

**MINUTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE ST. CHARLES CITY COUNCIL  
HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 17, 2017 – 7:00 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
2 E. MAIN STREET ST. CHARLES, IL 60174**

1. **Call To Order By Mayor Raymond Rogina at 7:17 P.M.**
2. **Roll Call.**
  - Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis**
  - Absent: None**
3. **Invocation by Alder. Paylietner**
4. **Pledge of Allegiance.**
5. **Presentations**
  - Presentation by Jenna Sawicki, Executive Director of the Downtown St. Charles Partnership of the St. Patrick's Day Parade Winners:

**Best of Show**  
Marquee Youth Stage

**Children's Showcase**  
Wildrose Elementary School Girl Scout Troop  
Tri-City Chargers Football & Cheer Association  
Beth Fowler School of Dance

**Non-Profit Showcase**  
St. Charles Public Library  
Fox Valley Model A Restorers Club  
Cyclones Amateur Hockey Association

**Business Showcase**  
McNally's Irish Pub  
Apex Companies  
Pheasant Run

- Presentation of a Proclamation declaring April 24<sup>th</sup> through 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017 as Distracted Driving Awareness Week in the City of St. Charles.
  - Presentation of a Proclamation to declare April 28, 2017 as Arbor Day in the City of St. Charles.
  - Presentation of a Proclamation declaring April 21, 2017 as Bring Your Student to Work Day in the City of St. Charles.
6. **Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve the Omnibus Vote.**  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED

- \*7. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file minutes of the regular City Council meeting held April 03, 2017.**  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- \*8. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file minutes of the Public Hearing meeting held April 3, 2017.**  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- 9. Motion by Payleitner, seconded by Stellato to postpone approval of the minutes of the City Council Fall Retreat meeting held on November 12, 2016 until May 1, 2017.**  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED
- \*10. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve and authorize issuance of vouchers from the Expenditure Approval List for the period of 03/27/2017 – 04/09/2017 the amount of \$1,350,472.49.**  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- \*11. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file the Treasurer's Report for periods ending January 31, 2017, and February 28, 2017.**  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

**I. New Business**

None

**II. Committee Reports**

**A. Government Operations**

- \*1. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve a Resolution 2017-40 Requesting the Closure of Routes 64 and 31 for the Memorial Day Parade.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- \*2. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve a **Resolution 2017-41** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Authorize the Mayor to Execute the Ride in Kane Service Agreement and Approve Fiscal Commitment to the Ride in Kane Program for FY2017/18.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- \*3. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve an **Ordinance 2017-M-6** Authorizing the Sale of Items of Personal Property Owned by the City of St. Charles (Scrap Transformer and Switchgear).

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- \*4. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to waive the bid procedure and approve a **Resolution 2017-42** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles for FY2017/18 of Ordering Gasoline and Diesel Fuel (Bio-Diesel) on an As Needed Basis.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- \*5. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to waive the bid procedure and approve a **Resolution 2017-43** Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Allow "Spot Buying" of Cable and Transformers on an As-Needed Basis for FY 2017/18.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- \*6. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to waive the bid procedure and approve a **Resolution 2017-44** Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Accept the Blanket Switchgear Quote from Federal Pacific for Stock Switchgear for Fiscal Year 2017/18.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- \*7. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file minutes of the April 3, 2017 Government Operations Committee meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

**B. Government Services**

None

**C. Planning and Development**

- \*1. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file Plan Commission Resolution No. 5-2017 A Resolution Recommending Approval of a Map Amendment for Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC).  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- \*2. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file Plan Commission Resolution No. 6-2017 A Resolution Recommending Approval of Special Use for Planned Unit Development and PUD Preliminary Plan for Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Prairie Winds, LLC).  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
3. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Silkaites to postpone approval of **Resolution** Authorizing the Mayor and City Council to Enter into a Certain Annexation Agreement (Bricher Commons PUD – Fourth Amendment – Prairie Winds of St. Charles) to May 1, 2017 under old business.  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED

*Alder. Stellato recused himself from the discussion.*

**Mayor Rogina**

To the developer, the City Council and Plan Commission have given you a lot of positive feedback and support of this project. Everyone here, the school district, park district and City, view us as partners together in this whole thing. I was glad that the park district and school district opined on this project tonight. I think that, in my opinion, I personally think we can come to an agreement. To the developer, I think we need a couple more weeks to try to tie the loose ends together. Your point about starting on a contingency basis, I am not sure that is appropriate. I think the City would feel more confident with all the rules in place. We are still reviewing the data that has been submitted. I have been on the Council for two and Mayor for four, this project has moved quickly. Quicker than most. So, I don't think there is any hesitancy. These are my comments and respectfully ask the Council to defer those items to May 1.

**Alder. Krieger**

I agree with your assessment. This has moved very rapidly and I just simply can't support something that I don't have all the numbers on. So move to postpone until May 1.

**Mayor Rogina**

We have a motion to postpone items 3 and 4, do we have a second?

**Alder. Silkaitis**

Second

**Mayor Rogina**

Keep in mind that this could be defeated, and a motion put on the table. Keep in mind that if there is a motion on the table with blanks, you have to fill in the blanks in the proposal. You would have to fill them in.

**Alder. Bancroft**

I think it is important to talk about a few things. First, I think on the governmental side of this, whether it is the City, School Board, Park Board the administration of this ordinance has not gone smoothly. From my perspective. There are two components of the ordinance. The first is the land cash value and the second is the contribution of the amenities. The land cash value section is very clear. It's based on fair market value and provides a right on the part of the developer to question that fair market value. It is important, critical, that those rights are protected under this ordinance. And we should proceed down the road of the way it's drafted to come to a resolution. And the resolution is done by the Council. It is very clear that input from the school board and park board is welcome. I think that is why the two weeks is important to make sure that we follow that process. But it is based on the fair market value. That number that is in there is representative of a decision whenever it was made in 2008. I think that this is an interesting process. The second thing I want to bring up is, I read the park board's letter and I read their determination regarding the amenities. No criteria, no analysis, no definition of what would have been sufficient versus what isn't sufficient. So in administering those two ordinances, I don't find that particularly helpful. That is also that same body's decision up here. It would be greatly helpful if to me if we were not just talking about a dollar amount to plug into our ordinance for fair market value, but also if you didn't find it sufficient why, and what would you find sufficient. I think that message needs to be sent to the park board, to make it clear. There is no stigma to the fact that the developer brought all of this to our attention. Because they were just following the ordinances that are adopted by this body. To hear input that we are concerned about the fees and we are concerned about the greater good, I agree with all of that. And I want the input of the park board and the school board on this, but at the end of the day, we have to administer an ordinance. And that ordinance has to have fair market value as the basis for that land contribution. It doesn't go any further than that and eventually we are going to have make that determination here. I am glad we are going to have the two weeks for everybody's input.

**Mayor Rogina**

To your point that fair market value, if someone feels that number is off base, they should provide to us proper and legitimate appraisal on improved property as determined by Council.

**John McGuirk, City Attorney**

Last time we were here we objected to the appraisal at that point because clearly it was on raw land. What we have received since then, is a different supplemental appraisal. Unfortunately, it was 68 properties, only 5 of which seemed to have met our criteria of improved property. The rest were outside the City limits even though the letter says they are within the City limits. So, I think we need a solid appraisal that gives up the right valuation of improved property. That is really what we need. Either that comes from the developer or someone else, but that's what the Council needs.

**Alder. Bancroft**

It is required in the ordinance. I just want to make sure we fairly administer the ordinance that is on the books.

**Alder. Krieger**

I agree with that. It should be fairly administered, apple to apples. If the land is worth less than 2008, so be it. We have to have a fair market appraisal.

**Alder. Silkaitis**

I just want an appraisal that meets our criteria. So far there have been two of them and neither meets the criteria. So, two weeks is fine but I expect an appraisal, not raw market data.

**Alder. Payleitner**

We are still waiting on that fair market value and I am thinking the applicant has put in something but the City did not sign off on it, is that correct?

**John McGuirk**

The applicant supplied a supplemental appraisal, using the same appraiser who expressed opinions as to value based on 68 properties. The problem is, that I see, is that those properties don't meet our criteria. About 5 of them do. But the rest are outside the City. And they are on well and septic. We really need improved property.

**Alder. Bancroft**

Are we providing clear direction as to what they need to provide in terms of an appraisal? Is it crystal?

**John McGuirk**

I don't know if it's crystal, but I had some conversations with Jeff and he gave me examples of Crane Road Estates, for example, but it's not in the City. We need an improved property.

**Rita Tungare**

City code clearly defines what is improved land, improved property. It has to be a property that is on City water, sewer, electric, sidewalk, streets, etc. That is what we need is a formal appraisal that is based on improved property in the general area.

**Alder. Bancroft**

A supported appraisal with an opinion of value based on that definition of improved property within City limits with City water and sewer. That is what is needed.

**Rita Tungare**

That is correct.

**Mayor Rogina**

We have said to the park district, if they would like an appraisal, they can do that.

**Rita Tungare**

Absolutely. The only point of correction is that it doesn't have to be in City limits. It can be in unincorporated area as long as it meets the criteria of improved land.

**Alder. Turner**

What I have read is that there is a set figure based on 2008. And one thing I think government should stay out of is housing and land value. It's really a market phenomenon. We can set any figure we want. It doesn't mean somebody is going to give it to us or think it's valued at. This is something that the market should be in control of. So, it should eventually be a floating value at the time instead of saying it's "\$240,000" that's what it is. It might have been in 2008 when things were booming and developers would pay anything to get a house in here but it's a little bit different now.

**Mayor Rogina**

I would venture to say that this Council here, and the new Council in two weeks, would grasp that challenge vigorously. There is also, as far as things that have to be resolved, and I am confident that our neighbors in Geneva will come across, but there is this Bricher Road improvement thing and comments from the City of Geneva are that they have some jurisdiction on Bricher Road. They have to sign off on the final plat. We got that as well. To the developer, you did not hear a thing up here about the quality of your product. I believe just about unanimously; this Council here admires your work. If we keep our eye on the prize, this will come to pass over the next two weeks. Our Staff, your Staff, the park district staff, the school board staff, can knock heads together and come up with a solution to this project before the month of May is over with.

**Alder. Turner**

What is this about Geneva having to sign off on the plat?

**Mark Koenen**

Bricher Road existed long before St. Charles or Geneva extended west of Randall Road. It was a township road. Whoever annexes a township road automatically inherits that right-of-way as a part of their jurisdiction. When Geneva Commons annexed first, they (City of Geneva) annexed Bricher Road, as we know it today, immediately west of Randall Road. It gives them the legal authority regarding access, speed limit, enforcement, maintenance, etc. When we are platting against Bricher Road, on the north side, where Bricher Commons or Prairie Winds is located, the City of Geneva signs off on the final plat (the plat designates the whole configuration of the development). There is also the width for the right-of-way location along Bricher Road, (there's a strip of land that needs to provide for that affect along the Prairie Wind frontage). This is the same thing that was done for Lowes and on the south side of Bricher Road when Geneva Commons was developed. This is not unusual. The piece of the work that is taking time. I spoke with Stephanie Dawkins who is my peer in Geneva; they are reviewing a traffic study which has been submitted by the developer. I also shared with her that the development community has agreed to a request from the City of Geneva and residents about adding a west bound right turn lane into the main entrance, or easterly entrance of Prairie Winds. So hopefully they will complete that exercise shortly. They are working with Brent Coulter who is the engineering consultant on traffic analysis for the City of Geneva. We just need to get the information back from them so we can move this project forward for that particular aspect of the project.

**Alder. Turner**

What if they drag their feet and say no, does this whole thing go down?

**Mark Koenen**

I think we are talking about a technicality. First of all, the access is permitted. There is an intergovernmental agreement between the City of Geneva and the City of St. Charles which says that yes there will be access at these locations. What we are talking about is if there is going to be a right turn lane or not a right turn lane. If there is a need for a traffic signal or not. Traffic engineering details. I am hoping we can get through that within the next two weeks or shorter than that.

**Alder. Turner**

When you said final plat, we are not talking about the interior design of the development.

**Mark Koenen**

No. This is a legal document that allows everyone to convey property or where public rights of way are, etc.

**Alder. Lewis**

As the aldermen of the fifth ward that the project is in. I support the project that you are building and the quality of the apartments. What you are presenting I think is quality. I love the density. You have 20 plus acres that you could have put 600 apartments. You put 250 that will include families. Which I believe is a better fit to our community. I do understand the differences that we have here. I do support the Council on the direction they want to take. I do really want to see this come to an end in two weeks. I don't think we are that far off what it is six hundred thousand to a million. It's going to be somewhat higher. I don't know that for a \$50 million project, I don't know that we are that far off in our calculations and I do want to see it move forward.

**Alder. Payleitner**

A question for clarity, so, in two weeks we will have our little blanks filled in?

**Mayor Rogina**

That is the hope.

**Alder. Payleitner**

And the Geneva issue will be addressed? And those are the two things we are waiting on correct?

**Mayor Rogina**

That and the appraisal. They are all documented.

**Alder. Payleitner**

If we have those two things, they will fall into place?

**Mayor Rogina**

I am confident in that.

**Alder. Payleitner**

And at that time we can have the conversation on the private recreational amenities?

**Mayor Rogina**

That should all be worked out by that then. It has to be worked out as part of the process.

**Alder. Bancroft**

The ordinance says we will decide.

**Alder. Payleitner**

Well we will decide with a conversation.

**Alder. Bancroft**

But what would be helpful would be, the Park Board they rejected it outright without any kind of description.

**Holly Cabel**

The Park District can provide additional information.

**Mayor Rogina**

I am confident that the Staffs and the developer will work something out.

**Alder. Silkaitis**

Are we just going to have one appraisal or are we going to have a third party?

**Mayor Rogina**

We want an appraisal from the developer that meets our standards and if the park district wants to get an appraisal, that's their business.

**Alder. Silkaitis**

I would like to see two appraisals. On any kind of property, I would get two appraisals.

**Mayor Rogina**

That's fine.

**Alder. Silkaitis**

But will we have them in two weeks.

**Alder. Bancroft**

Are you asking for the City to commission an appraisal?

**Alder. Silkaitis**

I am tempted to because I want to make sure that.

**Alder. Bancroft**

I just want to make sure because I don't think it's appropriate to ask the park board or the school board to get an appraisal.

**Alder. Silkaitis**

The park board volunteered to. Now if they don't, I would like the City to do an appraisal.

**Alder. Bancroft**

That's why I am asking the question.

**Holly Cabel**

The Park District will try and get an appraisal.

**Alder. Silkaitis**

Thank you.

**Mayor Rogina**



We will have two appraisals.

**Jeff Ratzer**

We supplied an appraisal from a national firm. Then we supplied a supplemental and that still didn't meet the exact criteria. The reason is, and the appraiser knew this, that's why he wrote a cover letter qualifying his appraisal, you cannot get an appraisal on thin air. You have to appraise something. For example, I tried to have our land appraised. Ron, when you said you don't want market analysis, that's the only thing that they do. I can tailor it to St. Charles more, or to the area, he refused to do an appraisal because I have to give him an address to appraise. People in real estate know what I am talking about. If you said, tell me what a house is worth, you have to pick a house. You can't say how much is an improved lot; there is no basis for an appraisal. The second thing, John is right, some were in the area; some were not quite in St. Charles proper. What was in the revised appraisal was across the street. That's in the area and that's allowed. But that appraisal is horrible for the park and school district. That appraisal turns out to be 29 or \$58,000 per acre. And it does qualify, it's improved lot. If you guys ever used an appraiser before and want us to pay for it, so it's your appraiser, we would be happy to do it. Up to you guys. We felt the school board fee was very fair. If you all change the fair market value, what we propose to do is make sure that the school board is made whole to the tune of \$487,000. We will write a separate check to them out of our own pocket, if the math doesn't work out. We are trying to get the park district fee more in line with what national cities and local cities would charge for a park district. We are not hamper the school district at all. Because \$487,000 is about \$2000/unit that's a typical impact fee for a school. Lastly, I would like you to consider, though Todd I know you asked them to pin down why they don't like my acres, but I don't know if you guys can vote on this tonight. But I would like to know that I didn't waste my time and money and my experience creating playgrounds, parks, walking trails, indoor pools and have it discounted out of hand. I don't know if you are able to vote on the fact that I am donating .93 acres. But I feel it is a very nice compromise at the end of this meeting tonight.

**Mayor Rogina**

There is a motion on the table and I am going to vote on that. If that's passed, the Staff is taking notes on the requests made by Council members up here. I am convinced that if you, or Mr. Rayman, sit down with the park board, it could be a joint meeting, that is possible. To get this hammered out because we are almost there. There is a motion on the table to defer items 3 and 4 under planning and development to the May 1 City Council meeting under old business.

**Alder. Payleitner**

To Mr. Ratzer's point, so Staff is aware, I think they have a good argument there with regards to the acceptance of the private recreational amenities. And I was asking will we get a chance to talk about it but you implied it would be a done deal by the time it gets here.

**Mayor Rogina**

Alder. Bancroft made a key point. It is your decision. Whatever the number, whatever the amenities, etc. It is your decision.

**Alder. Bancroft**

We need to be fair to the park board. We need to get their input.

**Mayor Rogina**

What I think is very important here a signal has been sent to all government entities, we are a partnership here in this City. We all act on our own boards, but we are nothing if we are fighting, disagreeing. We will disagree, but if we don't cooperate, the City will not be what it should be. I am not worried about it.

**Alder. Payleitner**

My concern is that the conversation will continue.

4. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Silkaites to postpone approval of **Ordinance** Amending Ordinance Nos. 1999-Z-11 and 2006-Z-7 (Bricher Commons PUD) and Granting Approval of a Map Amendment, New Special Use for Planned Unit Development, and PUD Preliminary Plan for Prairie Winds of St. Charles to May 1, 2017 under old business.  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED
- \*5. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file Historic Preservation Resolution 2-2017 A Resolution Recommending Approval of amendments to the Façade Improvement Grant Program.  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- \*6. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve an **Ordinance 2017-M-7** Amending the Façade Improvement Grant Program.  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- \*7. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to accept and place on file Plan Commission Resolution 8-2017 A Resolution Recommending Approval of a General Amendment to Ch. 17.22 "General Provisions", Section 17.22.030 "Permitted Encroachments" and Ch. 17.30 "Definitions", Section 17.30.030 "General Definitions" (yard encroachments for pergolas and sports courts).  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- \*8. Motion by Krieger, seconded by Gaugel to approve An **Ordinance 2017-Z-9** Amending Title 17 of the St. Charles Municipal Code Entitled "Zoning", Ch. 17.22 "General Provisions", Section 17.22.030 "Permitted Encroachments" and Ch. 17.30 "Definitions", Section 17.30.030 "General Definitions" (Yard encroachments for Pergolas and Sports Courts).  
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,  
Bancroft, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner, Lewis  
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0  
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

**D. No Executive Session**

**12. No Additional Items from Mayor, Council, Staff, or Citizens**

**13. Adjournment**

Motion by Lemke, seconded by Krieger, to adjourn meeting  
VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUS MOTION CARRIED  
Meeting adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

  
Nancy Garrison, City Clerk

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL

  
Nancy Garrison, City Clerk

