
5 developer.

6 All right. Is the applicant here? I'm
7 sorry. Not the applicant, the developer I guess I
8 should say.

9 First of all, is there anything from
10 staff? Russ?

11 MR. COLBY: Yes. Thank you. I wanted to
12 make some introductory comments. For those of you
13 who are familiar with this site known as the
14 Oliver-Hoffman property, there is some history
15 regarding its current lot layout and zoning.

16 In 2009 the City and property owner
17 entered into a litigation settlement agreement,
18 and that agreement remains in effect today. In
19 summary the agreement identified that the property
20 was to be subdivided into the five lots that exist
21 today, and that a conductor street was to be
22 dedicated through the site, and that the zoning
23 was to be designated as RM-3 and BC, the two
24 zoning districts that are in place today. And so

1 the property was subdivided and rezoned based on
2 that agreement in 2009 and 2010.

3 However, there has been no further
4 development of the site since that time. The
5 future development of the property under the terms
6 of the agreement would require that the collector
7 street be constructed, and then any project be
8 presented and approved by the City as a PUD, a
9 planned unit development.

10 So this concept plan application that's
11 being presented tonight, this will be the first
12 step in the process for the City to consider
13 whether to revise the settlement agreement because
14 what's being proposed tonight, it does differ from
15 what that document identifies.

16 So the Plan Commission is being asked to
17 review the concept plan as you would any other
18 concept plan, considering the land use and the
19 site plan based on the location of the property in
20 the comprehensive plan.

21 But when the concept plan is presented to
22 the Planning and Development Committee of the City
23 Council, they will further need to consider
24 whether they're agreeable to modifying the

1 settlement agreement in some manner as would be
2 required based on the project that's being
3 presented.

4 So with that introduction, we can turn the
5 presentation over to the applicant.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

7 MR. SEGOBIANO: Good evening. Thank you
8 for having us. We appreciate the time. My name
9 is Joe Segobiano; and with me this evening is Brad
10 Spencer, who is with Cage Engineering, as well as
11 Scott Shelton, who is with NVR Ryan Homes.

12 I'm part of an investment group that has
13 the property under contract right now, we are the
14 contract purchaser, and we have engaged Cage
15 Engineering to provide our development services,
16 which will include engineering and planning.

17 And then we've been working very closely
18 with Scott and his team at NVR. They would be the
19 home builder and the home seller of the property.
20 And although right now we do not have a contract
21 with NVR, it is our hope that by the time we came
22 back through for the final process, we would have
23 a contract with NVR.

24 So with that, we would like to walk you

1 through the project, certainly answer any
2 questions that you have, and then listen to your
3 feedback.

4 So with that, I will hand it over to
5 Scott.

6 MR. SHELTON: Thank you, Joe.

7 Good evening. My name is Scott Shelton
8 with Ryan Homes.

9 This will move that forward?

10 Thank you for the opportunity to speak
11 to you tonight about this project, and I'll give
12 you a brief presentation on what our intentions
13 will be.

14 So who is NVR Ryan homes? We are a public
15 home builder, one of the top five public home
16 builders in the country. During 2020, we're going
17 to build about 20,000 houses across the greater
18 United States, and we're going to build east of
19 Chicago. So here east over to -- all the way as
20 far south as Florida up through the mid-Atlantic
21 as well.

22 We came into this market in about 2010 and
23 then put up 14 communities in the greater
24 Chicagoland area, did about 300 houses of really

1 all product types. Since our inception here in
2 Chicagoland, we've built townhomes, we've built
3 single-families. They've really focused -- in
4 price points, really probably a half million and
5 under is where we have generally operated. We'll
6 be on track to outpace that throughout 2020.

7 Since we've come here, we've not built in
8 St. Charles. The closest community we've had
9 probably has been Geneva in an age-targeted
10 community that we've completed there.

11 A little bit about Cage who is here and
12 represented tonight as well. They're a
13 full-service civil design firm, licensed
14 engineers, offices here in Lombard -- or excuse
15 me -- Downers Grove and also a couple other
16 national locations; and they're going to be
17 handling the design services and some of the
18 project management associated with the community.
19 Our role will be to sell, market, and build the
20 homes in the community.

21 So our proposed plan, which I'll show you
22 a concept plan here shortly, is for 129
23 age-targeted homes, not age restricted; 92
24 townhomes, approximately a little over 1700 square

1 feet; 37 single-family ranch homes, 1900 to
2 2650 square feet in what we would call a
3 maintenance-light neighborhood.

4 We hesitate to call it maintenance free
5 because there's always some maintenance that's
6 required of the homeowner. But the goal is to be
7 a community that supports the empty nester,
8 provide lawn care services, snow removal services,
9 some of the exterior maintenance to the home.

10 As I mentioned, it's an age-targeted
11 community targeting empty nesters; and then what
12 we do in order to also achieve that demographic is
13 provide covenants that support that demographic.
14 Oftentimes those covenants are no trampolines, no
15 basketball hoops, things of that nature that might
16 be attractive to that empty nester, perhaps less
17 attractive to that family buyer who would have
18 other options for those type of activities.

19 I'll show you the concept plan. There's a
20 curvilinear layout, attractive lots through the
21 community and the plan is townhome and ranch
22 product with a mix of slab and basement based on
23 the market conditions, the price points.

24 So I believe you're all familiar with the

1 location, but here is the property here just south
2 and east of Foxfield Drive, just east of the
3 Charlestowne Mall.

4 We have, as you'll see in our concept
5 plan, taken into account the collector street that
6 was mentioned by Mr. Colby earlier that was part
7 of a previous plat, to maintain that, and that is
8 maintained throughout our concept plan.

9 Our concept plan, as you can see, has most
10 of our single-family detached homes on the east
11 side with a more dense product of the attached
12 townhomes closer to the mall component. And
13 really as you can see on the detached side it
14 makes a -- or a lot of homes back into open space,
15 and then we have townhomes here with open space
16 between them and a nice curvilinear layout in here
17 as well.

18 All these units, as you can see, I think
19 comply with the four-unit buildings, which also
20 gives a nice size to the townhome buildings. I'll
21 show you a couple examples of the elevations
22 as well.

23 So we have had success in this marketplace
24 with the empty nester product. It's been a very

1 vibrant demographic across the greater Chicago
2 area. There's been a lot of successful
3 communities not only for Ryan Homes but other
4 builders. We sold out a community in the
5 Aurora/Naperville area that's all ranch homes
6 targeting the empty nester.

7 Again, none of these are age restricted.
8 These were all age targeted, and absolutely a
9 chief demographic that we expected to see, very
10 little, if any, school-age children. All
11 generally -- not necessarily 55 and older, some
12 certainly have maybe a little more empty nesters
13 in their late 40s, but chief is that demographic
14 all the way up, you know, to certainly higher age
15 points and really attracted by the master down,
16 ranch living, as well as the maintenance in a
17 similar demographic community.

18 We sold out in Prairie Ridge, which is a
19 community in Geneva just off Peck Road, which
20 again was an age-targeted community. It was a
21 former townhome community that was converted to
22 single-family ranches.

23 We're currently active in three other
24 communities where we've had some really moderate

1 sales activity since our inception. Heather Glen
2 is in New Lenox, farther south. Really open a
3 little bit over a year, sold 47 houses. Grand
4 Reserve down in Yorkville and open just a little
5 over two years and sold 92 houses.

6 And then we just recently opened a
7 community in Highland Woods in Elgin. Opened that
8 in the midst of the pandemic and after engaging in
9 the first months with no one wanting to come out,
10 we've sold homes in there as well, and that's a
11 huge pickup.

12 So we really like this demographic. We
13 think it's underserved in greater Chicagoland, and
14 we believe there's an opportunity, certainly, in
15 this area as well.

16 So here's just a brief amount on the
17 square footages. The townhome, 1740 square feet,
18 and then three different single-family ranch
19 plans, 1950 all the way up to 2600 square feet.
20 All of these have master bedrooms and living area
21 on the first level, so master down. They're all
22 three bedrooms, and all of that comes with some
23 form of outdoor living, usually covered porch
24 areas. That seems to be a very important option

1 that we're seeing with this.

2 I'm going to show you just some examples
3 of some of the different elevations. There are
4 multiple elevations that can be put together not
5 only for the townhomes, but also for the
6 single-family ranch. Here's an example of a
7 three-unit building and different craftsman-style
8 elevations put together with townhomes.

9 And then I'll show you just some examples.
10 The Alberti, this is the smallest of the ranches,
11 the Bramante, and the Palladio, and each of these
12 come with three, four elevations, some full brick,
13 some partial brick. I didn't want to bore you
14 with all the different elevations tonight. We
15 just wanted to give you a sample of the flavor of
16 what the houses will look like.

17 With that I'm going to ask Cage to come
18 and talk a little bit about zoning, a little bit
19 about the topography, and answer any -- kind of
20 address some of the engineering questions.

21 MR. HOREJS: Thanks, Scott.

22 Once, again, I'm Greg Horejs with Cage
23 Civil Engineering. We are the project designer
24 and project manager.

1 THE REPORTER: Would you spell your last
2 name, please.

3 MR. HOREJS: Sure. H-o-r-e-j-s.

4 So I'd like to take a quick minute and
5 talk about the proposed zoning. Mr. Colby touched
6 on this in his staff report here, but what we have
7 shown is a comparison from the existing zoning to
8 the proposed, to what is -- to what we are
9 proposing. The existing zoning west of the
10 platted right-of-way is business commercial, and
11 on the east side we have RM-3 residential zoning.

12 So our original proposal is to adhere to
13 the RM-3 zoning on the east side of that
14 right-of-way; and then on the west side, we would
15 be proposing to rezone the area currently as BC
16 to RM-2.

17 I would like to note that in the staff
18 report, Russell and Rachel's team very astutely
19 pointed out that based on some of the departures
20 that would be required in our proposal from RM-3
21 and RM-2, the more efficient approach would be to
22 actually create a PUD with underlying RM-2 zoning.
23 And therefore that -- we actually are in favor of
24 that as well, and we'll be working closely with

1 staff as we prepare our preliminary submittal.

2 So there are wetland, existing wetland
3 areas, natural resource areas on-site that we will
4 be addressing as part of our project, and you can
5 see the fine solid line delineates the limits of
6 those wetlands.

7 And what we've shown here is the overlay
8 of not only the property boundary but the platted
9 right-of-way, the previously approved
10 right-of-way. We've shown that to highlight the
11 fact that part of -- in conjunction with our
12 proposed residential development, the roadway that
13 is proposed there, the public roadway, collector
14 roadway will also be part of that wetland impact
15 and just something that we'll have to deal with
16 with the mitigation of the overall site.

17 So in our concept plan, our proposal is to
18 handle the mitigation of the wetlands by a
19 combination of on-site mitigation within our
20 proposed stormwater management area in combination
21 with the purchase of offsite banking practice
22 within the local watershed.

23 So we will work to maximize the onsite --
24 the available onsite mitigation to the extent

1 possible; and then whatever balance is remaining,
2 we'll provide in offsite credits.

3 And that's the conclusion of our technical
4 portion of the presentation. Our team, as Joe and
5 Scott mentioned earlier, are here to answer any
6 questions that you guys may have. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Questions?

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have some
9 questions I would ask.

10 So looking at the layout of the project,
11 the first thing that strikes me is there's no area
12 for open space or recreation facilities or parks.
13 Can you tell me a little bit about your plans in
14 that area? Somebody?

15 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. Thank you. That's
16 correct. We don't have any onsite active or
17 passive amenities proposed, which is pretty
18 typical for a community of this size with just a
19 100 -- a little over 100 units. It's very
20 difficult to cover the cost from a homeowners
21 association standpoint to have that, plus in an
22 area that has a lot of access to various retail
23 and other --

24 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So no social
2 spaces, no -- I mean, you do have sidewalks --

3 MR. SHELTON: Yes.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: -- I'm assuming.

5 MR. SHELTON: Yes. We do have public
6 walks, but no other spaces proposed.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. And then can
8 you tell me if there is any kind of a -- did you
9 want to --

10 MR. SEGOBIANO: Yes. I mean, obviously,
11 we would be paying the park donation fees.

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

13 MR. SEGOBIANO: But also there is a matter
14 that we're working on right now. If you see the
15 little leg of the site that goes to the south --

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

17 MR. SEGOBIANO: -- we are -- that
18 really is not -- right now it's platted as a lot.
19 It doesn't make sense for that lot to be that
20 deep. So what we are planning to do is to open
21 discussions with staff and the park district to
22 see if that space does provide any value for open
23 space. At this time we don't know if it will or
24 not, but it is something we've already talked

1 about doing.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It's right along
3 the frontage road there.

4 MR. SEGOBIANO: Yeah. There's that
5 little -- like that little finger that really --
6 we don't need it for detention. That lot does not
7 need it. So it's good space that we can use, and
8 it's high and dry, and there might be decent older
9 mature trees on there, and we can save those trees
10 with that space.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. Thank you.

12 And then on the other side of the -- the
13 southwest side, that little street that leads to
14 nowhere, can you tell me is there any plan for a
15 future -- would you make it wide enough that it
16 could be a through street if that ever came to
17 fruition, if you ever wanted to expand that?

18 MR. SHELTON: Are you referring to this
19 right here?

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

21 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. That's really just --
22 that's really just an alley stem to access the
23 driveways through here. So it's not meant to be a
24 through road into the mall or whatever.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And it never -- I
2 mean, you wouldn't plan for it to ever --

3 MR. SHELTON: I don't think so. That
4 wouldn't be in the plan.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

6 MR. SHELTON: I mean if it became a, you
7 know, safety concern at some point, but it's
8 really just to access those units on the end
9 there.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And I know in the
11 RM-2 zoning requirements you don't have to have
12 the buffer, but would there be any plan for a
13 buffer or fence on the south side behind those
14 townhomes, end homes?

15 MR. SHELTON: I'm sorry?

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Any kind of buffer
17 or fence along the south portion of the project?

18 MR. SHELTON: I don't know that we've
19 looked at that that closely yet. Certainly, we
20 can state that any sort of trees that might be on
21 that, that we would certainly desire to do that.
22 It makes the lots more attractive. But I don't
23 think we've looked that closely to see whether
24 there's an opportunity for sort of additional

1 screening, you know, to the mall there.

2 MR. HOREJS: That's part of our open
3 areas, and we're going to determine the grading in
4 the area to determine if any berming is possible.
5 So that's something that will be evaluated. We're
6 just not prepared to answer that definitively at
7 this point.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. That's all I
9 have right now.

10 MEMBER BECKER: I have some questions.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12 MEMBER BECKER: I'd like you to address
13 the request for a reduced right-of-way street
14 width, to make some comments about that. What's
15 the necessity, and is there any way to accommodate
16 it per ordinance?

17 MR. HOREJS: Yes. In an attempt to
18 achieve the necessary separation between units
19 just because of the configuration of the site and
20 the plan, that the reduced right-of-way width
21 allows us to accommodate that and obtain the
22 necessary side yard setbacks and separation.

23 And that really plays back to the
24 determination that Russell and his team had made

1 in regards to the PUD with underlying RM-2 zoning,
2 but the PUD will allow us to address some of those
3 departures all together with our plan.

4 MEMBER BECKER: So if you're reducing the
5 size of the local street, the way I understand is
6 the townhome portion of the development, will that
7 have any impact on on-street parking for guests or
8 residents?

9 MR. HOREJS: With the reduced right-of-way
10 width, we would still be -- we would still be able
11 to introduce easements outside of the
12 right-of-way. It would essentially -- we're not
13 necessarily proposing a substandard roadway
14 section.

15 MEMBER BECKER: Okay.

16 MR. HOREJS: It's actually just the
17 right-of-way, so the property lines don't --

18 MEMBER BECKER: That makes a big
19 difference. Thank you.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a couple of
21 questions.

22 What's happening to the wetlands? Are you
23 relocating them or --

24 MR. HOREJS: It will be a combination. So

1 our mitigation plan will include onsite mitigation
2 within the proposed stormwater management area and
3 then also the purchase of off-site banking credits
4 as well.

5 There's only so much mitigation that can
6 happen on the site just due to the constraints of
7 the area. We will look to maximize that and to
8 use that as a natural resource amenity with the
9 plan, but then the balance will be provided
10 offsite.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: So are you going to be
12 providing some sort of plantings that are remnants
13 of the wetlands or just a straight detention
14 basin?

15 MR. HOREJS: That would be native
16 plantings that would be in line with the
17 requirements, the Kane County requirements.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Another question, you're
19 not showing all the driveways on the plan. It
20 would be nice to see actually how much driveway is
21 taking up the lot areas; and from looking at the
22 elevations in the homes and townhomes it just
23 seems -- I think there's one elevation that's
24 kind of nice that -- you know, these are smaller

1 homes, so the two-car garage door is kind of
2 overwhelming. So it literally takes up 50 percent
3 of the building facade.

4 So if there's any way that you can
5 downplay that garage door and hopefully downplay
6 the driveway in the front so it doesn't overtake
7 the facade of the house.

8 MR. HOREJS: That's something that we can
9 certainly evaluate further as we get into our
10 design.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: All right.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a question.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: It's in reference to what
15 Jeffrey just asked.

16 You showed, I think, three home models,
17 two of which appear to be front garage and then
18 the larger one with a side entrance into the
19 garage.

20 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. They're all proposed
21 at this point, based on our current layout, to be
22 front entry. That was the best elevation I have
23 of that particular floor plan is -- I only had the
24 side entry. So what you would see there are the

1 two windows that are in front of the garages.

2 These are proposed to be front-entry garages.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: So they'll all be front.

4 MR. SHELTON: Yes.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: As far as the models and
6 the size, do you predetermine that, let's say, the
7 1700-square-foot in certain locations to kind of
8 break up the style; or is it possible that maybe
9 3, 4, 5 of the same model gets built in a row?

10 The reason I'm asking for that is a little
11 bit of my concern is taking a look at a lot of
12 garages, and I understand that with the
13 townhouses, four units, you have some of that; but
14 with the houses, it's kind of a boring-type look
15 unless you have some forced distribution of those
16 models and the type of styles and the repeats and
17 that type of thing.

18 Is that in your plans, or is it buyer of
19 lot 7 wants this particular model, and that's it,
20 and you're going to go with that.

21 MR. SHELTON: That's a good question. We
22 always have an anti-monotony code that we impose
23 upon ourselves if there's not one that is
24 additionally imposed by the jurisdiction that

1 we're building in. So our monotony code would not
2 put the same house and the same elevation next to
3 each other, across the street, and so we would
4 always have a variation that we do that.

5 But what I've only shown you tonight is
6 one example elevation in which there's four or
7 five of each of the different house types. So you
8 end up getting 12, 14, 15 different elevations
9 available to the customer. So in a lot of cases
10 you can have the same floor plan next to each
11 other but a totally different elevation, exterior
12 elevation look on there.

13 So yes, we're mindful of that, but we also
14 don't prescribe, you know, per lot, you know, that
15 lot A will be a 2600-square-foot because of the
16 market. We model kind of middle of the road for
17 the market itself, and then we let the customers
18 choose, of course, monitoring the elevations so
19 that we have appropriate anti-monotony.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think there's some
21 elements, but you're saying it is the side of the
22 garage?

23 MR. SHELTON: It would be a front entry.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Front entry.

1 MR. SHELTON: Yes.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: But what's shown is
3 the side.

4 MR. SHELTON: Yes, sir.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And maybe it's too
6 early to be concerned about this, but the width of
7 the road is it really going to be -- I mean, the
8 fire department is -- always adequate for
9 turnarounds and accessibility.

10 MR. SHELTON: Yes.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm just concerned
12 about it.

13 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. They're not designed
14 to be narrow roads in the sense of not being able
15 to handle the standard emergency vehicles that
16 we'd be having. Of course, we would include that
17 during our engineering, but that is not designed
18 to change those -- the width of the roads.

19 I think as Greg mentioned, the
20 right-of-ways outside of the pavement curb to curb
21 will be slightly smaller.

22 Is that what you were saying?

23 MR. HOREJS: That's correct, yeah.

24 MR. SHELTON: So to handle the standard

1 vehicles that would be required.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. And just on
3 that Lot No. 7 at the top that comes down that we
4 were talking about, that we would possibly have a
5 public area. So do we have a sidewalk in this
6 area? Would you do that?

7 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. We --

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Would there be side
9 lot easements?

10 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. There will end up
11 having to be, you know, some sort of easement.
12 If this ends up being a public area of some kind,
13 then there would need to be an easement created
14 between those two lots for access to the public.
15 Whether it's, let's say, it could be a passive
16 amenity like a dog park or something to that
17 effect. There would need to be an easement for,
18 you know, the homeowners to the neighborhood to be
19 able to access that.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. And at some
21 point in time you're going to do a traffic study?
22 I have some concerns about that, the turn close
23 to the --

24 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. We anticipate that

1 there will need to be an impact study on the
2 traffic, assuming that would be something that
3 would be importance to the group to understand
4 that.

5 You know, I think in some respects by
6 utilizing that access, it may alleviate some
7 congestion that currently goes west, you know,
8 from the homes that are currently north of us. If
9 you go over and come back and go southeast and
10 southwest, it could be a real help.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
13 questions?

14 MS. MELTON: I have a question. So
15 looking at where the houses are going to be, that
16 looks like a thin wall, you know, kind of
17 cul-de-sac dead-end turnaround. So maybe I just
18 don't understand. Jennifer had asked about
19 on-street parking.

20 But it would have to be pretty wide to
21 handle on-street parking and two-way traffic
22 because it's the only way out. You turn in there
23 and you make a mistake and you have to follow the
24 cul-de-sac and come out.

1 I guess the problem would be that, you
2 know, typically cul-de-sac locations are the
3 premium lots, and they're bigger. And you've
4 downsized that, you know, everyone is going to
5 turn off and always be turning around in your
6 cul-de-sac. There's no other way out.

7 MR. SHELTON: Greg, do you want to address
8 that?

9 MR. HOREJS: Yes. As far as the road
10 width and the right-of-way width, the comment that
11 Ms. Becker had earlier was actually in regards to
12 the area of the townhome community. So the
13 single-family area east of Charter One Avenue,
14 actually both the right-of-way and the roadway
15 width are in accordance with the ordinance, the
16 village ordinance so that there is full
17 right-of-way there and full roadway width. So
18 that is the typical village standard.

19 MEMBER MELTON: Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And just to be
21 clear, the roadway widths throughout the proposed
22 development are to code.

23 MR. HOREJS: That's correct.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's just the

1 right-of-way that's --

2 MR. HOREJS: Simply the right-of-way so
3 the area outside of -- behind the back of the
4 curb.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have just a
6 question, clarification for staff. The reason
7 that we need to rezone -- they would need to
8 rezone is the consent decree agreed that the
9 zoning would stay the same regardless if it was a
10 PUD or not; is that correct?

11 MR. COLBY: Well, the existing zoning
12 designations on the property are based on the
13 consent decree. So obviously the BC, the
14 community business portion of the property, that's
15 in conflict with what's being proposed. So at a
16 minimum that portion would have to be rezoned.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because of the
18 consent decree.

19 MR. COLBY: Just because of the proposal
20 based on the land use, it's inconsistent with the
21 zoning district. So it would need to be rezoned
22 regardless.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. And to
24 rezone, you would have to alter the consent

1 decree.

2 MR. COLBY: That's correct. The rezoning
3 would deviate from what was in that decree.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All right.
5 That's all the questions I have. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have some questions.
8 What is the planned bounce for the
9 detention pond? You're showing a high water line.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm sorry. I can't
11 hear you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. We can't hear
13 you.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm sorry.

15 I said for the detention pond, you're
16 showing a high water line, and so what is your
17 anticipated bounce or depth for that?

18 MR. HOREJS: We could say that the
19 range -- the range will most likely be 4 to 6
20 feet, but the final design of those details will
21 be coordinated as we move forward with the design.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: And given the setback
23 from Charter One, it looks like lots 11 and 10
24 don't look really buildable. Because you have a

1 corner side yard and there's a specific setback
2 from Charter One, and it looks like it cuts
3 through almost the middle of lots 10 and 11, or is
4 that just a mistake? I'm just asking.

5 MR. HOREJS: You're referring to the
6 single-family area to the north --

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

8 MR. HOREJS: -- north of Charter One?

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, there's Lot Nos.
10 10 and 11.

11 MR. HOREJS: Yeah. As far as the side
12 yard setbacks, those will all be worked out in
13 accordance with the proposed zoning and PUD.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. And lots 11
15 through 22 running along the east property line of
16 the parcel are substantially deeper than the other
17 single-family lots. Can you explain that?

18 MR. HOREJS: The existing vegetative
19 barrier that exists along that east property line
20 is -- that's why we originally planned for more
21 depth in those lots so we have the flexibility to
22 avoid that, if possible.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. All right. But
24 won't you have to also put in utilities and those

1 kinds of things back there?

2 MR. HOREJS: We will on the lots. We'll
3 have to address the drainage and the utilities,
4 but the locations of those utilities -- the fact
5 that the lots are larger just affords us more
6 flexibility.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: And there's an IBT
8 utility easement noted on the plat. I'm not
9 familiar with that. What is that for?

10 MR. HOREJS: The utilities that are
11 running in that easement -- we're aware of the
12 easement and incorporating that into the planning,
13 but the actual utilities running in that still
14 need to be confirmed in our final design.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. With the
16 single-family homes, will there be -- you said
17 that there could be a potential for slab or
18 basements. Are more of them basements insofar as
19 what you've built given your history with that
20 product?

21 MR. SHELTON: I would say the communities
22 that we've been involved in there are probably
23 more two-thirds basements and a third slabs.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: For the single-family

1 homes.

2 MR. SHELTON: Yes. We haven't
3 finalized -- you know, we may determine, based on
4 the final grade, that we can't do any slabs and we
5 need to do all basements. We haven't finalized
6 the mix of that quite yet.

7 But typically having some flexibility with
8 that, you know, just allows -- we've had some
9 customers that routinely don't even want the
10 basement. In that empty nester demographic, they
11 don't want to deal with a basement, the thought of
12 a basement; and the homes are big enough to
13 provide enough storage for them throughout the
14 home; and in some cases, it's a price point for
15 building for that individual as well.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: And also with the
17 townhomes, do many of them have basements, or do
18 you see most of it's slab on grade?

19 MR. SHELTON: You know, we've done a mix.
20 It really just depends on the price point. I
21 would anticipate that most of these would be
22 basements.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: On the wetlands --
24 you've identified that you have some wetlands,

1 that you're going to potentially do some onsite
2 and some off-site in a bank. Do you know which
3 bank services this as a watershed?

4 MR. HOREJS: Yes. There's an existing
5 bank that is located within this watershed that we
6 are actively corresponding with.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm sorry. Which one
8 is it? Which bank is it?

9 MR. HOREJS: The name of the bank?

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

11 MR. HOREJS: I'm not sure offhand what
12 that is.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. Well, I guess I
14 would encourage more of it to go to the bank than
15 be developed on-site, only from the standpoint
16 that you have 90 units, a smaller --
17 relatively speaking, a relatively small
18 association and even larger associations have
19 trouble with long-term management of wetland
20 systems.

21 They don't understand them. Their boards
22 don't understand them, and they end up year three,
23 four, five years after you're done building,
24 they're pretty much gone because of that.

1 So I realize there's some cost to buying
2 off-site, but there's also a cost to developing
3 onsite, and I think most homeowners associations
4 find it easier to mow grass and do simple things,
5 not manage systems that most people aren't
6 familiar with from an ecology standpoint. I'll
7 let you guys work on that.

8 MR. HOREJS: Yeah. Thank you. We'll
9 evaluate that as we move forward.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: There's an existing
11 overflow from the Charlemagne pond to the
12 northeast corner that's going to come through your
13 property. How is that going to be accommodated?

14 MR. HOREJS: We will need to provide
15 adequate space and potentially even easements or
16 outlots to allow that conveyance through the
17 proposed system.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah. Because it looks
19 like it runs through all the way to the east side
20 to go off-site.

21 MR. HOREJS: Yeah. Most likely it will be
22 a combination of pipe flow and overland flow. So
23 we'll have to plan for adequate space for that.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. On the

1 right-of-way and some of the details you were
2 talking before, so you're actually asking for the
3 street pavement to be reduced by 2 feet, from 33
4 to 31; correct?

5 MR. HOREJS: The pavement width is
6 something that we are going to still evaluate as
7 we move forward, but our proposal, our initial
8 proposal, we are going to reduce the right-of-way.
9 We're requesting to reduce the right-of-way, but
10 we are ideally moving forward with a standard
11 roadway section.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think a 60-foot
13 right-of-way is fine. I would not be comfortable
14 with a 50-foot right-of-way and a 30 foot or 31 or
15 33 pavement cross section. I think once you add
16 the sidewalks, you end up with a parkway area from
17 the back of the curb to the edge of the sidewalk
18 that's basically a 4-foot strip of grass and I
19 don't find that that creates a very good aesthetic
20 from a street right-of-way standpoint.

21 So to the extent that that can be looked
22 at, a 60 foot I think is probably fine because I
23 still think that with a 4 1/2 or 5-foot sidewalk,
24 you end up with an 8- or 9-foot parkway, and I

1 think that's adequate to support the trees that
2 are planted as part of our subdivision
3 requirements; but a 4-foot strip of grass cannot
4 support trees, and I don't think that that would
5 be workable, at least from my perspective for you
6 guys to have a 50-foot right-of-way.

7 You can see it in places. You can see it
8 along King George right over just north of you.
9 They have reduced right-of-ways, and they have no
10 parkway trees at all, just a little strip of
11 grass. And I don't find that a very aesthetic
12 right-of-way presentation despite, you know, the
13 architecture and stuff of the homes.

14 MR. HOREJS: Scott, as far as the
15 programming and the behaviors of your typical
16 residents in your other developments, if you can
17 comment on that. We can work together as we move
18 forward on that.

19 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. I think we'll have
20 to -- I appreciate the feedback. Obviously, we
21 want an aesthetically pleasing community because
22 that helps us sell houses. Pretty much any
23 development we have has the parkway trees there.

24 Quite honestly, I don't have all the

1 widths memorized, but 8 to 9 feet feels a little
2 bit bigger than some of the ones we have, but I'll
3 have to take a look at that more closely. But the
4 desire would be to have a nice streetscape, a nice
5 sidewalk, and walking area aesthetically pleasing.
6 Sure.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Sure. Because I think
8 the park district issue with a lot -- or at least
9 as far as your proposal, the lack of direct open
10 space on this parcel to some degree is offset by
11 the fact that there are -- even though you have to
12 cross Foxfield Drive, there are parks directly to
13 the north, north of Foxfield Drive.

14 So as far as open space, and if you're in
15 an age-targeted market, if there is a need for it,
16 there is some directly across Foxfield Drive, and
17 so I think that probably is okay. Because you
18 guys -- it doesn't appear that you're asking for
19 reductions in the fees to the park and school
20 district; and inclusionary housing, it looks like
21 a basic application. You're including all that.

22 MR. SHELTON: That's right.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: All right. Lot No. 7
24 is kind of like that flag lot. I think Joe talked

1 about that a little bit. You mentioned
2 something -- Joe mentioned something about maybe
3 having the park district take it. I'd say good
4 luck. I doubt that they'd be interested. It's a
5 small parcel. They have big parks directly to the
6 north. I doubt they'd have an appetite for a
7 small piece that they'd have to maintain.

8 Is it a possibility to actually sell that
9 piece to the mall? Because I think they would end
10 up with more benefit for whatever their future
11 plans are. Given the very limited nature of that
12 and the width and the proportions of it, it
13 doesn't seem very useful for you for almost
14 anything. It's just, you know, part of the
15 configuration of the parcel.

16 But it seems like the mall or the entryway
17 there, it would have more value, or whoever is the
18 future developer of the mall would have more value
19 with it and maybe there's a sale or something that
20 could happen there. But I think that should be,
21 as you come forward, you know, you guys can
22 explore your options on how to address that, but
23 it does seem like an piece of land associated
24 currently with Lot No. 7.

1 MR. SEGOBIANO: We agree. We agree.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is the nature of the
3 townhomes going to be always four units, or can
4 you, based on maybe some further redevelopment and
5 stuff like this, look at units of three or five to
6 help address maybe not a unit loss, but a way to
7 address some other options?

8 And that would be -- I think that staff
9 identified the desire for a potential connection
10 to the south to the mall property, and, I think,
11 we've talked about collectively as a group the
12 integration of neighborhoods and things like that.

13 My guess is that the north and east parts
14 of the mall are probably ultimately going to
15 become some sort of a residential development. I
16 don't think we'll have enough retail demand to not
17 see that happen. When that happens, I don't know,
18 but I don't think there will be much.

19 And if this is, in fact, ultimately going
20 to be a residential development, a connection
21 there might be a worthwhile idea from a community
22 standpoint, that that neighborhood connects
23 through, and there's this interconnection of the
24 way people can move. Otherwise, you've kind of

1 isolated everything to the south and to the -- to
2 your west.

3 You are isolating because of the ponds on
4 the west, but the south could have a connection.
5 Whether it's where that alley is now or somewhere
6 along there, I think that would be a worthwhile
7 thing to look at for that.

8 Also there was a request by staff to look
9 at connecting to the Petkus property to the east.
10 Yeah, to the east of you. Is it possible to
11 extend King Henry Lane, which is the street on the
12 far northeast corner, that clip.

13 MR. SHELTON: This here you're saying?

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: No. King Henry Lane is
15 actually almost off the picture. It's at the far
16 north end of your pond. It's on the north side of
17 the street -- right there.

18 MR. SHELTON: Yeah.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: That's King Henry Lane.
20 Is it possible to plan for that to clip the corner
21 of your property, understanding it has a slight
22 impact on your detention pond but I think minimal.
23 So then when the Petkus property comes forward,
24 there would be an opportunity to connect that

1 property to Foxfield Drive. Otherwise, there will
2 never be an opportunity to do that.

3 So far the proposals we've seen from them,
4 it is going -- you know, they're proposing
5 primarily residential. They haven't really
6 brought much forward lately.

7 MR. SHELTON: You're referring to this
8 property here to the east.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah. That's the
10 Petkus property to your east. And it would just
11 be to clip that little corner of your detention
12 pond, which would allow for a right-of-way to then
13 enter into the Petkus property and provide that
14 future connection, again wanting to connect
15 neighborhoods in the future.

16 And since Foxfield Drive is a collector,
17 that would facilitate some things because they
18 obviously have access to Smith Road, but then
19 they'd also have access to Foxfield which would
20 bring them into some retail, you know, like
21 towards Jewel and things like that without having
22 to go out on Smith or Main Street or something
23 like that. So if you could look at that as an
24 option. I think that would have minimal impact on

1 your design.

2 And I would be okay with your geometric
3 request to 100-foot center-line radius. I don't
4 think for these types of streets -- unless there's
5 a major hang-up from the fire department, I think
6 that 100 foot is probably adequate unless they
7 feel otherwise for this kind of a project.

8 I think that ultimately it sounds like
9 you're coming forth with a PUD for any variety of
10 reasons. I think something else to consider,
11 since this is a PUD and you're requesting zoning
12 changes and stuff is will a change to the geometry
13 of Charter One help you in some way? I mean
14 you're redesigning it all anyways.

15 If you just adjusted that geometry,
16 there's going to have to be some amendment --
17 well, it sounds like we're going to have to have
18 an amendment to this consent decree anyways. So
19 why not roll it all up into one thing, and if the
20 geometry adjustment helps your design to maybe not
21 lose units or to make lots more buildable, I think
22 that's a worthwhile thing to consider with
23 obviously the end points really being the most
24 important.

1 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. I think we
2 designed -- attempted to design that keeping the
3 integrity of what was there.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: What was there,
5 understood.

6 MR. SHELTON: Yeah.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: But you're in for all
8 of it anyways. I think if there was some change
9 to the geometry, I can't imagine that that's the
10 kind of thing that becomes the lynchpin to why it
11 won't be approved. I doubt it anyway.

12 And I think that the PUD could be your
13 right process and I would recommend there's -- I'm
14 sure staff can help you identify this if you guys
15 haven't already, and there's a number of things
16 that have to be addressed when you come forward;
17 and I think that there's seven, nine of them that
18 I think will be discussion points for us and for
19 you, assuming that you come back with a
20 preliminary submittal.

21 MR. SHELTON: Yeah.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you.

23 MR. SEGOBIANO: Just one last point. This
24 has been great. I think the feedback that we've

1 gotten is actually more than we thought. The
2 level of detail is more than we thought which is
3 very, very good, very positive. It's great for
4 us.

5 One of the things, though, that is
6 complicating this is the consent decree. So one
7 of the things that I would just ask, you know, the
8 Plan Commission members is if it appears that the
9 use and the density is generally acceptable.
10 That's very important for us to understand,
11 knowing that this is only a concept plan review.

12 But that's important for us to know as we
13 go afford in making decisions because everyone has
14 heard the consent decree will have to be amended,
15 and it will actually need to go back to the Judge.

16 So it's those things that we need to
17 assess. I'm not looking for detail. I'm just
18 looking for general consensus amongst the board
19 members, the Plan Commission members that the use
20 and densities make sense to you. Obviously, the
21 devil is in the details, and we understand that,
22 and we expect that. So we would appreciate that.
23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other

1 questions?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
4 from members of the audience? Sir.

5 MR. GLENN: Good evening, Plan Commission.
6 My name is John Glenn. I live at 820 King Henry
7 Lane, which was recently mentioned. I'm actually
8 the president of the homeowners association of the
9 townhomes, although I'm not speaking on behalf of
10 that association. The board decided not to take a
11 position on this. I'm speaking as the public --
12 as a member of the public.

13 I'm also vice chair of the housing
14 commission, and I'm not speaking in terms of that,
15 but I do appreciate the component funding for the
16 housing commission projects.

17 But I would like to just make some
18 comments in general. I'm also a realtor. I'm
19 very familiar with Ryan Homes. You mentioned some
20 of the other projects. Prairie Ridge is a pretty
21 beautiful development. Highland Woods is a
22 beautiful development. If you build the stuff you
23 built there, I'd be very happy.

24 So there's also a reference to the 2009

1 agreement on the zoning and the consent agreement.
2 So there's a lot of density on this property ever
3 since they built the townhomes around -- just
4 before 2000. There have been probably three or
5 four proposals for this property.

6 I remember the one with apartments which I
7 was in favor of because apartments would have been
8 a great buffer between our townhomes and the mall,
9 which at that point was still alive. But there
10 was a lot of negativity from our residents, and it
11 just didn't happen.

12 So it stayed a field, which is there; and
13 then, of course, we had the Walmart truck -- the
14 Walmart, and I believe that is why the consent
15 agreement because in the wisdom of people making
16 decisions, it would be a good idea to have a west
17 side -- sorry, the east side of this collector
18 street be -- no, the west side near the mall. I
19 forget frankly. But one side to be, I believe, a
20 commercial and one side maybe residential, like
21 apartments. I forget which is which.

22 But when you look at what's going on today
23 in the real estate marketplace, malls are dead.
24 There is no concept in my mind. We don't know who

1 is going to take this mall. It's been attempted
2 three or four times recently, a change of
3 ownership, still no idea of what's going to happen
4 to that property.

5 So in my mind, if there's some residential
6 put in there, it's probably the highest and best
7 use from my point of view, but I know what it is
8 now, which is a nice open field. We know
9 something is going to go there, and I can't
10 imagine anything better quite frankly.

11 So, again, I'm speaking for myself only.
12 You might have some other people on the Zoom call,
13 but I don't know who would be on the Zoom call.
14 But I don't know anybody else from my community in
15 the audience, and I did make them aware of this
16 property -- this meeting in a newsletter last
17 week.

18 So as a townhome owner living on King
19 Henry, I was not particularly in favor of the
20 suggestion of opening up King Henry across the
21 street. King Henry is a very narrow road. I do
22 not want more traffic. One of the things I would
23 look forward to is less traffic because along King
24 Henry, you get into Cornerstone Lakes over to

1 Smith, and you would be able to go straight along
2 King Henry out to Smith wherever they want to go.
3 It's going to be a big reduction in our traffic.
4 So I don't really want Petkus people on our
5 street. That's right on our street, not only the
6 ones being talked about here.

7 So one comment I would make as a townhome
8 association president is with the plan for
9 parking, in this case it may not be as much
10 because it is senior targeted, so they probably
11 are not going to have multiple cars; but
12 oftentimes people have a problem parking --
13 crossing where the driveways are. So any way you
14 can provide enough parking on the street or
15 something like that, that would probably be a good
16 idea.

17 I don't think there's anything else I need
18 to cover. I think the idea of it being what it is
19 is a good idea. I would be interested to -- I
20 think some of my residents would be curious about
21 the pricing of the products since we live across
22 from there, and they're interested in, you know,
23 what's it going to do for our values. So anything
24 you can share on pricing targets on the townhomes

1 and the homes. Is it too early?

2 MR. SHELTON: I can answer your question.
3 I think our initial projections are that the
4 townhomes would likely end up in the low to mid
5 300s, and the single-family homes would end up in
6 the mid to high 300s.

7 MR. GLENN: Thank you.

8 I appreciate the opportunity to speak.
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thanks, John.

11 All right any other questions or comments?

12 MS. HITZEMANN: We've got a couple of
13 e-mails I'd like to read into the record. The
14 first is from Mark Sawyer, and he said:

15 "Dear Mr. Colby,

16 "My name is Mark Sawyer. We live at 3714
17 King George Lane, St. Charles, Illinois 60174.

18 "Thank you. I received your public notice
19 of the upcoming meeting for the subject property.
20 My main concern is the proposed access road,
21 Charter One Avenue, that exits onto Foxfield
22 Drive. I think that would cause a major traffic
23 problem for that intersection and for the portion
24 of Foxfield Drive that continues to Kirk Road.

1 "Perhaps a better location could be
2 considered, such as at the southwest corner of the
3 property where there's an alley located, and that
4 would access onto the service road going past the
5 Jewel store entrance all the way to Foxfield Drive
6 where there is already an intersection.

7 "I can see where that would require
8 repositioning of one of the townhome buildings.
9 Something like this would not only be better for
10 us coming out of King Edward Drive to Foxfield,
11 but it would also be better for the future
12 residents of Oliver-Hoffman subdivision because
13 then they also would have less traffic problems
14 getting out to Highway 64 and Kirk Road.

15 "Thank you for your attention and
16 consideration to this."

17 Then we had another e-mail from Mark
18 Hauser, last name, H-a-u-s-e-r. He asked:

19 "Does the plan include a four-way stop at
20 the intersection of Charter One Avenue/King Edward
21 Drive and Foxfield Drive? If not, that should be
22 part of the recommendation. With the number of
23 cars that currently exceed the 25 mile per hour
24 speed limit on Foxfield Drive, primarily

1 Cornerstone Lakes residents, there are going to be
2 numerous accidents if only the drivers coming off
3 of Charter One or King Edward are required to
4 stop. I would estimate that at least 75 percent
5 of the vehicles driving down Foxfield Drive,
6 school busses included, are exceeding the posted
7 limit by 10 to 15 miles per hour. This is a huge
8 concern."

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
10 Anything further from the applicant?

11 If not, we will go ahead and just
12 summarize our comments. What I'll ask Plan
13 Commissioners is just give a brief statement of
14 your impressions of the concept plan positives and
15 negatives just so they have that to go out with.

16 I think that I'll start it on that end.

17 MEMBER BECKER: Thanks. Well, to start,
18 I'm in favor of building the entire site RM-2. I
19 think that makes the most sense. I still remain
20 concerned about the width of the road. I think
21 we've heard different information about the
22 pavement width and right-of-way at the townhome
23 section. So I'm mainly concerned about that, and
24 hopefully there's a way to address that particular

1 variation request.

2 I don't have a problem with the density,
3 and that is all I really have to say about that.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: I'm actually in favor of
6 the density. My only issues are the design of the
7 homes, that I have an issue with the garage door
8 being -- taking up 50 percent of the facade on the
9 single-family homes. And the townhomes also, a
10 major portion of that facade is all garage door.
11 If there's a way that you can downplay or maybe a
12 similar color or something to kind of make the
13 garage door go away.

14 And then I'd like to see in the next
15 round, you know, what -- the driveway in front,
16 how does that impact the hardscapes and what that
17 would look like, if you'd give us some visuals on
18 that. So that's it.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: I support the overall
21 concept that's presented as well as the request to
22 change the zoning. I think it's appropriate to be
23 able to make that change. I like the idea for
24 King Henry to be able to take a little bit of that

1 corner lot for future consideration as far as an
2 extension of the street.

3 I have a concern on the southern border or
4 those units that are near the mall, and I know you
5 need to take a look at grading and things like
6 that, but I think there needs to be enough of a
7 buffer, have enough consideration for the new
8 homeowners, not knowing what's going to happen
9 with the mall itself, just so that they have some
10 beauty to take a look at.

11 I do have concern with the design of the
12 homes as Jeffrey had said, and I also like the
13 idea that Peter recommended concerning the one lot
14 down in the corner and that land down there. I do
15 agree I don't think the park district is going to
16 be interested. I'm not going to speak for them,
17 but I don't think that they're going to be
18 interested, my personal opinion.

19 And it may be something that you would be
20 able to spin that off to the current mall or to
21 better utilize the property down there and make it
22 advantageous.

23 And one last thing, too, was Peter's
24 suggestion of the contour of the connector road

1 there. Yeah. It's a perfect time to take
2 advantage. You have an entry and an exit and what
3 you do in between. You might as well present. I
4 wouldn't find any object on my part -- objection.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: There's not much left
6 for me to say, but I would say this, that I am
7 comfortable with the overall project. I think
8 it's going to be an asset to the City.

9 I'm concerned about the road width, and I
10 think as things move forward, it will have more
11 definition, at least for me. And the concern
12 comes up all the time with intersections or a
13 dispute to try to have the width. Possibly a
14 traffic study would give us some clues about that.

15 So overall, I'm comfortable with it, and I
16 encourage you to move forward.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm in favor of
19 the type of development and the density. I am not
20 particularly concerned about the roadway
21 right-of-way. I am about the pavement width.

22 I can think of many communities I've been
23 in everywhere where, you know, parkway trees may
24 or may not be there, and it depends on the design

1 of the homes, if you have a good urban look.

2 I do believe strongly that the alley, the
3 20-foot alley should be stubbed as retention of a
4 future roadway. We have spent a lot of time in
5 every development we talk about with connectivity.

6 I don't believe that that connection is
7 really going to flip a corner of this property as
8 much as I'd like to see a connection there. There
9 may be another way to do that, but to do a
10 straight across connection into a narrow
11 neighborhood may not be the best idea. And
12 whatever you do with that little flag piece is up
13 to you.

14 MEMBER MELTON: I like -- like the other
15 commissioners, I like the project. I'm fine with
16 the density, fine with the layout. I would say,
17 though, with the exception that I would like to
18 see more social spaces. When I think about an
19 age-targeted community, they're home during the
20 day, and they like to go for walks. So just kind
21 of encouraging that. I think that would be more
22 attractive to them.

23 You know, I agree with the other comments
24 about the buffer towards the mall and the

1 connections that have been discussed. So I don't
2 want to repeat everything, but I am in agreement
3 with everything that's been said.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. I do support
5 the concept and the density and the zoning. I do
6 agree with Jeff in terms of the garages in the
7 front. It's also not always the prettiest thing,
8 and it does create some monotony. And I think you
9 did a good job with the layout and the connector
10 road. So I have no problem with that.

11 The frontage road along the mall isn't
12 very pretty. So I do think that a buffer or some
13 kind of fencing would be necessary on the south
14 side of the project, and that's about it.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm really happy that
16 somebody is coming forward to look at this
17 property in earnest, and so thank you for doing
18 that. I really don't have much to add to what
19 other people said. I think I've already voiced
20 all of my thoughts or concerns or suggestions
21 related to the site development.

22 I think one last thing that as a public
23 kind of entity and as we look at how we travel
24 through our community, if you look at the geometry

1 of Foxfield Drive and your units, you're going to
2 have multiple townhome buildings and a number
3 of -- probably about a third to half of your
4 single-family homes where the back of them will be
5 very visible either from Foxfield Drive or from
6 the new street that connects to the road.

7 So I think that that rear elevation -- all
8 we've seen is the front elevations, and I've not
9 visited any of your products. I think the rear
10 elevation will be important because they will have
11 a very public presence when the project is built
12 independent of whatever landscaping and street
13 trees and those kinds of things that go in.

14 I'm sure you're not going to be planting,
15 you know, 10-foot evergreens and 4-inch caliper
16 trees. So I think seeing the backs of those homes
17 and what that looks like will be important as a
18 community presence.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Yeah.

20 MR. GLENN: John Glenn. I'd like to just
21 latch on to that concept of visuals and the trees.

22 So one thing that is beautiful when you
23 drive home on Foxfield from the west and the Jewel
24 area is the line of trees on the right all the way

1 along the pond of Charlemagne, and then the kind
2 of trees along the lot that you would be
3 developing to the left of the street, the new
4 street. And then, of course, we have the open
5 field, but it also has a nice line of park line
6 trees. So I guess my request would be try to
7 maintain that tree line as much as you can.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't think there's
10 anything I have to add. I'll just emphasize I
11 agree with what John just said tonight.

12 I also agree with the comment that was
13 made by e-mail about the necessity for some type
14 of a traffic control device on Charter One and
15 Foxfield. Whether it's a four-way stop, I don't
16 know, but I know from experience that that's kind
17 of a raceway there. So that would be nice,
18 especially if you have increased traffic, which
19 I'm sure there will be some.

20 And the other thing I'll second is the
21 necessity for social areas and pedestrian
22 centered, you know, features within the
23 development. I think certainly those are
24 important.

1 And finally, although none of us know
2 what's going to be happening to the south, you
3 know, certainly I would keep in mind future
4 connectivity for whatever goes in. I don't know
5 vehicular connectivity, but at least, you know,
6 pedestrian.

7 So but all in all, thank you. You put
8 together a good plan, and I look forward to seeing
9 you again.

10 MR. SHELTON: Yeah. I just want to say
11 thanks. The feedback has been great, very
12 helpful. Look forward to be back in front of you.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

14 All right. That concludes Item No. 5.

15 Any additional business?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. You all
18 have the weekly development report, meeting
19 announcements. We have several. The November 3rd
20 meeting -- the November 3rd meeting is election
21 night, election day. Are we planning on canceling
22 the meeting on that day?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes, we typically do not have
24 Plan Commission meetings on election days.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We're not having
2 one.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any public
4 comment?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion to adjourn?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

10 (Ayes heard.)

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
14 Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

15 (Off the record at 8:15 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 27th day of September, 2020.

My commission expires: May 16, 2024



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois