

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2020**

Members Present: Chairman Wallace (7:30)
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

Vice Chair Kessler 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 August 4, 2020 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Ms. Becker, seconded by Ms. Purdy and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the August 4, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.

**5. Anthony Place Phase 2 (GC Housing Development LLC)
Application for Concept Plan**

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

**6. Munhall Glen (Court Airhart, Airhart Construction Corp.)
Application for Zoning Map Amendment
Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
a. Public Hearing**

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

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, September 9, 2020
Page 2

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Ms. Purdy to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

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

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried 9-0

b. Discussion & Recommendation

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the Zoning Map Amendment, Special Use for Planned Unit Development, and PUD Preliminary Plan subject to: 1) The South Ave. connection shall be a full public access; and 2) Resolution of staff comments prior to City Council action.

Roll call vote:

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

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried 9-0

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

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

c. Plan Commission

Tuesday, September 22, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

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

d. Planning & Development Committee

Monday September 14, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, October 12, 2020 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

10. Public Comment

11. Adjournment at 8:26 p.m.



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

Transcript of Anthony Place Phase 2

Date: September 9, 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: :
Regular Meeting including :
Application for Concept Plan; :
Anthony Place Phase 2 :
(GC Housing Development LLC). :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Wednesday, September 9, 2020
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 313830A
Pages: 1 - 27
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Anthony Place Phase 2
Conducted on September 9, 2020

4

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Welcome. The
3 meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission is now
4 in order. I'll take the roll.

5 Becker.

6 MEMBER BECKER: Here.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

16 MEMBER MELTON: Here.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

18 MS. HITZEMANN: I think Commissioner Funke
19 is joining us via zoom.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I'm here.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke here.

22 Thank you.

23 Item 3 on our agenda is the Pledge of
24 Allegiance. For those whose wish to do so,

Transcript of Anthony Place Phase 2
Conducted on September 9, 2020

5

1 please rise.

2 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Item 4 on our agenda
4 is presentation of the minutes of the August 4th,
5 2020, meeting. Is this a motion to approve?

6 MEMBER BECKER: So moved.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

9 (Ayes heard.)

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. No. 4 --
11 I'm sorry -- No. 5 on our agenda is Anthony Place
12 Phase 2 (GC Housing Development LLC) Application
13 for a Concept Plan.

14 And we have a presenter. Very good. We
15 have a court reporter here, so state your name and
16 address.

17 MR. PATZELT: Okay. For the record, my
18 name is David Patzelt, P-a-t-z-e-l-t, from the
19 Shodeen Family Property Company, 77 North First
20 Street, Geneva, Illinois 60134.

21 Good evening. For the record, we are the
22 current property owner, and we are working with
23 GC Housing Development, LLC. GC Housing Development,
24 LLC, you may be familiar with. They are the same

1 developers of the senior affordable unit building
2 that was built in the St. Charles Prairie Centre
3 more or less east of Dominick's along Prairie Street.

4 So this evening I have -- or we have chosen
5 again to work with them to do a second building.
6 The first one that's in the St. Charles Prairie
7 Centre is 100 percent occupied, and we had a good
8 relationship with them working on the same building.
9 Again, Shodeen is not the owner of that building,
10 but we were the owner of that property, and it
11 will be the same here; we plan to sell the property
12 to them for them to develop a second building,
13 Senior, age-restricted, affordable, 75 units, more
14 or less identical to the building on the north.

15 So this evening with me is Chealon from
16 GC Development. What I'd like Chealon to do is
17 walk you through both the photographs you'll see
18 tonight and walk you both through the existing
19 building, Anthony Place 1 as we know it, as well
20 as walk you through Anthony Place 2, which again
21 would be a sister building and almost identical to
22 Anthony Place 1.

23 So with that I'll let Chealon come up and
24 present the actual project.

1 MS. SHEARS: Thank you, David. My name is
2 Chealon Shears. First name is spelled C-h-e-a-l-o-n,
3 as in "Nancy"; Shears S-h-e-a-r-s. And I represent
4 GC Housing Development, LLC, and Crane Construction
5 Property, LLC, and our address is 343 Wainwright,
6 W-a-i-n-w-r-i-g-h-t, Drive in Northbrook, Illinois
7 60062.

8 Thank you, Commission.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Before you get started, if
10 you don't mind -- I'm having a little difficulty
11 hearing. So if you talk a little closer to the
12 microphone, that would be helpful. I'd appreciate
13 it. Thank you.

14 MS. SHEARS: Is this better?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Much better.

16 MS. SHEARS: All right. Thank you,
17 Commission. As Dave mentioned, I represent
18 GC Housing Development/Crane Construction Company,
19 and as he mentioned -- I'll go to the next slide --
20 we have just finished construction on Anthony Place
21 at Prairie Centre, and we were able to open the
22 property in early July, and fortunately we are --
23 had successful lease-up. Our residents are very
24 happy.

1 The building itself does include 75 units.
2 It is a four-story structure, and as Dave mentioned,
3 it is an independent senior community for seniors
4 that do have restricted incomes. Building amenities
5 include on-site property management, indoor parking,
6 a community room kitchen, fitness room, computer
7 room, library room, and you can see that from the
8 photos in the slide.

9 Within the units themselves, which you'll
10 see in the next slide in a little bit closer
11 detail, some of the unit amenities include modern
12 appliances, washers and dryers, walk-in closets.
13 The two-bedroom units do have an actual full
14 balcony. As I just mentioned, in this slide you
15 can see a closer detail of some of the amenities
16 that I mentioned that will be in the units.

17 What we are presenting tonight, as Dave
18 mentioned earlier, is that we are interested in
19 moving forward in developing and constructing a
20 second phase of Anthony Place. So what we see here
21 is a conceptual rendering of what we envision that
22 this potential property will look like on the site.

23 As I mentioned, Anthony Place Phase 2 units
24 would be similar to the Anthony Place at Prairie

1 Centre. It will be 75 units, four-story structure,
2 and like Prairie Centre, this will also be an
3 independent senior affordable residential community.
4 Like our other properties -- we do have other
5 properties in Glendale Heights, Yorkville, and
6 Ottawa. This will be a combination of private and
7 public investment for this development.

8 What we are coming to the Commission
9 tonight to request is two-part. The first request
10 is approval of our concept plan so we could move
11 forward in getting a special use application and
12 PUD preliminary application to the St. Charles
13 Commercial Center PUD to allow multifamily
14 residential use and any applicable zoning standards.

15 Our second part of our request is a request
16 for development cost offset which involves waiver
17 of applicable development fees and partner school
18 fees.

19 As you see from the proposed site plan that
20 you have in front of you, again, we are proposing
21 this to be a 75-unit four-story structure. We also
22 plan to include 82 parking spaces, which 70 would
23 be indoor garage spaces, and the balance would be
24 service parking. Doing initial general assessment

1 of the site, utilities such as water, sewer,
2 electrical, sanitation, stormwater management,
3 those are in place, and they run up to the site,
4 and we do feel that those utilities in place will
5 have adequate capacity in order to service our
6 proposed use.

7 The site itself is about 4.31 acres. In
8 partnering with Shodeen the plan is to take that
9 4.31 acres and divide it into three parts or
10 three lots, so lots A, B, and C. What you see in
11 front of you is our proposed development sitting
12 on Lot B. The site itself, it is located just
13 south of Lincoln Highway north of Bricher Avenue
14 and east of Randall Road.

15 Lot B, in which we'd like to place our
16 proposed site out of that lot, itself would be
17 about 1.55 acres in size. What is also nice about
18 the central property is that along Lincoln Highway
19 there are a few Pace route stops, and so that is a
20 nice amenity for those residents that would be
21 living here that would need to rely on public
22 transportation.

23 What we also believe is very positive to
24 the development is that it does align with certain

1 facets within the West Gateway Subarea Plan. We
2 feel that our potential project aligns with this
3 plan in the sense that it will increase the
4 potential for surrounding businesses, it will not
5 compromise the character of the commercial corridor,
6 and the potential project will not require any
7 participation from any other property managers
8 adjacent to the site.

9 So we thank you for your time, and I'm more
10 than happy to answer any questions you may have.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a question
13 regarding parking. Since you're leased up at the
14 existing facility at Prairie Centre, how has the
15 parking worked out as far as the number of spaces
16 that are used in the building versus the service
17 spaces? Because you seem to have less service
18 spaces at the proposed site than you do at the
19 existing site.

20 MS. SHEARS: So at our current site the
21 parking garage itself, it's well utilized. There
22 are some additional spaces in the garage because
23 not every resident has a vehicle. And as far as
24 the service parking in front of our building at

1 Prairie Centre, there are ample spaces; not all
2 the spaces are utilized.

3 So we could reassess the amount of parking
4 if the Commission thinks that's something we need
5 to look at, but we believe there will be ample
6 parking for a senior community.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right now visitors can
8 certainly use the spaces that are outside your
9 current building, but in the new site plan you will
10 only have like 12, 14 service spaces. So even if
11 residents aren't using it, you have 14 spaces for,
12 in theory, 75 units.

13 As far as visitors or family members coming
14 for a visit, or if somebody was needing some sort
15 of assistance temporarily even though it's
16 independent living, so if they had a caregiver or
17 somebody coming by, there's very limited service
18 parking because I assume you're not going to allow
19 visitors or other workers to use the indoor parking.

20 So I'm a little concerned about the number
21 of service spaces that are being allocated because
22 of that.

23 MS. SHEARS: So if we are allowed to move
24 forward in submitting the application to planning

1 and development, that is definitely a feature that
2 we will definitely go back and take a look at and
3 see if we can make better accommodations for the
4 site.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: The site looks pretty
6 tight. I realize that Shodeen is trying to
7 subdivide it for future users, too, but I think
8 that -- you're first, so that gives you some -- in
9 my view some leeway to be able to have more land
10 to address those potential parking issues.

11 Understanding that there's some retail to
12 the west a bit, but unless there's a true shared
13 parking arrangement, that's not really a solution
14 if some of that retail is not using all the
15 parking that's there right now.

16 MR. PATZELT: On the site plan that you
17 see in front of you we anticipate that what I'm
18 going to call the outlots to the north, that that
19 would further develop and that there would be
20 parking on that drive aisle, that east/west drive
21 aisle with parking stalls to the north.

22 And as we did at St. Charles Prairie Centre,
23 we have a cross-access agreement -- cross-access
24 parking that should they have an overflow or have

1 the need for some parking spaces such as, you know,
2 during the day visitors show up that we again will
3 have that same cross-access agreement for parking
4 on both sides of that east/west drive aisle. Those
5 spaces probably -- or will not be added until such
6 time as that lot further develops north of the
7 building.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Even though this is a
9 concept plan, I think that in general that's fine.
10 I think executionwise, not knowing when you would
11 sell the lots to the north, I think we would have
12 to have assurances that that parking could be
13 built anyway if there was a need. You're asking
14 for shared access and that's fine; I don't have
15 any problem. Overparking is not the solution,
16 either, but I think there should be adequate
17 parking to address the needs whether it had to be
18 built in construction of the development of the
19 lot to the north or ahead of that and then that
20 just gets sorted out exactly who pays for what
21 later.

22 MR. PATZELT: As Chealon said, we'll take
23 a further look at that and try to address it when
24 we come back for preliminary plan approval.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Anything?

3 MEMBER MELTON: I just have one quick
4 question. Is this a stand-alone building, or are
5 they sharing amenities with the other building
6 across the street?

7 MS. SHEARS: This will be a stand-alone
8 building.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. This
10 is Jeff Funke. The retention for the site, is
11 that on the south side of the property? How is
12 the retention handled?

13 MR. PATZELT: Yes, there's an existing
14 stormwater basin located directly south of the
15 subject property -- or subject building site.
16 That detention basin was constructed -- a portion
17 of it was constructed with the original Dominick's
18 shopping center that was built there, and then at
19 the time that the Randall Road outlots and the
20 Fairfield Inn were developed that basin then was
21 expanded to not only allow for the stormwater
22 detention for those improvements but, in essence,
23 was built to its full capacity for development of
24 the entire site from the Lincoln Highway to

1 Bricher Road and Bricher Road on the east to
2 Randall Road on the west. So currently the basin
3 is sized for the entire development.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. And the subdivision
5 of the lots, is that included in this proposal?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We're reviewing a
7 concept plan, and subdivision of the lots would be
8 included in an application in the future.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Again, my question would be
10 on the south lot that that Lot A that was discussed,
11 what do they anticipate going in that lot? Do
12 they have any ideas of what that would bring in
13 the future?

14 MR. PATZELT: Currently no plans.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Jennifer.

16 MEMBER BECKER: That ties into my comment
17 that I concur with staff's recommendation to leave
18 the underlying BR zoning. With the uncertainty
19 surrounding the ultimate development plans of the
20 lots to the north and the south, I think it makes
21 sense to move in that direction.

22 And Commissioner Funke asked my other
23 question about the ultimate land use of that
24 southerly lot which really all ties into the

1 ultimate zoning of the property. So it's a
2 comment, not a question.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

4 I have a couple questions. Specifically,
5 this may be to staff, the first one.

6 The request -- the future request for the
7 inclusionary housing cost offset is significantly
8 more than what the ordinance calls for with the
9 80 units in a development this size. Is it
10 something that has been done in the past, or is it
11 possible to waive the entire inclusionary housing
12 fee and then again also on the school and park
13 land cash?

14 MR. COLBY: Sure. I can respond to that.
15 So the City's inclusionary housing ordinance which
16 is part of the City code identifies the development
17 cost offsets as being available for any required
18 affordable units within a project. So within a
19 residential project there's a certain percentage
20 of required affordable units. The fees applicable
21 to those units would be waived, and that includes
22 all of the City's building permit fees, utility
23 connection fees, and school and park land cash fees
24 that would typically apply to a residential unit.

1 So the request that's being made is to
2 apply that same offset to the entire project based
3 on all the units being planned as affordable. The
4 code right now does not allow for that. It's
5 possible that it could be considered either through
6 a PUD request or else through some type of code
7 amendment to allow that, but there is precedent
8 for waiving all of those fees for required
9 affordable units.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I have to ask,
11 you mentioned at the outset that it was a
12 public/private project. Is that the public
13 portion that you're referring to, or is there some
14 other funding?

15 MS. SHEARS: So our anticipated main funding
16 source would be from the Illinois Housing
17 Development Authority in the form of housing tax
18 credits and a possible subordinate loan.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you. And
20 then the other question I had or what I wanted
21 some feedback on is, you know, the land use in
22 compatibility with the surrounding development.
23 And I think we've spoken a little bit about that
24 and how -- you know, Commission Funke brought up,

1 you know, what impact it would have on any future
2 development, which we don't know of any right now,
3 but does this fit in the area that it's located.

4 It's all commercial around it, all zoned
5 BR, it's part of the PUD, it could be easily
6 changed, but is that use -- is it compatible with
7 those commercial developments along there?

8 MS. SHEARS: So we're hoping that that
9 type of guidance has already been detailed in the
10 subarea plan where it does detail that the
11 potential use could be a compatible use for the
12 surrounding businesses within what's detailed
13 within that plan.

14 MR. PATZELT: And I would further comment
15 I think that from a land use standpoint we often
16 hear about the entire Randall Road corridor where
17 there's from land planners this idea or concept
18 that the retail component is along the Randall
19 Road corridor but there's not been -- there's not
20 any density for rooftops whereby people can literally
21 walk to the retail or restaurant components along
22 Randall Road.

23 So, again, philosophically there's been
24 this discussion about introducing higher density

1 along the entire Randall Road corridor not just in
2 St. Charles but all the way from I-88 to 90. And
3 I think that that concept and that idea comes
4 along from the idea of the mixed use component or
5 bringing density next to a retail component. And
6 where I think this is a good use is it brings
7 those residents up against the retail component as
8 well as, I'm going to call it a buffer or
9 transition to the residential component to the
10 south, albeit into Geneva but still into that land
11 use where you have a multifamily two- and three-
12 story building component, then you have this four-
13 story residential component transitioning to the
14 retail.

15 So I think it's a good place for the
16 residents so that they can use those goods and
17 services that are within walking distance, and
18 it's also good for those retailers to have those
19 residents close by to be using those retail and
20 restaurant services.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any other questions
22 from the Commissioners?

23 (No response.)

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We do have an email

1 that we received that I wanted to read in, and
2 it's from Peggy Gilgallon, G-i-l-g-a-l-l-o-n. And
3 she says -- it was sent on Tuesday, September 8th --
4 "I am against the apartments due to additional
5 traffic the apartments will bring to the area.
6 Bricher Road is already becoming very congested as
7 more business establishments are moving into the
8 area you are proposing to build. Thank you, Peggy
9 Gilgallon." And I just wanted to make sure that
10 that was included in the information.

11 So any comment or questions from the public?

12 (No response.)

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Seeing none, I'd
14 ask the Commissioners -- this is an application
15 for a concept plan, and it would be appropriate
16 for Plan Commissioners to give any feedback they
17 have to the applicant as to what you have in front
18 of you.

19 So who wants to go first?

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'll go first. I
21 think it's a very attractive. From what you've
22 presented, it looks very nice, and clean, and
23 neat, and tight. I'm glad that you're providing a
24 cross access because I think that's very important.

1 And some of the things that we talked about
2 with Prairie Centre is to make sure that -- where
3 it's applicable to make sure that it's landscaped.
4 I don't know how much of that your company will
5 get involved with, but I think it's very important,
6 as I'm sure some of the other Commissioners will
7 probably talk about.

8 I do agree with the parking. If there are
9 visitors, cleaning ladies, anything like that,
10 there's not going to be enough parking. Because
11 if it is for an older demographic, there are going
12 to be those issues where there's nurses possibly
13 coming in, or cleaning ladies, or things like
14 that. So I do think that there needs to be more
15 parking.

16 But other than that, I think it's a very
17 attractive and necessary development.

18 MS. SHEARS: Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Go ahead.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes, I have to agree
21 with her. I think it's a good fit. I travel that
22 road often, Bricher Road and Randall. I'm glad to
23 see the property is being developed. I think it
24 fits well with the high-density housing south of

1 Bricher. I think it fits well and I am encouraged
2 by it. High density is an issue, but you've
3 offered solutions to that, and I hope to see that
4 come to pass. So that's all I have to say.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Jennifer.

6 MEMBER BECKER: I think it is an appropriate
7 transitional land use. A couple comments also.
8 I'd just like to make sure to support the
9 pedestrian -- underlying pedestrian use to make
10 sure that there's adequate crosswalks and sidewalks
11 so that those types of movements are facilitated
12 both to the surrounding property owners and then
13 along that frontage road, which I'm not sure the
14 name of it. But if you're going to tout it as
15 pedestrian friendly, make sure that that
16 infrastructure is there.

17 MS. SHEARS: Thank you.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Go ahead.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I have nothing new to add
20 to what's already been said. I would say that
21 with the recommendations and some of the concerns
22 that are presented, if those are addressed, as you
23 come back I would have no difficulty with
24 supporting the concept that you have there.

1 MS. SHEARS: Thank you.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Commissioner Funke. I also
3 don't have issue with the use. I do have issue
4 with the proximity to the property line and to the
5 street, if there's a way that you can create a
6 larger setback.

7 And I do have an issue with that Lot A.
8 My concern would be for the future use, how do you
9 access that lot, and it seems like there would be
10 only one way to access that lot from the north.
11 How do you exit that? How do you create a viable
12 development in that lot?

13 And then it would be nice to see, you know,
14 outdoor spaces for the building for the tenants,
15 some sort of outdoor terraces or something that
16 they can utilize as an amenity.

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

18 MS. SHEARS: Thank you.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would just say that
20 as a use that I am comfortable with the use from
21 the standpoint of how it supports adjacent retail.
22 But then along that line as some of the other
23 Commissioners have mentioned, beyond my earlier
24 comments about parking I think addressing

1 pedestrian movements especially for people who are
2 going to in theory move a bit slower so that they
3 have crosswalks, safe passage to the front of the
4 buildings even adjacent to the west and for those
5 that care to have the energy and venture to be
6 able to cross 38. Realizing that there's a light
7 there, but if there's not adequate sidewalks to
8 get there, then you're requiring people to walk in
9 a parking lot, which for all practical purposes is
10 not the best. So I think that finding some way to
11 address that as part of this task that you guys
12 can start here.

13 MS. SHEARS: Thank you.

14 (Chairman Wallace joined the proceedings.)

15 MEMBER MELTON: I would agree with all the
16 comments that have been made about parking and
17 everything. I also agree with Commissioner Funke
18 that it would be nice to have some sort of outdoor
19 space for folks to come outside and sit and get
20 some fresh air since they don't have a back yard
21 anymore. So that would be nice to see.

22 MS. SHEARS: Thank you.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I'll just
24 comment I agree with everything that's been said.

1 I think it's an appropriate land use. I'm thrilled
2 to hear that the building in Prairie Centre is
3 full. I'm thrilled to hear that all of the units
4 are affordable. I think it's important to -- as
5 much as we try to get young people to stay in the
6 communities, it's important to keep our aging
7 population here, as well.

8 Anything else?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
11 concludes Item 5 on the agenda. Thank you.

12 (Off the record at 7:31 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, 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 15th day of September, 2020.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Munhall Glen

Date: September 9, 2020

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Munhall Glen (Court Airhart, :
Airhart Construction Corp.), :
Application for Zoning Map :
Amendment, Special Use for :
Planned Unit Development, and :
PUD Preliminary Plan. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Wednesday, September 9, 2020
7:32 p.m.

Job No.: 313830B
Pages: 1 - 47
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item No. 6 is Munhall Glen
3 (Court Airhart, Airhart Construction Corp.) We have
4 application for zoning map amendment, application
5 for special use for planned unit development, and
6 application for PUD preliminary plan.

7 This is a public hearing, and the
8 Commission will hear comments in support of or
9 against the application, and once the Plan Commission
10 feels they have enough evidence to make a
11 recommendation to the City Council's Planning and
12 Development Committee, we'll close the public
13 hearing and take action on the item.

14 Anyone who is here who wishes to offer
15 testimony, I would ask you be sworn in. Please
16 raise your hand.

17 (Witness sworn.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
19 And when you speak, if you could just stand at the
20 lectern, state your name and address for the
21 record, spell your last name.

22 MR. AIRHART: Would you mind if I take
23 this off?

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, no, that's fine.

1 Any questions regarding our procedure?

2 MR. AIRHART: No, other than I don't want
3 to screw something up on this. This is not our
4 project; I don't want to hit a wrong button.

5 Perfect. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

7 MR. AIRHART: My name is Court Airhart,
8 C-o-u-r-t A-i-r-h-a-r-t with Airhart Construction.
9 Address is 500 East Roosevelt Road in West Chicago,
10 Illinois 60185.

11 Thanks for letting me be here tonight.

12 Again, my name is Court Airhart. I'm here with
13 Mark Glassman, my partner, Airhart Construction.
14 We're here to talk about Munhall Glen residential
15 development. We were here earlier this year
16 talking about a concept plan; we're here for
17 formal preliminary applications.

18 I'll spend a little bit of time on just a
19 short background, Airhart Construction's similar
20 project experience on similar construction which I
21 think is germane to the development that we're
22 doing, the selected location, area amenities,
23 zoning, transitional nature and the surrounding
24 uses, our neighborhood plan, as well as house

1 designs.

2 We are a second generation company. We've
3 been building in the Kane and DuPage area for
4 approximately a little over 55 years now, and as
5 what I would call a local builder, we're very
6 interested in meeting area housing needs whatever
7 those may be. As we look at properties, this is
8 something that we focus on, and we feel that this
9 property would be perfect for single-level living
10 or story and a half meeting an empty nester
11 segment, double-income-no-kids, that type of
12 housing, maybe early retirees.

13 As a part of this, we have been building
14 this type of housing. Two projects specifically
15 that are similar to this, one is called Fisher Farm. We're
16 actually just starting construction on the last
17 home in the 71-lot development. This is in
18 Winfield. These are premier series homes, and
19 they're small lots. Snow removal/landscaping is
20 taken care of. This again is an age-targeted
21 neighborhood similar to what we're proposing for
22 Munhall Glen but specifically not age restricted.

23 Another project that we're doing right now
24 is called Stafford Place. This is in Warrenville.

1 Actually, I went through an RFP process with the
2 City of Warrentville and was awarded the project,
3 and the center portion of this is where we built
4 some garden homes which are very similar to some
5 of the housing that we're proposing for Munhall
6 Glen, as well. Those were ranches and first-floor
7 master bedroom houses. In fact, our current model
8 is there, and if you want to stop by and see what
9 we do, this is a great example of what we do and
10 what we would propose for Munhall Glen.

11 Munhall Glen is on the east side of the river
12 in St. Charles just south of Main Street/Route 64
13 and is at the intersection of Tyler and Munhall
14 Avenue. One of the things whenever we look at
15 projects we really do look at how we can fit into
16 a community. We've been around for 55 years; we
17 care about what we do; we want something to last.
18 We have second- and third-time buyers, and so it's
19 very important to us as we evaluate and look, and
20 we think this is a perfect location for a project
21 such as Munhall Glen.

22 There's a variety of parks in the area as
23 well as very good traffic circulation from Tyler,
24 a major collector onto Route 64/Main Street

1 corridor which gives easy access to downtown
2 shopping district in St. Charles, which a lot of
3 people are interested in, as well as the
4 Pottawattomie golf course and the park and Boy
5 Scout Island, as well. The Fox River trail is
6 something that we very much love. We love trails;
7 we love giving our buyers, our residents in our
8 neighborhoods outdoor opportunities, and we think
9 this is a fantastic amenity. I'll be talking
10 about that a little bit as well as Mt. St. Mary's
11 Park.

12 The property is currently zoned two
13 classifications; there's a portion of it that's
14 RS-4, and a portion of it is zoned M-2. We would
15 be requesting a rezoning to RS-4. We feel that
16 this is a very transitional area, and residential
17 in this area makes a lot of sense. There are some
18 small private professional offices that actually I
19 think have a strong residential character to them
20 to the east. To the south is all RS-4 residential.
21 To the west there's an RT-3 residential, as well
22 as a St. Charles municipal storage facility.
23 There is some mixed use/warehouse at the northeast
24 corner for those who enjoy CrossFit there that may

1 be part of our buyer group. And then there's a
2 rail line and a potential linear park to the north
3 which I think would be a fantastic amenity if this
4 was developed at some point in the future as a
5 linear park.

6 Our site plan consists of 50 homes. Because
7 of the shape of the property we're actually
8 proposing two different specific lot shapes. One is
9 very similar to what we did in Fisher Farm, that's
10 why I brought that up, our premier series, and the
11 other is very similar to what we're doing in
12 Stafford Place, which are garden home series.
13 They allow for different depths and sizes of yards
14 which works with the shape of this property.
15 That's why we're proposing two different lot shapes.

16 Some of the highlights, we have some open
17 space to the north as well as to the southeast at
18 the entrance to the property. In the southeast
19 corner we do have a naturally landscaped stormwater
20 basin, as well as a water quality BMP basin. In
21 addition to all of our neighbors, we look at what
22 our buyers want and what buyers in this category
23 want. They're looking for opportunities for
24 walking. We'll have sidewalks throughout this

1 neighborhood, which we believe is really important.
2 In addition to that, we also think that it's
3 important to have some neighborhood connection
4 areas. So at the entrance at the south end we'll
5 actually put in a neighborhood connection area in
6 which there will be some benches and some
7 landscaping and actually will allow for people to
8 kind of look over the water quality BMP if they're
9 out for a walk and they can bump into friends.

10 At the north end there is a larger
11 naturally landscaped detention basin as well as a
12 water quality BMP basin. Again, looking for those
13 opportunities for residents to get outdoors, we do
14 plan to put in a path now in anticipation that
15 something may be happening in 5, 10, 15 years, if
16 a path would ever be put along the north side
17 there, we think it's appropriate to put that in
18 now. It also gives people access back to the
19 community detention basin.

20 In addition, overlooking the water quality
21 BMP basin we're putting another neighborhood
22 connection area. Again, some park benches, small
23 seating area that people if they're out for a walk
24 could take a rest or connect with neighbors.

1 All of this would be taken care of through
2 a homeowners association, and our plan is at this
3 point, as well, to include landscape maintenance
4 and snow removal for the houses. We have that
5 both in Fisher Farm and in Stafford Place, and our
6 residents really do enjoy that. It doesn't mean
7 they cannot garden on their lot, but it just means
8 that some of the more maybe heavy lifting tasks
9 are taken care of.

10 The residents in Munhall Glen are divided
11 into two categories. Again, price points will be
12 similar; it's just that we have slightly different
13 lot designs. The garden homes are on slightly
14 wider lots, slightly shallower, again, single-
15 story and story-and-a-half homes.

16 The house on the -- the floor plan on the
17 left shows a two-bedroom ranch that has actually a
18 flex space that gives an opportunity for an
19 additional bedroom or a home office. Quite often
20 it's really good to have a flex space like this
21 for a variety of uses for people. A lot of these
22 houses will simply be two-owner-occupied houses.
23 We do not expect very many children, in fact, very
24 low levels of children because of the housing

1 focus.

2 The house on the right is our Chestnut
3 Hill. This is actually a story-and-a-half home.
4 Again, there's another flex space. With the open
5 concept living that we do so much of now, it's
6 actually nice to have a room that you can go close
7 the door. You may have a TV watcher; you may have
8 somebody that's working from home or something
9 like that, so it's nice to have a space to close
10 the door.

11 This actually is our model in Stafford
12 Place, and we actually showed that flex bedroom
13 four as an office there, but we actually have a
14 wall that comes down for guests.

15 The other type of houses -- this is our
16 premier home. These are a little thinner, a
17 little deeper. Again, they'll be single-story,
18 story-and-a-half. We will have some two-story
19 homes as a part of this.

20 Again, here is a floor plan for our
21 Oakfield house on the left. It's a three-bedroom
22 home. Again, the front bedroom can be flexed to
23 an office, and then we also have a two-story
24 four-bedroom home on the right there.

1 Under the comments as we came in with the
2 concept plan there were a couple of items that
3 wanted to be addressed -- excuse me. Our home
4 sites in Munhall Glen, as we design our projects,
5 again, we want to incentivize through zoning
6 things that we want, and we want to de incentivize
7 things that we don't want. So we're actually
8 looking at the RS-4 zoning with setbacks for front
9 porches at 14 feet, setbacks for living space at
10 20, and actually, we're putting a more intensive
11 zoning restriction on ourselves than actually
12 RS-4 has; we're going to put the garages at 25.
13 What we believe this does is it de incentivizes the
14 garage doors, it sets those back so that it limits
15 the road path on a front load home, and it really
16 works well. In fact, oftentimes we actually paint
17 the garage doors the color of the siding. That way
18 if there's a garage door that really deemphasizes
19 that and really works well.

20 Our premier home average lot size is
21 7,687 square feet. Our garden home average lot
22 size is a little larger, 8,745. The RS-4 lot size
23 requirement is 6600. One of the reasons we're
24 asking for a PUD is we do have some lots that are

1 under the -- that minimum. We have some lots in
2 the premier home series that our smallest lot is
3 6,370 square feet. So it's about 5 percent
4 smaller than the requirement, but that does push
5 us into a PUD. Now, our garden home is actually
6 larger than the RS-4 lot size requirement.

7 As I discussed before, setbacks, our porch
8 is 14 feet, which meets the RS-4 requirement. Our
9 house is 20 feet enclosed heated living space, and
10 our garage is 25, which is actually more
11 restrictive than the RS-4 zoning requirement.

12 Our side yard is 6 feet, which -- minimum
13 side yard is 6 feet which is more restrictive than
14 the 5 foot that's allowed. However, the combination
15 RS-4 between is supposed to be 14 feet, and we're
16 just asking for 6 feet on each side. So the
17 combination would be 12 feet between the houses.

18 Our corner yard is 15 feet, which is RS-4.
19 Our rear yard would be 30 feet, which again meets
20 the RS 4 zoning requirement. Because we're going
21 to be doing a lot of ranches and story-and-a-half
22 homes, these houses do take up more lot coverage.
23 It just is what it is. A 2,000-square-foot ranch
24 is going to have more lot coverage than a 2,000-

1 square-foot two-story. So because of that we're
2 also requesting an increase in lot coverage ratio
3 to 37 1/2 percent.

4 In the previous concept hearing there were
5 some comments and requests, and I'd like to address
6 those at this point. We did do a traffic impact
7 study for the 50 residences. The a.m. peak hour
8 they're anticipating about 40 additional cars in
9 or out, and the p.m. peak hour they're
10 anticipating traffic analysis impact is
11 approximately 52 cars in the a.m. peak hour.

12 This really is a minimal effect on the
13 existing traffic. In fact, because Tyler is a
14 major collector, you actually couldn't put this
15 development in a better location where you're on
16 Tyler, which is a main collector, as well as North
17 Avenue. Hampton, Lenzini & Renwick, who are the
18 traffic reviewers from the City St. Charles, they
19 also agreed with this, and they concur with the
20 finding of the study there would be minimal effect
21 on the existing traffic.

22 There was also some discussion of the tree
23 impact. We did a tree study, did some zone
24 studies and some specific. This is a farm field.

1 There are a lot of border plants that are invasive
2 species, buckthorn, et cetera, that are not of
3 high quality. In fact, it's pretty dense. And
4 because of modern stormwater requirements, it is
5 extremely difficult to develop a piece of property
6 and actually save trees. By the time we're
7 cutting in the swales, we're putting in stormwater
8 piping, we're putting in detention facilities,
9 roads, all of that, it makes it extremely
10 difficult to not affect trees, to not affect root
11 development. So we will be pretty much -- we will
12 be removing all of the trees.

13 However, as a part of that we're also going
14 to be planting 170 street trees. In addition to
15 that we're going to be planting 102 border trees.
16 These will be much higher quality trees than
17 currently exist on the property, and in the long
18 run it will be a much healthier area for trees and
19 the success of the plantings.

20 And also, at Airhart Construction we believe
21 landscaping is important. If you go to any of our
22 neighborhoods, you can see the plants that we plant
23 just within our housing. That's part of what we
24 do; that's part of what we supply. So although we

1 will be removing the trees, we are going to be
2 planting a lot of trees, and it will be a
3 wonderfully landscaped area when we're complete.

4 Finally, the other item was South Avenue.
5 We would request that South Avenue be used as an
6 emergency connection. We believe that because of
7 the usage in the industrial area on South Avenue
8 that the traffic patterns between the residential
9 and the commercial/industrial doesn't tie well
10 together.

11 Now, Fisher Farm is right up against an
12 industrial park. That's okay; that happens. But
13 the traffic doesn't tie together. In this
14 situation we don't believe it makes sense to run
15 traffic from that area through Munhall Glen.
16 There's a pretty complete traffic pattern for this
17 area to get out onto South Avenue without really
18 impacting the surrounding residential areas.

19 Now, some of the emergency guys have said
20 maybe we don't want to have a gated area and if we
21 did it with signage with emergency access for
22 municipal vehicles only, but we would rather just
23 not have a full access at that point except for
24 emergency vehicles. We think that would be a

1 proper tie-in for those areas, and then if those
2 usages change at some point, the road is there,
3 the opening is there, and it could be tied in.

4 Again, Munhall Glen, we're really excited
5 to be working with this property. We think it
6 will be a great addition to St. Charles. We think
7 it will be a great addition to housing in
8 St. Charles, those people who have been in the
9 community, they've been involved with social
10 organizations, religious organizations, they've
11 been involved with municipal leadership or as
12 businesspeople, we think this gives them a great
13 solution as they're looking for single-level
14 living or story-and-a-half living, and we would
15 hope that you'd approve this tonight. Again, my
16 name is Corey Airhart, and I'm happy to answer any
17 questions that you may have regarding the project.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.
19 Before we go on to questions, I do have something
20 I need to read in. This was an email that was
21 submitted from Richard McDonald dated September 8th.

22 "Dear ladies and gentlemen, I own
23 Unit A/B1 of the 525 Tyler Road complex adjacent to
24 the northeast corner of the proposed development.

1 My complex leadership has not responded to my
2 inquiry of their actions, so I'm writing this.

3 "Please note there are major elevation
4 differences between the developing property and
5 the 525 Tyler Road business complex especially
6 along the northeast corner. This causes major
7 drainage and erosion, mud, and water along the
8 shared borders of these properties.

9 "Can you please address the necessary
10 retaining walls and drainage issues needed to
11 safeguard our properties especially along the
12 current house and fence location proposed building
13 No. 4 area. Will the trees overhanging my unit be
14 removed? Without trees and/or retention wall, this
15 area will cause problems for Building No. 1 of our
16 complex.

17 "Thank you for your time and consideration,
18 Richard McDonald."

19 I guess do you want to provide any response
20 to that?

21 MR. AIRHART: Sure. Did he say that he
22 had reached out to me in that letter? I have
23 heard nothing from that individual. I did not
24 hear anything from that person.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

2 MR. AIRHART: But anyway, yeah, we're going
3 to have drainage swales. In fact, this was one of
4 the reasons that it's difficult to save trees is
5 because we are having to capture our stormwater,
6 keep it on our property, run it through the
7 detention basin. So actually, stormwater in this
8 area will improve.

9 In fact, the current environment doesn't
10 really require the farm field to have any
11 stormwater held, and we actually -- after the
12 development will be done we will have a slower
13 release rate of stormwater into the stormwater
14 systems than currently exists.

15 So this amount of development will actually
16 improve that, and we will be keeping our stormwater
17 on our property.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What are the elevation
19 differences between your property and the 525 Tyler,
20 I guess along the east, northeast corridor?

21 MR. AIRHART: I think he's talking about
22 this area right here.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

24 MR. AIRHART: We are in this area probably,

1 I would say 5 to 7 feet above. When this was
2 built, I'm assuming that they came through, and
3 they kind of flattened that area out there for the
4 parking lot and stuff like that. What we have
5 actually in this area will have a drainage swale
6 that will tie into the detention basin. We'll
7 actually have a drainage swale that will tie into
8 the detention basin along this area right here.
9 That's where his buildings are. This detention
10 basin then will release out into a storm sewer
11 system. So we'll actually now be controlling
12 water here instead of just sheet drainage down
13 that area. So it will actually improve
14 stormwater.

15 Along this side right here, you could say
16 our eastern boundary, so his western boundary, we
17 again will have a drainage swale that will run
18 down through here so we won't have sheet drainage
19 going off onto his properties.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Where are most of the
21 trees that are going to be removed?

22 MR. AIRHART: The trees are in -- sorry.
23 There are trees at the north property line where
24 the detention is. That's the lowest part of the

1 property. There are some trees along this -- our
2 eastern edge and our northern edge here. There
3 are some trees right in this area, and there are
4 some trees along the commercial area here.

5 So what we'll be doing is, again, going in
6 and planting trees surrounding -- that's one of
7 the reasons why we want to plant trees to surround
8 the -- as part of what we're doing plant additional
9 trees as part of our development. It's just -- to
10 control stormwater we have to have stormwater pipe
11 surrounding the project and it's just very
12 difficult. They're buckthorns; they're invasive
13 species; they're classic farm row trees. So the
14 tree species that we'll be planting are
15 significantly higher quality and will be much
16 better trees.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any other
18 questions?

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Can you talk a
20 little bit about the South Avenue access again?
21 How would you mandate emergency vehicles only?
22 How would you control that?

23 MR. AIRHART: There's a couple of ways
24 that that could be done. There's simply putting a

1 gate and what's called a Knox box, where if the
2 fire department needed to come through, they could
3 open that gate up. There has been -- the fire
4 department is not excited about that.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: The fire or police
6 department are not too excited about that.

7 MR. AIRHART: The fire department is
8 concerned about potentially snow removal in that
9 area; police, same thing. What could be done is
10 signage, signage where -- "Emergency Vehicle
11 Access Only," and "No Truck Traffic," and that
12 will keep a lot of that -- is it a perfect
13 solution? No. But I think it will help take
14 traffic from this area, do a much better job of
15 keeping it out there and keep people from that
16 location.

17 MEMBER BECKER: While we're on the subject,
18 could you describe -- in the staff report it talks
19 about, "Public works prefers to require South
20 Avenue to be constructed to meet current City
21 Code, including curb, gutter and sidewalk up to
22 the end of the existing pavement, approximately
23 350 feet west of the subject property."

24 MR. AIRHART: That is -- if you see where

1 South Avenue comes here and there's a little
2 bend --

3 MEMBER BECKER: Okay.

4 MR. AIRHART: -- there's this little --
5 the pavement ends about in that area. So this
6 right now is all hard-packed gravel. There's a
7 couple -- I think there's three semitrailers there
8 that are parked and miscellaneous construction
9 materials.

10 MEMBER BECKER: So they're requesting off-
11 site improvements as part of their recommendation?

12 MR. AIRHART: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The staff report
15 also talks about there not being restrictions and
16 perhaps altering the locations of driveways and
17 garages throughout the subdivision. How do you
18 respond to that?

19 MR. AIRHART: I would respectfully disagree
20 with the staff in regards to that. Our primary
21 entrance to the subdivision is going to be off of
22 Munhall. That will be the primary access. That's
23 the easiest way.

24 What I always -- what we like to do, we

1 like to put the garages on the far side of the
2 houses. With the step back of the 14-foot for the
3 porch, the 20-foot for the heated living space,
4 the 25 feet for the garage, we actually think that
5 does a better job of diminishing the garage impact.

6 Also, I like to keep -- we like to keep
7 the driveways separated from each other. I would
8 rather not have 16 foot of pavement and a flared
9 end section in the parkway. This way we're able
10 to have street trees throughout and it creates
11 separation.

12 One issue with this where our plan
13 digresses from that normal goal is that there is --
14 there is actually a fair amount of slope to this
15 property. It slopes from the south to the north,
16 and so as we go to the north, because of that we
17 actually end up having to put the garages on the
18 leaving side, and we've actually been talking
19 about ways that what we can do is we can put some
20 landscaping, kind of leave the garage and put some
21 landscaping in that area.

22 If we put the landscaping -- if we put the
23 driveways on the far side in that location what
24 will end up happening is we'll end up having

1 retaining walls along the driveways and those
2 types of things which I really don't like to see.
3 I think they can be trip hazards, and I just don't
4 think they work well.

5 So I agree with the staff in regards to
6 monotony. We always do that as self-imposed
7 where -- we have an architect on staff. We do not
8 have any elevations that are similar beside or
9 across from each other. We always do adjustments --
10 even if it's the same lot, we always do adjustments
11 in elevations, colors, variety, and I would be
12 happy to put that down on paper.

13 Ellen and I have had some discussion about
14 that. That's not a problem because that's how we
15 want to build. If you look at our neighborhoods,
16 you'll see a great variety of colors and finishes
17 and features.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So it's not an
19 issue for you?

20 MR. AIRHART: No, I don't have any problem
21 with what I just said whatsoever.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I have to make
23 the comment. I am so opposed to gating South
24 Avenue. Single-entrance subdivisions are an

1 enigma in this town, and there's really no reason
2 why with signage you can't achieve the same goal
3 you're trying to achieve with a gate.

4 MR. AIRHART: I understand. That's why I
5 said signage because I would just like to keep --

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But at the same
7 time it should be a natural connection to South.
8 It definitely should be. The likelihood of that
9 being used regularly is probably slim based on the
10 layout of the subdivision and based on the entrance
11 and its location. But to be all the way back in
12 that subdivision and not have an access -- a
13 regular access out to the east is totally wrong.
14 So I just wanted to make sure that that's been
15 stated.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: I will say -- because I'm
17 struggling with the South Avenue. I agree with
18 Tim and what he said. So that was a question I
19 was going to bring back up again, and then I had
20 one other question as related to your plantings,
21 your trees and your border plants.

22 I understand that the type of tree that
23 exists on the lot is not ideal. However -- and
24 understanding that that was farm -- you know,

1 prairie land. But when you remove all of that
2 vegetation, it is going to be a very empty, flat --
3 well, you have contoured land, but it's going to
4 be naked land. And I would say that from a
5 planting perspective that your selection of the
6 plants, your selection of trees need something of
7 size and not something of a minimal nature so that
8 we're not taking a look at a half-inch-diameter
9 tree that's planted that will take years to grow.

10 MR. AIRHART: We typically look at
11 planting 2- to 3-inch trees. If you transplant
12 plants larger than that, it actually stunts them,
13 and actually the 2- to 3-inch is really the right
14 size. They grow faster. If you transplant a 5- to
15 7-inch tree, the 2- to 3-inch will actually
16 outgrow that tree.

17 In discussions with public works, we
18 actually were discussing the trees on the site
19 because they don't allow trees in their utility
20 easements. We're supposed to wrap the site with a
21 10-foot utility easement and that's not allowed.
22 So through a really good working session we were
23 talking about what we could do and actually put a
24 5-foot space that we would plant trees in around

1 the property and actually move that public utility
2 easement 5 feet into the property. That was
3 discussed and that's what we're proposing.

4 Actually, in the center of the site you
5 can see in the middle what we actually did with
6 the trees there, we have a 10-foot rear yard on
7 both sides, and so we're actually pulling the
8 trees outside of that 10 feet on each side and
9 still planting trees through that area.

10 The buyers in these neighborhoods, they
11 want landscaping; they're not planning to kick a
12 soccer ball in the back yard, so having those
13 trees works well. I agree that would be one of
14 the things we would really look at doing is
15 potentially once we get the development going come
16 right back in and plant border trees. We did that
17 in Fisher Farm, that was part of what we did
18 there, planted border trees and planted those
19 immediately so that they're growing. So it's not
20 waiting for a home to be built and then those
21 trees are planted.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'd like to make a
23 comment. I agree about the South Avenue access.
24 When I read the report and both the police

1 department and fire department are unhappy with
2 this, it just can't be that way. That has to be
3 accessible for the safety of those citizens in
4 that subdivision and elsewhere along South Avenue.
5 So I think that's critical for this approval.

6 Another thing that I was concerned about
7 is the monotony that Tim brought up. I understand
8 and I agree with you about placements of the
9 driveway. As I looked at the plan, the lots are
10 so narrow that I can't disagree. They've got to
11 be yard, lot, yard, lot instead of driveway -- I
12 mean yard, driveway, yard, not two driveways side
13 by side. I understand that. I think that's okay.
14 But I think what we're talking about is the
15 elevations so that the houses that will be adjacent
16 to one another.

17 And especially in this high-density complex,
18 I mean, you've got to be careful. And I think
19 you've already expressed that. But I would look
20 for that to be part of the petition that it's
21 applied that way because it's a high density.

22 And then my last question, how many lots
23 will there be that are 6,370 square feet?

24 MR. AIRHART: The lot -- a couple things.

1 We're not -- I will say this. Regarding South
2 Avenue, we understand the desire of the fire and
3 the police, and we're not saying that that isn't --
4 we wouldn't be a part of paving that, we didn't
5 say. What I am just saying is that either I would
6 like it gated or signed, and if police and fire
7 don't want it gated and signed and public works
8 say, "We don't want it gated because it's a pain,"
9 I understand that, but if we could sign it, that
10 would be great.

11 Regarding your third question.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I was just wondering,
13 you know, we have lots of that smaller size.

14 MR. AIRHART: Thank you, thank you, yes.
15 Great question, super valid question.

16 There are a total of 10 lots that are under
17 6,600 square feet. So 20 percent of the lots are
18 under that. The smallest lot is 6,307 and there
19 are -- can I move this? There we go. There's
20 one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. There's
21 seven of them they are 6,307 square feet, there's
22 one that's 6,510, 6,563, 6,376.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And when you brought
24 this first before the Plan Commission, as I was

1 looking back, were there 51 lots and now you have
2 50, or am I just -- what happened?

3 MR. AIRHART: As far as the engineering
4 design what we ended up doing was we ended up
5 having to take one of the lots, the lot at the
6 northwest corner, and that lot is actually turned
7 into a water quality BMP now predetention area.
8 So that's why we've shifted actually our
9 neighborhood connection area off the path and over
10 to that location. So you're correct.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
12 questions, comments?

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Overall I like the
14 plan. I like what you're doing with the houses
15 and the variety. I know a lot of times with more
16 than one builder there's more resistance to doing
17 that, so I appreciate and applaud that you're
18 going to do that.

19 As similar to other staff and Commission
20 members, I think the South Avenue connection is
21 important, and I would also ask that the sidewalks
22 be extended South Avenue to your west property
23 line. So that depending on improvements that
24 public works, and staff, and everybody agrees to

1 as far as changing the gravel portion of
2 South Avenue with a paved portion that there are
3 sidewalks that could be extended in the future to
4 take it all the way over towards 14th.

5 MR. AIRHART: That is our plan to extend,
6 do full -- so that, you know, it's a full road to
7 our border and in discussions with the staff what
8 that next section will be.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: And curiosity, you have
10 the existing public works facility -- not to say
11 everything is going to be the same forever -- on
12 your west property line kind of south of South
13 Avenue. Yet there doesn't seem to be a very
14 intensive screening there in those rear yards.

15 MR. AIRHART: Our plan is to put trees there.
16 There has been some discussion about potential
17 fencing. There's actually a fence already on that
18 boundary -- on that line that surrounds the
19 St. Charles municipal yard, and typically
20 municipalities don't want fence against fence.

21 We can have some discussions about that,
22 but our goal is to get trees planted. We do have
23 four houses that back to that and so we understand
24 that. But, again, we've also built in other areas

1 like this, and we think that we can get past that.
2 We don't think that's the best amenity to this
3 project.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Agreed, agreed. And
5 you also are not kind of having any planting along
6 your north property line. You're probably clear
7 to the property line it looks like from a grading
8 standpoint to build a detention basin.

9 MR. AIRHART: Yes.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: And currently there's
11 no park or anything like that there --

12 MR. AIRHART: Correct.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- and then there's the
14 back side of retail that faces the basin.

15 MR. AIRHART: That area is just all treed
16 at this point. There is a gravel -- there is a
17 gravel road -- in fact, I drove it today before I
18 came here -- that goes along that area. And so
19 you are correct we are planning to do our natural
20 landscape basin along that. As a part of that, we
21 haven't finalized the planting plan and turned the
22 planting plans into staff, so we may end up with
23 something there. But, correct, at this point
24 there's no real plan for intensive planting on

1 that north side.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: And, also, as part of
3 Outlot B, which is your basin that wraps around
4 the first four lots, I was wondering why there was
5 really no planting in that area directly north of
6 Lot 4. You're showing some trees along the back
7 of those four lots, but there is nothing within
8 that outlot.

9 MR. AIRHART: Right now there's a water
10 main that actually is on our property that feeds
11 those buildings, and the engineering department is
12 requesting that we actually tie that water main
13 into our property. The water main runs right along
14 here and stops about in this area, and they're
15 asking that we tie this in so that it will properly
16 loop that system so the system is no longer a
17 dead-end main that serves that property.

18 And so as a part of that, again, this is
19 also -- we're looking at this at a potential
20 bioswale, and so we'd be putting a planting plan
21 together for that kind of in the very, very, near
22 future as we go through for preliminary approval.
23 But that's why at this point right now, because
24 there's utility work -- there's no utility

1 easement now, but there's going to be utility
2 easement so that if -- for the City there because
3 there's that water main there. So we're actually
4 putting utility easement in that area then and
5 that'll affect kind of how we plant in that area,
6 which you cannot plant in a utility easement.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Understood. It seems
8 like a pretty sizable area to not do anything,
9 especially since the main driveway coming into
10 your property, those first dozen lots, eight lots
11 angle at a higher elevation, so you're not looking
12 into the adjacent user. Again, it's not a
13 horrible use directly to the north, but just
14 something to kind of start to act to control that
15 and turn the view back into the property might be
16 helpful.

17 MR. AIRHART: Agreed.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: As far as the plantings,
19 looking at the list and some of the quantities, it
20 seems to be a very high percentage of maple
21 varieties used.

22 MR. AIRHART: That was brought up and
23 actually, that was -- we've made a change to that.
24 We have updated ours. That was some of the

1 comment that we got back from the staff that there
2 were certain plants that they actually didn't want
3 to have. So we've redone our planting plan, and
4 this is actually the updated planting plan. I
5 emailed that off too late to Ellen for her to be
6 able to forward it on to you as part of our
7 packet; that was my fault. But we've taken that
8 under advisement absolutely.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think more varieties
10 of plants like Kentucky coffeetree, catalpa, black
11 locust, and probably even reduce the number of
12 honey locust. Nobody likes to repeat the Elm
13 fiascos of the '60s and '70s that's happened, so I
14 think diversity would be great.

15 Looking at your tree preservation, I
16 certainly have read the preservation plan in the
17 report to the extent it was available in our
18 package, and I guess I 100 percent agree that a
19 vast majority of the trees on the property are
20 very -- so removal is really not an issue to me
21 personally. I don't know how everybody else feels
22 about it. Some people see trees and all they see
23 is forest, but I see trees -- at least most of
24 those, I see mulch because I don't think they're

1 very desirable species. But I think there are a
2 lot of trees especially around the existing
3 homestead and on the plan that was part of the
4 package there are a number of trees that front
5 along Munhall, yet no real effort is being made to
6 preserve them.

7 Understanding the need for grading, and
8 accomplishing stormwater, and those are all, you
9 know, good things, it just seems like some of them
10 were very close to the edge of the property, and
11 with some adjustments to grading some of those
12 could be saved. And I think that having mature
13 trees along Munhall would increase the overall
14 kind of street value of the project because the
15 scale would help in a sense for creating an
16 established neighborhood look and certainly would
17 reflect things to the south.

18 So I would ask that you and your engineer
19 and maybe your landscape architect or arborist
20 take a look at that. I think there may be some
21 specific things that could be done. There are
22 some large trees in the back of that pond. But
23 understanding that would probably be really
24 difficult to accomplish in preservation just

1 because of the size of pond that you're creating.
2 I like the detention approach so far that you have
3 with the wetland. I realize you're part of that,
4 it looks like mitigation as part of achieving
5 those objectives, but I like the naturalized
6 detention that you're doing there. With that and
7 the bioremediation I think will help create a nice
8 unique look to the property. But I think if you
9 can do a little something in an effort with your
10 engineer to make grade adjustments to save some of
11 those, that would be great.

12 I have a question partly for you and partly
13 from staff. Is anybody from engineering here?
14 Maybe not. Doesn't look like it. I had a question,
15 for the north pond in Outlot 8 you have 6 feet in
16 that pond and 4 1/2 in the front, and I guess the
17 6 feet of pond -- I'm assuming there is not an
18 engineering comment so far. I don't know, staff,
19 I haven't read the engineering report.

20 MR. AIRHART: It was not an engineering
21 comment on that.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: Given the residential
23 nature of the project, I don't know how long the
24 pond could potentially stay at that capacity, but

1 that's a pretty deep pond for a residential project,
2 and I guess I'm a little concerned about safety
3 and adjacent neighbors and inviting neighbors and
4 their friends to be nearby, there's no safety
5 ledges or anything in part because it is a dry-
6 bottom pond, but if you have 6 feet of water, that
7 seems like a little bit of a concern that you have
8 just straight slopes to the bottom.

9 MR. AIRHART: There's -- you always have a
10 point where you need a pond, you need a basin.
11 We're putting landscaping on the side of the basin;
12 it's not the back of somebody's house. There is
13 obviously the water quality BMP that's to the
14 southwest of that north pond.

15 We've had ponds in this area in range
16 before, and the pond -- I think it's set for like
17 3 1/2 or 4-inch restricter. So it will take some
18 time to go out, but I don't look at that as an
19 immediate safety issue. There's not a situation
20 where you're going to have anybody near the
21 outflow and so I just --

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: Not so much the
23 outflow, just the fact that you have that depth
24 available even if it is for a few days, and

1 there's really no way for anybody to -- if they
2 happen to slip in, they're just going to continue
3 down the slope. There's no safety ledge; there's
4 nothing to address that. On a lot of wet-bottom
5 ponds at normal water line you have a safety ledge;
6 if you will a foot down a foot and a half down.
7 Here because of the dry bottom you don't do that.

8 I understand the cross section. I'm just
9 asking whether 6 feet seems like a comfortable
10 safety thing for everybody. I mean, from an
11 engineering standpoint I don't know. I realize
12 you guys aren't engineers.

13 MR. COLBY: That's something we can look
14 into, though.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. And to that end
16 you have 4 1/2 feet in the front pond, and if
17 everybody is comfortable with 6 feet, could you
18 modify the grading to make it a little bit deeper
19 and adjust the grading to look at saving some of
20 the trees. Because you have a volume, you have a
21 volume you're trying to meet.

22 MR. AIRHART: It's a complete volume issue.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: It's a watershed area
24 that contributes, and you have so much you can

1 stack. So if you have to squeeze the pond a
2 little bit in a few areas, that might allow the
3 grading to adjust to save some of those trees
4 along Munhall Avenue that might be a tradeoff in
5 volume. I don't know.

6 MR. AIRHART: We're also planting 18 trees
7 along Munhall and in that area before you get to
8 the houses. So I mean, I hear you. If we could
9 save trees -- it's extremely difficult with
10 stormwater requirements. If there's something
11 close that we can do, absolutely I promise you I
12 will take a look at it, and I will specifically
13 talk to my engineer about it.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
15 comments or questions?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If not then if the Plan
18 Commission feels they have not evidence -- oh, I'm
19 sorry -- is there anything from members of the
20 audience?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If Plan
23 Commission feels they have enough evidence to make
24 a recommends, then a motion to close the public

1 hearing is in order.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded.

5 Any discussion on the motion to close the public
6 hearing?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, Tim.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

10 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

20 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Moving on

1 to discussion and recommendation, I'll start by
2 asking if there's a motion.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a
4 motion to recommend approval to the Planning and
5 Development Committee of City Council the
6 application for zoning map amendment, the
7 application for special use for planned unit
8 development, and application for PUD preliminary
9 plan subject to the condition that South Avenue
10 connection be maintained as a normal street
11 connection and resolution of all staff comments
12 prior to City Council action.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second it.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Moved and
15 seconded. Discussion on the motion?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

18 MS. JOHNSON: Actually, could I clarify?
19 That motion, the condition of South Avenue, was
20 that with an open access with no signage or an
21 open access with signage?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would say open
23 access with no signage.

24 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Transcript of Munhall Glen
Conducted on September 9, 2020

45

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.
2 Becker.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are we done with
4 discussion? Okay. Go ahead; sorry.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

6 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

18 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That concludes Item 6.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. AIRHART: Thank you for your time.

Transcript of Munhall Glen
Conducted on September 9, 2020

46

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Good luck.

2 MR. AIRHART: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Additional business,
4 weekly development, meeting announcements. Back
5 to our Tuesday schedule starting at the next
6 meeting, do we have agenda items?

7 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I have a show
9 of hands for all the Commissioners who showed up
10 here last night. I was a maybe.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Public
12 comment.

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do I have a motion to
15 adjourn?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Second.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

20 (Ayes heard.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: St. Charles Plan

22 Commission is adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

23 (Off the record at 8:26 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 15th day of September, 2020.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois