

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2017**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chairman Tim Kessler
Brian Doyle
James Holderfield
Tom Pretz
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tom Schuetz

Members Absent: Dan Frio
Michelle Spruth

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

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the December 20, 2016 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the December 20, 2016 Plan Commission meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. Prairie Center (former St. Charles Mall site) (Shodeen Group, LLC)**
Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Pretz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to close the public hearing.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Page 2

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Doyle, Holderfield, Schuetz, Purdy, Pretz, Wallace, Kessler

Nays: None

Absent: Frio, Spruth

Motion carried: 7-0

MEETING

5. Prairie Center (former St. Charles Mall site) (Shodeen Group, LLC)

Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development

Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Pretz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to table the item to the January 17, 2017 meeting.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Doyle, Holderfield, Schuetz, Purdy, Pretz, Wallace, Kessler

Nays: None

Absent: Frio, Spruth

Motion carried: 7-0

6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

7. Weekly Development Report

8. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 17, 2017 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

Tuesday, February 7, 2017 at 7:0pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, February 21, 2017 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, February 13, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, March 13, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment at 9:31 p.m.

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: :
Prairie Centre (former :
St. Charles Mall Site), :
Shodeen Group, LLC, :
Application for Special :
Use for Planned Unit :
Development and PUD :
Preliminary Plan. :
-----x

HEARING, Volume III
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, January 10, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 129889
Pages: 178 - 295
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand

14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State

15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 BRIAN DOYLE, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 TOM PRETZ, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

11 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

12 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

13 Development Director

14 CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering Division

15 Manager

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The St. Charles Plan
Commission is in order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 3 on our
agendas is presentation of the minutes of
December 20th, 2016, meeting of the Plan Commission.

Is there a motion to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and

1 seconded.

2 All in favor?

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes
5 unanimously.

6 Item 4 on the agenda is Prairie Centre,
7 former St. Charles Mall site, Shodeen Group, LLC,
8 application for special use for planned unit
9 development and application for PUD preliminary
10 plan.

11 This is a continued public hearing, and for
12 those of you who have not been with us before,
13 welcome. The Plan Commission is appointed by the
14 City Council to conduct public hearings for certain
15 applications that come before it such as these.

16 Our role here tonight is to take testimony
17 and evidence from the Applicant as well as from any
18 member of the public, Plan Commission, staff; and
19 after we have all the evidence we need in order to
20 make a decision, we will close the public hearing;
21 and then subsequently, we will vote to recommend
22 approval or denial of the application to the City
23 Council.

24 At a later date, it will go to the City

1 Council planning and development committee. They
2 conduct their own review, and then it will go to
3 City Council for a vote.

4 Any questions?

5 Okay. The last time that this was up before
6 us, we reviewed a site plan and entertained general
7 questions regarding the development.

8 Our plan was to do that first, and then at
9 the next meeting, which is tonight, we were going to
10 focus on the traffic study, and there have been some
11 modifications to the site plan which we're going to
12 go over as well.

13 So we'll have the Applicant present that
14 information; and then after the Applicant is done,
15 the Plan Commission will ask questions; and then
16 I'll open it up to members of the audience who have
17 questions. If we feel that we have enough
18 information in order to close the public hearing
19 tonight, I'll allow the Applicant to make some
20 closing remarks, and then we will close the public
21 hearing.

22 Anyone who wishes to offer any evidence,
23 including asking questions, needs to be sworn in,
24 and I'll do that at this time. If you would raise

1 your right hands.

2 (Witnesses duly sworn.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

4 And when you speak, if you could approach
5 the lectern here, state your name, spelling your
6 last name, state your address. And please note that
7 only one person can talk at a time because we have a
8 court reporter here, and she is good but not that
9 good.

10 Any questions? Okay.

11 First, we have some exhibits. Did we
12 already have an Exhibit A?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes, we did.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. We have an Exhibit
15 B, which appears to be a letter from Bryan Wirball
16 to Russell Colby. The subject is Prairie Center
17 feedback for Plan Commission. It's dated 12/8/16.
18 This letter is in the meeting packet.

19 Are all three of these items in the meeting
20 packet?

21 MR. COLBY: No.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just the letter.

23 MR. COLBY: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. The second

1 exhibit, Exhibit C, is a letter from Carolyn Hooten
2 to Russ Colby, dated January 9th, 2017.

3 Exhibit D is a drawing submitted by Jim
4 Holderfield.

5 And without any objection, I will accept
6 these into evidence. All right. Seeing none, they
7 are.

8 At this time, are you ready?

9 Staff, is there anything before we begin?

10 MR. COLBY: No.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

12 MR. BAZOS: Good evening again, Plan
13 Commissioners. For the record, my name is Peter
14 Bazos, attorney representing the Petitioner, and the
15 owner as well, Towne Centre Equities and Shodeen
16 Group, LLC.

17 Here again this evening with me are Dave
18 Patzelt, president of Shodeen Group; and Mr. Jon
19 Talty, principal with the Chicago architectural firm
20 of OKW.

21 This is, of course, a continuation of the
22 hearing, the first -- the third portion. In the
23 January 6th staff analysis and memo, the staff
24 called out certain items that had been submitted

1 since the date of our December 6th public hearing,
2 which was the second, and also mentioned certain
3 updates.

4 I just want to quickly mention to you in
5 response to the requests from Member Pretz, our
6 client submitted what turned out to be a
7 26-page detailed point-by-point response to how the
8 proposed Prairie Centre project fulfills the various
9 objectives set forth in the St. Charles
10 comprehensive plan. This is contained in that
11 letter that should be before you, I hope.

12 There is also an updated site plan, building
13 elevations, and landscape plan prepared by OKW that
14 Mr. Talty will explain. There is a more fleshed-out
15 architectural rendering of the project which was
16 requested, and you'll see that.

17 There is also in your packet a letter from
18 the St. Charles Park District to Mr. Colby dated
19 December 27th which indicates that after further
20 discussions with the developer, and I believe the
21 City, the park district is interested in at least
22 pursuing whether it may wish to take some of the
23 onsite park -- open space as part of its -- park
24 district manage the park site. That hasn't been

1 resolved yet, but those discussions are going on.
2 If that doesn't occur, that open space and those
3 onsite parks will be managed by the association that
4 we set up.

5 There is an updated traffic analysis revised
6 January 3rd to take into account the additional
7 affordable units that were added to this project,
8 and the staff's -- this is a City consultant that's
9 done that, and I believe you're going to hear from
10 them tonight.

11 And then finally, there is a draft PUD
12 ordinance which you're seeing for the first time
13 that staff and we have worked on together. It's
14 still a work in process.

15 But before I turn this over to Mr. Talty,
16 I'd like to comment that -- and I'm sure you know
17 this because many of you, not all of you, have been
18 on the Plan Commission a long time -- a PUD is by
19 definition a zoning approach used to allow
20 modifications and departures from the strict
21 application of a municipal code in order to
22 accomplish a more creative approach to the design
23 and use of a site, especially a challenging site
24 like this infill site, the Prairie Centre site.

1 On Exhibit D to this PUD ordinance, we have
2 attempted to work with staff to call out every one
3 of the departures and variations that we could
4 identify. I think we've got them all, but there's a
5 possibility we may have missed some. But I believe
6 it's comprehensive. So I just wanted to call your
7 attention to that.

8 With no further ado, I'd like to ask
9 Mr. Talty to present to you the revised plans that
10 he has prepared. Thank you.

11 MR. TALTY: Thank you very much. Again, my
12 name is Jon Talty. I am chairman of OKW Architects,
13 Chicago, 600 West Jackson Boulevard. I think you
14 have my information. But I want to walk through
15 quickly with everyone the changes to the plan from
16 the last time we gathered.

17 There was conversation about addressing
18 building footprints to accommodate the housing
19 density bonus that is part of this conversation; and
20 so virtually all of the mixed-use and residential
21 buildings that are represented on the site,
22 everything north of these buildings, these mixed-use
23 D1, D2, and D3, including those buildings and to the
24 north, their footprints have been massaged to

1 accommodate additional square footages on a
2 floor-by-floor basis to absorb that housing density
3 that we have discussed as part of this PUD
4 application.

5 Included in that, in those footprint
6 modifications is a kind of embedded flexibility.
7 You can see it between residential E and C1 here.
8 There are these dashed lines which represent the
9 potential for the connectivity of these buildings,
10 whether it be on the ground floor, upper floors, so
11 that buildings can increase in length to accommodate
12 both market needs, unit counts, and so forth.

13 We don't -- you know, we don't know exactly
14 what, you know, the future holds for some of these
15 buildings. So we want to embed that flexibility to
16 connect some of these buildings across the site to
17 accommodate their future needs.

18 There's also the idea of the park that Peter
19 spoke of here. In the dialogue with the park
20 district, there has been modifications to this
21 portion of the site, including modifications to
22 residential B1 and mixed-use B1 and their footprints
23 to accommodate the potential for this developed park
24 embedded in the middle of the property. I think a

1 value add to the project, you know, moving forward.

2 So that represents the modifications to the
3 site plan from where we last discussed.

4 When we got together in December, I
5 presented to you a sketch which was more reflective
6 of an architectural vernacular, this prairie
7 architecture that we kept referring to throughout
8 our presentations and asked the opinion of the Plan
9 Commission whether it was a direction that was more
10 appropriate in terms of your eyes as to how the
11 buildings need to evolve, should evolve.

12 I think there was kind of a unanimous
13 response that, yes, we like the direction this is
14 heading. These elevations for both the mixed use,
15 the building on the top; and the residential, the
16 building below kind of reflect that architecture,
17 that sketch that was seen last month.

18 Again, the mixed-use building being a
19 four-story building, ground-floor commercial,
20 below-grade parking, three floors of residences
21 above, the building massing broken down not only
22 through a color pallet, but a material change from,
23 you know, the sidings that are represented; as well
24 as the residential building, a three-story building

1 that is sitting out of the ground a bit with the
2 parking partially buried below grade, three floors
3 of residences above.

4 The residential building has more of a roof
5 form whereas the mixed use is proposed as a
6 flat-roof solution right now. The intention behind
7 that was to not only differentiate the building
8 massings across the site so as not to promote kind
9 of a monotony to the overall composition, but also
10 begin to differentiate the building types themselves
11 and to keep massing consistent from one building to
12 the next.

13 Finally, there's, you know, an exhibit
14 that's included in all of this which speaks to the
15 notion of the prairie school, the prairie
16 architecture, the prairie theme; and we've spoken at
17 great length about this project not being a one
18 liner, not being simply a name on a sign or a simple
19 expression in a building's architecture, whether it
20 be a roof form or a color or a horizontal banding.

21 But the hope for this project would be that
22 that philosophy, that design language would be
23 carried throughout this site in buildings, in site
24 signage, in building architecture, in amenities, and

1 streetscape elements, the landscape, and even, you
2 know, the details that are part and parcel with the
3 buildings themselves.

4 For this to be truly successful, that
5 philosophy, that spirit has to be carried through on
6 multiple levels that transcends simply bricks and
7 mortar, but include the treatment of the site itself
8 and the welcoming from both the vehicular and a
9 pedestrian scale; and I think we're -- you know,
10 we're prepared to -- I know we're prepared to
11 execute that and make that successful for everyone.

12 So that's a general overview of the changes
13 from the last time we got together. Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Chris, are you up?

15 MR. BONG: Yes. Good evening. My name is
16 Chris Bong. I'm the development engineering
17 division manager.

18 So this evening, we're going to be
19 discussing the next engineering study on Prairie
20 Centre, which is the traffic study.

21 So to offer you a little recent background
22 to show you how we got where we are, in March 2016,
23 Shodeen asked City staff to hire and manage
24 consulting engineers to produce site civil

1 engineering capacity studies for the site. The way
2 we worked this is Shodeen provided a deposit to the
3 City to cover the costs.

4 The last time we were here, we discussed the
5 other two engineering studies, which were the water
6 main modeling study by Trotter & Associates, and we
7 also discussed the downstream sanitary sewer
8 capacity study by WBK Engineering.

9 And tonight, we're going to be discussing
10 the traffic impact study by HLR Engineering, and the
11 presentation is going to be by their traffic
12 engineer, Alex Garbe.

13 So I'll hand it over to Alex.

14 MR. GARBE: I'm Alex Garbe. My last name is
15 G-a-r-b, as in boy, -e. I'm a traffic engineer with
16 Hampton, Lenzini and Renwick in Elgin. We're at 380
17 Shepard Drive, S-h-e-p-a-r-d.

18 HLR -- we're a full-service civil
19 engineering firm from land survey in to construction
20 management. We do traffic operations, environmental
21 engineering, structural engineering, and we have
22 several offices throughout the state, but we're
23 headquartered in Elgin here.

24 As I said, I'm a traffic engineer with HLR.

1 I'm a licensed professional engineer in Illinois,
2 and I'm also certified as a professional traffic
3 operations engineer.

4 As Chris mentioned, the City retained us to
5 perform a traffic impact study for the proposed
6 development. So to get started, I'll talk a little
7 bit about the methodology behind the study.

8 The methodology follows industry standards
9 outlined in guidelines such as the Highway Capacity
10 Manual and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control
11 Devices. It consists primarily of data collection
12 and then all our analysis. Then we come up with a
13 set of findings and recommendations, if any
14 mitigation is needed.

15 So we'll start with the data collection.
16 I'll start out first with the survey of the site to
17 see what the existing conditions are and moving on
18 to traffic counts.

19 The map here shows most of the study area
20 that was included. This is the majority of the
21 impacted area. We collected traffic count data at
22 16 intersections. These four signalized
23 intersections, Randall at Prairie, at Route 38, and
24 on Route 38 at the west mall entrance, and at 14th

1 Street. We also counted 12 stop-controlled
2 intersections, 10 of which are shown on this map.

3 Basically, with the counts that we did, we
4 tried to capture any point in or out of that block
5 since there's some interaction between or among
6 the -- potential interaction among the sites there.

7 The other two intersections that we counted
8 that aren't shown on here are Prairie at 7th Street
9 and also on 3rd Street, which have also been
10 reviewed in earlier versions of the study over the
11 years. We did our traffic counts on typically
12 weekdays and Saturdays in April and May of 2016.

13 Moving on to the analysis portion, we have
14 all of our data collection complete at this point.
15 So the first thing we start with is projecting the
16 traffic count data from 2016 to 2026, a 10-year
17 projection. We use growth rates that are
18 provided -- based on data provided to us by the
19 Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning.

20 We then made some adjustments. The CVS at
21 14th and 38 was not open yet when we did our counts.
22 So we had to adjust the future traffic to add that
23 in, in addition to growing the traffic that's
24 already on the network.

1 The next step then is to use the Trip
2 Generation Manual, another industry standard
3 guideline, based on the land uses that Shodeen is
4 proposing, to estimate how many new vehicles would
5 enter and exit the site.

6 We put a little table in here that gives
7 sort of the overall numbers of the three main peak
8 hours we looked at, the weekday morning, weekday
9 evening, and the Saturday peak hours. So you can
10 see the total column is the total expected to be
11 generated by the site during each of those peak
12 hours. And then we actually split it up as far as
13 what's entering and what's exiting. So that's what
14 those columns are for.

15 We made some further adjustments to these
16 numbers to account for trips that might remain
17 internal to the site since we have a mix of retail,
18 restaurant, residential. Some of the new trips that
19 might be generated could easily be from somebody who
20 is living in the development to just go out to eat
21 that night, so that traffic would never be seen out
22 on 38 or out on Randall. It would all stay within
23 the site.

24 The other major area for adjustment is

1 pass-by trips. It's a little bit different than a
2 typical -- a generated trip would come from anywhere
3 to the site. A pass-by trip instead is taken out of
4 the existing stream, so any traffic that might be
5 currently going by on Route 38 that might be
6 diverted into the site for a quick stop or a quick
7 bite, whatever.

8 So with those adjustments in place, then we
9 take all that, apply it across the roadway network,
10 distribute it out where it makes the most sense,
11 where the traffic is going to, where its coming
12 from. Then that gives the volumes, the sets of
13 volumes that we use for the basis of our analysis.

14 One thing to note, Shodeen is not proposing
15 any new access points anywhere on this site. The
16 site has a good number of access points already.

17 Now, the bulk of our analysis is a capacity
18 analysis. What the capacity analysis entails is
19 reviewing the geometry of the various intersections,
20 the type of control, whether it's a stop sign or a
21 traffic signal, and applying the traffic volumes
22 that we expect to see at those intersections and run
23 it through the software. We use Highway Capacity
24 Software, we use SINCRO, which are the two main

1 applications that IDOT relies on.

2 Then we come up with some estimates of what
3 we expect in terms of delay. That's kind of the
4 main thing that we're looking at at each
5 intersection. So how long, how many seconds per
6 vehicle each vehicle might have to wait at an
7 intersection to progress through.

8 There's three main scenarios that we're
9 looking at here. I'll kind of walk you through the
10 volume scenarios that I mentioned before.

11 We have the existing, which is 2016, so
12 that's just the counts. Then we have what we call
13 the base, which is taking the counts and growing
14 them 10 years to 2026, adding that CVS traffic; and
15 then what we call the total, which takes the base
16 and on top of that what Prairie Centre is going to
17 generate.

18 The existing and the base are both analyzed
19 just under existing traffic control, existing
20 geometry, no changes being assumed made. But with
21 total -- with the total scenario, we're looking at
22 the existing, and we're also looking at what might
23 change to help -- what changes are planned and what
24 changes might be recommended.

1 The last segment of our analysis or major
2 segment is the traffic signal warrant study. We
3 looked at three intersections on Prairie Street for
4 signal warrants -- 14th Street, 7th Street, and 3rd
5 Street. For those the traffic counts were 13-hour
6 counts, so we get a lot more data to work on. So
7 we're looking at a whole day instead of just the
8 peak hours.

9 And we've also analyzed it based on the
10 counts, based on the base traffic, and based on the
11 total traffic. So we have added those estimates of
12 the adjusted traffic and estimated signal warrant
13 analysis for that as well.

14 The signal warrants, if you're not familiar,
15 they're guidelines in the MUTCD to aid in the
16 decision on whether installing a traffic signal is
17 necessary or recommended. They're based on an
18 analysis of a combination of traffic volumes, and
19 also they consider crash history, pedestrians,
20 proximity to schools and railroad crossings, things
21 like that.

22 The Federal Highway Administration, which
23 publishes the guideline, they do require that before
24 a traffic signal can be signaled to control an

1 intersection, that at least one of these warrants be
2 met; but the reverse of that, just because a warrant
3 is met does not require a signal to be installed.
4 There are many situations where you might have
5 conditions that meet one of these nine warrants, but
6 a traffic signal is not necessarily the right way to
7 do deal with the traffic.

8 So after we have run all of our analysis, we
9 come up with our findings and recommendations based
10 on the estimated traffic here.

11 Generally, what we saw was that the area
12 roadways should be able to absorb the impact of the
13 development of the site. What was kind of
14 interesting with this one is where we saw potential
15 issues are in places where there already are
16 existing problems, primarily Randall Road and then
17 Prairie Street out east, 3rd Street, and 7th Street,
18 in that area.

19 Starting with Randall Road, there is -- the
20 interaction between the signals at Prairie Street
21 and at Route 38 can be a bit touchy. So the signal
22 timing there, you have to be careful to get that
23 working well. We're working with Kane County DOT.
24 Those are their intersections. So there's always

1 need for a lot of attention at those particular
2 intersections. The existing westbound left-turn
3 lane at Randall and Prairie in particular also has
4 some queuing issues.

5 Let's see. Some of the movements at this
6 intersection are expected to see a level of service
7 D or F. One thing to be careful with with looking
8 at those letters is they sound like school grades.
9 An F sounds like it's failing, but that doesn't
10 necessarily mean the same thing. It is the worst
11 category that we look at for delay, but just because
12 you're seeing that doesn't mean that the
13 intersection is failing.

14 One key thing to look at in this interaction
15 at these two intersections is Randall -- Randall
16 Road, again, I mentioned this, is owned by Kane
17 County, maintained by them. They already have plans
18 in the works to widen Randall Road from its current
19 four-lane configuration to six lanes within the area
20 of the Prairie Centre.

21 One of the things our analysis showed was
22 that that widening pretty much takes care of any of
23 the issues, both the existing as well as the future.
24 I see some confused looks.

1 They don't have actual -- it's not been let
2 at this point, but it is something that they have
3 been working on for years. So it's in the pipeline,
4 but I believe they are awaiting funding right now.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are you referring to
6 the intersection of Prairie and Randall, that
7 section of Randall Road?

8 MR. GARBE: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To six lanes?

10 MR. GARBE: Yes. The widening recommended
11 there was, I believe, recommended to go -- and this
12 has nothing to with our study, this predates all of
13 this -- from north of Route 64 where that widening
14 has already happened down south of Bricher, I
15 believe. But beyond that point, there may be other
16 studies that show other things, but in this
17 particular case, those are --

18 So, again, similar to Randall Road, Prairie
19 Street also has some existing concerns. At least
20 they might look like concerns. There's some higher
21 levels of service, Ds and Es. Prairie Street and
22 14th Street operates pretty well despite what the
23 levels of service might show the way it's configured
24 right now.

1 Under existing traffic, it does meet signal
2 warrants, and, of course, that condition continues
3 when you add future traffic. However, at this
4 point, we don't see a reason to signalize that
5 intersection. The operation seems to be pretty good
6 there.

7 The more complicated part of Prairie Street
8 is looking at the 3rd Street and 7th Street
9 intersections. At those two all-way stop
10 intersections, the queues can be somewhat lengthy
11 there at different times of day. That's with
12 existing traffic.

13 When you add development traffic, of course,
14 that's going to increase delay and queueing. When
15 we get that far from the site, it becomes much more
16 difficult to attribute any interaction there to the
17 site traffic, first of all.

18 Then you also have some situations with
19 Route 31, the signal there at Prairie Street, that
20 interaction with the 3rd Street stop sign.
21 Basically, we didn't go too far into recommendations
22 for those two intersections.

23 There are a lot of options that could be
24 done there -- roundabouts, signals, different types

1 of traffic control, turn restrictions. So that area
2 probably warrants further study, but it's not
3 something we see that's a part of this development.

4 Really the main recommendations that we're
5 making as part of the development were at their
6 proposed main entrance on Route 38. Currently,
7 there are no left-turn phases for the driveways.
8 There's no green arrows right now coming out of
9 those driveway approaches. So we're recommending to
10 add those. It helps a little bit with the capacity.

11 And the final recommendation is to optimize
12 all of the signal timing in that area at the various
13 stages throughout the development. Randall Road
14 already probably has some potential for improvement
15 there, one thing that was evident in the study that
16 we looked at.

17 So when we did the analysis of the existing,
18 we did not make any changes to the timing. We used
19 the existing timing plans. So when you compare that
20 to our analysis of the base condition, which is the
21 10-year projection without this site added, many of
22 the movements actually improve because of that
23 analysis, and we did optimize the timing.

24 So we're adding traffic and adjusting the

1 timing plans and seeing some improvements. So there
2 is probably an opportunity to work with Kane County
3 to improve that as well right now.

4 Some additional notes, we originally
5 submitted this study to the City August 17th. What
6 we submitted last week was Revision 1 which
7 incorporates the 61 additional residential units
8 that were added after the original study was
9 completed.

10 IDOT has seen the original study, but they
11 have not seen Revision 1, and we received review
12 comments from IDOT the last week of the year. And
13 so those -- there's no response to those comments
14 incorporated into Revision 1. That work was already
15 too far along to make any adjustments at that point
16 and be in time for this meeting. We are working on
17 those. We looked at those comments.

18 Mainly, they wanted some modifications, some
19 clarifications to some of our calculations. They
20 are also recommending or requiring a number of
21 right-turn lanes, in particular two on Route 38 and
22 a northbound right-turn lane at Randall and Prairie.

23 The one on the Randall -- again, Randall is
24 owned by Kane County. So that's going to take some

1 work with them as to whether or not that happens.
2 But the two on Randall -- or the two on Route 38,
3 that's more of an IDOT decision.

4 Now, in our study, we did not recommend
5 adding these right-turn lanes. Our analysis found
6 that the capacity for the intersections was okay
7 without it. Right-turn lanes -- adding right-turn
8 lanes doesn't usually give you much advantage in
9 terms of capacity analysis. It doesn't take much to
10 lay away from the rest of the intersection. The
11 throughs and the left turns are always sort of the
12 problem movements, and their interaction with each
13 isn't affected much by right turns.

14 That said, IDOT does have a set of warrants
15 similar to the signal warrants that we talked about
16 earlier, but this is their own set for right-turn
17 lanes. Based on the volumes that we're showing,
18 using their set of warrants, right-turn lanes are
19 warranted at these intersections. So I believe
20 that's probably the basis for their recommendation,
21 more than a capacity analysis result.

22 Again, we're working on Revision 2 now.
23 We're going to be getting that put together to
24 incorporate IDOT's comments, and that will be

1 submitted to the City and to IDOT when that's
2 completed. But we don't really expect any
3 significant impacts to our recommendations, apart
4 from the addition of the right-turn lanes that
5 they're requesting.

6 And one other point there, Kane County also
7 has seen the original August study. They don't
8 actually have any jurisdiction over this study
9 because Shodeen is not looking for any access on
10 Randall, but just the City wanted to kind of keep
11 them in the loop, and they responded that they
12 generally agreed with our findings, didn't have any
13 objections.

14 So that pretty much takes me through my
15 analysis. It's somewhat brief, but I'll be sticking
16 around for questions.

17 Thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Go ahead.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a couple
20 questions. Thanks for paring down that 319 pages.

21 Can you go back to one of your first slides.
22 I think it was methodology. One more.

23 MR. GARBE: This one?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So the total new

1 trips after all of adjustments in vehicles per hour,
2 that's based on the counts that you made in April
3 and May, plus the proposed project? What are those
4 counts representing?

5 MR. GARBE: The table there is just what's
6 generated by the site. It has nothing to do with --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The way it sits
8 today.

9 MR. GARBE: No. What would be generated by
10 the proposed site, what's estimated --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. What would be
12 generated by the proposed site. Not in addition to
13 what's already there just by that site --

14 MR. GARBE: Right. Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- is that correct?

16 MR. GARBE: Yes. So the count -- any of the
17 traffic counts are not included in those numbers
18 at all.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. And going
20 back a little further, you talked about the CMAP
21 projections, and those CMAP projections have nothing
22 to do with the proposed site.

23 MR. GARBE: Correct.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: They're just based

1 on projections that --

2 MR. GARBE: Right. So what we send CMAP
3 is -- we give them a map of the site and tell them
4 what is being proposed to go in there and what roads
5 we want looked at.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

7 MR. GARBE: So in this case, it was the four
8 surrounding it -- Prairie, Randall, 38, and 14th
9 Street.

10 And then what they come back with is the
11 daily traffic volumes they expect to see at some
12 year in the future. Currently, they're going to
13 2040. So we have to do some math to look at the
14 counts, what they are now, what the annual traffic
15 has been like in recent years, what they're
16 projecting, and then estimate our growth rates to
17 fit it into 2026 based on our --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you give them the
19 proposed project, and they include that in their
20 projection?

21 MR. GARBE: Yeah. What they're looking --
22 what they're looking at is a more regional basis.
23 So it doesn't necessarily -- it doesn't incorporate
24 the site itself. What they're saying is -- they're

1 kind of looking at Kane County or something along
2 that scale as a region and saying we kind of expect
3 traffic to grow overall throughout the region in a
4 certain amount, you know, and they just kind of
5 distribute it out across the roads in the area
6 appropriately.

7 So yeah, so it's independent of what would
8 happen on this site.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And perhaps I missed
10 it, but did you make a recommendation for Prairie
11 Street at Randall? I know you talked about
12 projecting.

13 MR. GARBE: No. We didn't have any specific
14 recommendations --

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

16 MR. GARBE: -- to do any improvements there
17 mainly because the existing situation there -- it
18 already needs to be widened really.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Prairie.

20 MR. GARBE: And Kane County -- Randall does.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm talking about
22 Prairie.

23 MR. GARBE: Prairie Street, yeah. Prairie
24 Street, the geometric configuration that's there

1 right now is going to be, we think, fine. What
2 really needs to happen is to widen Randall Road, and
3 I know we talked about the lengthening queue and
4 that westbound left-turn lane in particular and --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And the two
6 entrances that are what --

7 MR. GARBE: The entrances on 14th Street?

8 MEMBER PRETZ: No. On --

9 MR. GARBE: I'm sorry. On Prairie Street.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: On Prairie Street.

11 MR. GARBE: Yeah.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm just talking
13 about to the Jewel entrance or those entrances all
14 the way up to Randall. I mean, it's a nightmare. I
15 just wondered if you had any recommendations.

16 I understand that that condition is existing
17 and is not being caused by -- it's not going to
18 change by the project. It's bad now, and it's going
19 to be bad then.

20 MR. GARBE: Right.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm just wondering.
22 You had talked about all of the other --

23 MR. GARBE: Right. Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- intersections.

1 MR. GARBE: Right. Yes. The geometry that
2 they're proposing for their driveways in our
3 analysis we found to be adequate. So we didn't have
4 anything to add in addition to what Shodeen is
5 already proposing to do with those entrances.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.

7 MR. GARBE: And that section of Prairie
8 pretty much all along the property is a three-lane
9 section right now. So that's one of the things that
10 helps a lot. You already have a two-way left-turn
11 lane through there. So that helps the capacity
12 quite a bit.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: I'd just like to follow up on
16 that. You said the geometry on Prairie is -- in
17 terms of what the Applicant is proposing is
18 adequate. So I want to come back to this idea of
19 closing the access point into the parcel where the
20 queue -- left-turn lane backs up and moving that
21 back to basically be parallel with the front facade
22 of the Jewel.

23 You are not recommending -- you have
24 language in your report that indicates, that

1 suggests that that might be recommended, but it's
2 not a part of your summary recommendations.

3 MR. GARBE: Yeah. We put that in there as a
4 suggestion of one way to deal with that east leg of
5 the intersection. It's actually a recommendation
6 that we had in our 2010 study as well.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Brian, can you
8 explain what you mean?

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Can you show that
10 aerial view where you just had the stoplights?
11 Okay.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So would you explain
13 that to me, Brian?

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. The stop sign --
15 here's what I understand. The stop sign which is on
16 Prairie, just east of Prairie and Randall is the
17 current two-lane point of ingress and egress to the
18 Jewel parking lot from Prairie.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's not existing.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Existing. With where the
21 stop sign is marked right now just --

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There is not a stop sign
23 on Prairie. It's from the --

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Well --

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- south parking.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: On this diagram.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There is no existing
5 stop sign; correct?

6 MEMBER DOYLE: If you're coming out of the
7 Jewel.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: There is coming out
9 of Jewel.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But not on --

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: But not on Prairie.

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Not on Prairie.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's what I didn't
14 understand. So go on.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: So if you imagine that you're
16 driving along the parking lot immediately in front
17 of Jewel and you have to make an imaginary line
18 going northbound along the -- basically directly
19 north from there to right where that outlot is, the
20 proposal that's in the narrative is to move that --
21 to move that driveway back eastward so that the
22 left-bound turn lane can be lengthened. Because
23 right now, the queue blocks that point of entrance.
24 If you're there waiting to get out, you can have

1 left cars blocking your way out.

2 So by having a longer queue, it would
3 alleviate -- my understanding, it would alleviate
4 some of the problems with the westbound left-turn
5 approach to Randall Road.

6 MR. GARBE: Correct.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And that problem exists
9 right now.

10 MR. GARBE: Right. Another part of that is
11 there's another driveway just west of that stop sign
12 into --

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The little strip
14 center.

15 MR. GARBE: -- that strip center.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Rockford Properties
17 strip center.

18 MR. GARBE: Right.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Yep.

20 MR. GARBE: So that recommendation or
21 suggestion, that was one idea of what we thought.
22 Adding a driveway in line with the front of the
23 Jewel store was a way to take away an access point
24 and provide another one, so.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's what I wanted
2 to know. That's what I was wondering if there was
3 some --

4 MR. GARBE: Yeah. We're not specifically
5 recommending to go through with that. That was one
6 idea.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, that's my question. Is
8 the recommendation embedded in your analysis and
9 it's not pulled out in your summary findings as a
10 recommendation?

11 MR. GARBE: Well, again, it kind of goes
12 back to what we're looking at is an existing
13 situation. So what I think we were trying to do was
14 to give the City some ideas that they could use
15 going forward regardless of what happens with the
16 property in question to address a concern there
17 with --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's why you
19 talked about 14th Street and Prairie.

20 MR. GARBE: Right. That's the main reason
21 that those were brought in.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: So is it fair to conclude
23 that if there's a problem in traffic that's a
24 preexisting condition, you're not recommending

1 remediation because it's preexisting?

2 MR. GARBE: Yes and no. What makes the
3 Randall Road intersections a little different hinges
4 largely on that widening plan by Kane County. If
5 that widening goes through, that's really the
6 solution that needs to be put in place, and that's
7 the main one that solves that problem.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Along Prairie when we have
9 existing problems westbound to Randall at the three
10 intersections that you've mentioned, there are --
11 right now, base measurements today shows that there
12 are existing problems there.

13 MR. GARBE: Correct.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Should we infer that because
15 there are existing problems today, that is the
16 reason why there's not a recommendation to mitigate
17 today?

18 MR. GARBE: Yes.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question. This
21 may be unfair, but I hope we can get some kind of
22 idea or clarification.

23 Tim had brought up the 800-plus, 900 extra
24 trips in and out of the site. So that does not

1 include the existing.

2 MR. GARBE: Correct.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So will there be -- you may
4 have said and I may have missed it. Will there be
5 in addition an update on the traffic study which
6 will show what is existing and what is adding, or
7 that will not happen?

8 MR. GARBE: Well, the study includes the
9 traffic counts as well. That particular table I
10 just wanted to show how much new traffic there
11 was -- we were projecting.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I missed that. How much?
13 What are they together? I guess what I'm trying to
14 do from a layman's term is -- this is probably an
15 unfair question.

16 Do you have any idea what Geneva Commons
17 has, just a ballpark guess? Because we're very
18 familiar with how that works.

19 MR. GARBE: Probably more than that. That's
20 about as good as I can.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's what I would guess.
22 What's that?

23 MR. GARBE: That's probably about as good as
24 I could do. We did actually do sort of a similar

1 alternative analysis which is mentioned in the study
2 that might be comparable.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just thought maybe it
4 would relate to how that works versus this site.

5 MR. GARBE: I agree. I have a memo about
6 that in the study. I'm just trying to figure out
7 exactly which one it is.

8 Appendix K is a memo that we had done or we
9 had worked with the City to develop in the past.
10 That one talks about if the Prairie Centre were
11 developed as a shopping center without going through
12 any sort of rezoning, and that would put you in a
13 similar -- a similar size development, I think, a
14 similar type as well to Geneva Commons. Then in the
15 study itself, in the narrative, we did provide a
16 comparison. It's on page 24 of the study, if you
17 want to look at Table 15 and 16.

18 To compare it to say, for example, the
19 evening peak hour, we have the Prairie Centre
20 estimating to generate 898 new trips after
21 adjustments for internal capture, pass-by.

22 If the Towne Center -- or not the Towne
23 Center, that was the old study. Based on the
24 current zoning, we estimated almost twice that 1,639

1 new trips. So that's probably more in line with
2 what the Geneva Commons is.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So you're saying that this
4 is going to be potentially less.

5 MR. GARBE: Correct.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: By a bit.

7 MR. GARBE: Yes. And it depends on what
8 time of day you look at.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Sure. We don't need to
10 split hairs --

11 MR. GARBE: Right.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: -- but I was just looking
13 for a general feeling when you're looking at that.

14 MR. GARBE: And that has largely to do with
15 this mixed-use type. Commercial uses, retail tend
16 to be very high generators. Restaurants are going
17 to be very high generators. Residential is not. If
18 you think about it, that kind of makes sense. Most
19 people go to work in the morning, and they come home
20 at the end of the day. So whereas retail, they're
21 trying to get traffic. So although it's a similar
22 size probably, it might even be a smaller property.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You mentioned -- I have

1 some concerns with the traffic that goes from the
2 development into downtown St. Charles and primarily
3 along Prairie Street. You mentioned as one idea a
4 traffic circle.

5 MR. GARBE: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: A roundabout.

7 MR. GARBE: A roundabout.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How big does a roundabout
9 have to be?

10 MR. GARBE: Not too big. I mean --

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

12 MR. GARBE: -- 50-foot, 100-foot radius, I
13 believe.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is it feasible?

15 MR. GARBE: It would have right-of-way
16 impacts.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is it feasible to put
18 roundabouts in at 7th and 3rd Street?

19 MR. GARBE: I mean, I can't really say if
20 it's not. It's kind of beyond what we looked at.
21 Again, at that point, we were trying to just kind of
22 throw in some ideas that might help. Roundabouts
23 typically perform better in terms of capacity to
24 have in an all-way stop.

1 Another option could be to take out the stop
2 signs on Prairie Street and just have 7th Street or
3 3rd Street stop. So you'll see traffic move around
4 to different streets probably when things like that
5 happen. The same thing with the signals. If you
6 were to signalize it, you'd see traffic move to
7 different streets. So it's not something we studied
8 in great depth because the staff kind of felt like
9 it was outside of the scope.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. You also mentioned
11 cut-through routes.

12 MR. GARBE: Uh-huh.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Did you examine directly
14 to the east of the site cut through on Horne Street?

15 MR. GARBE: Yes, we did look at that.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Was there anything
17 included in the report about that? I didn't see it.

18 MR. GARBE: Yes. Page 21 and 22 of the
19 study goes over that. Again, it was something we
20 kind of looked at from a high-level view, not
21 extremely detailed.

22 Largely because the cost involved in doing
23 that type of study would be pretty large, larger
24 probably than doing the study that we did. It takes

1 a lot of traffic counts really to follow the traffic
2 that way.

3 But in sort of our high-level view, the main
4 thing we see is it's a very large residential area
5 already to the east; and if you're coming along
6 Horne Street, you've got some alignment deflexion
7 that's not the easiest to get to the site. So, you
8 know, it doesn't seem like there's a lot of
9 potential for that as a cut through.

10 With that being said, for someone who might
11 be a resident in that area, I could certainly see
12 how somebody might think someone is cutting through,
13 but it's a very large residential area, and so you
14 might have people on that street that are part of
15 the neighborhood. So that's our -- you know, that's
16 kind of our professional gut opinion I guess you
17 could call it.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: For someone who has lived
19 a block off of Horne Street for 27 years, I can tell
20 you that that is a very popular cut-through route
21 for people going to anywhere in St. Charles and
22 Geneva from that site.

23 MR. GARBE: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So are there any other

1 questions from the Plan Commission?

2 Brian.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: Did your recommendations
4 regarding Prairie Street factor in -- you mentioned
5 earlier proximity of the schools.

6 We have two elementary schools, one on the
7 south side and one on north side of Prairie. They
8 have a shared boundary. So when you look at -- I
9 know you have no recommendations for mitigation
10 right for the two intersections; but in general,
11 what -- like, for instance, eliminating stop signs
12 for Prairie running east and west, obviously, I
13 would assume that would impact pedestrians to be
14 able to -- pedestrians to cross Prairie.

15 So there's no specific question here except
16 to what degree did you look at pedestrian crossings
17 of Prairie north and south, particularly in light of
18 the two schools?

19 MR. GARBE: From the counts that we got, we
20 didn't see very many pedestrians. That being said,
21 we probably did not count the hours, or at least we
22 didn't analyze the hours that school traffic would
23 have been heaviest. But that's a very good point.
24 If whatever improvements, if any, are to be made,

1 the owners should definitely take that into
2 consideration.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: That's my last question.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just want to see
5 if I understand.

6 So we have a number of existing conditions
7 that are less than ideal --

8 MR. GARBE: Right.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- around the
10 property but not directly adjacent to the proposed
11 project.

12 And I would harken back to my question that
13 I had at our last meeting regarding the stormwater.
14 Are there plans in place in public works to mitigate
15 these things? Suppose this project doesn't go
16 through, suppose this project wasn't even
17 proposed --

18 MR. BONG: Right.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- what is the
20 City's thinking about these untenable intersections?
21 What would they do?

22 MR. BONG: I'm not aware of any projects on
23 Prairie. The project that I'm aware of that would
24 mitigate some of this would be more of a Kane County

1 project, the Randall Road widening, but I'm not
2 aware of anything.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I cannot figure in
4 my head how widening Randall Road to six lanes can
5 fix the problems on Prairie Street.

6 MR. BONG: Well, because they have to
7 include -- they have to go down Prairie Street and
8 improve that intersection, so that helps.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So that would be
10 driveways, et cetera, that we have to move.

11 MR. BONG: Right. For example, and, you
12 know, there's lots of -- I wouldn't call them
13 recommendations but ideas in the study that maybe
14 didn't become recommendations that would probably
15 not happen -- roundabouts, traffic signals -- and I
16 would say that kind of goes along with some of the
17 suggestions down at Randall and Prairie.

18 Now, when -- but you would hate to do
19 improvements and then have KDOT come in like a year
20 later and widen it and wipe it all out as well.
21 That's part of it too.

22 But, yeah, I'm not aware of anything in
23 particular on those that public works has planned
24 for those east intersections. I'm not exactly sure,

1 you know, what could be done at those intersections.

2 I know that the signal warrants are met, but
3 I think the City has in the past made a decision
4 that it wouldn't really be the right approach to put
5 in signals. So that leaves limited options as to
6 what to actually do.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It seems a little
8 bit like the chicken and the egg to me.

9 MR. BONG: Yeah.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: If the Applicant is,
11 you know, agreeable to doing some recommended
12 improvements on the roadways adjacent to their
13 property, which I imagine they would be, why
14 wouldn't they be, they would have to for the
15 development, but I don't want to stall development
16 because we have problems around the area.

17 It seems to me that there's an onus on us,
18 on the City to correct some of these problems
19 regardless of this project or not. Again, it
20 reminds me of what occurred or what you described
21 with the stormwater. I mean, those are issues that
22 are -- they're there whether you do this or not. We
23 need to fix it.

24 MR. BONG: Right.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I didn't -- we
2 didn't spend a lot of time talking about the
3 entrances into the proposed site. I know you've
4 talked about right turns in and Randall and the
5 existing.

6 Was there any recommendation for the Prairie
7 Street entrance into the property --

8 MR. GARBE: No. Beyond what they're already
9 planning, no.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- in the plan.

11 Then to go back to what Chris said. How do
12 you know how to improve it until you know what's
13 there? I mean, that's part of our issue. If you
14 don't know what's going to happen with the Randall
15 Road improvement, then how can you improve it?

16 MR. BONG: Right.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any questions
19 up here?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Questions
22 from members of the audience.

23 MS. BELL-LASOTA: Good evening. Vanessa
24 Bell-Lasota, B, as in "boy," -e-l-l, hyphen --

1 sorry -- L-a-s, as in "Sam," -o-t, as in "Tom," -a,
2 1610 Howard Street.

3 I appreciate the opportunity to voice my
4 concerns and comments. I'll keep them as a brief as
5 I can. I lost my no-line progressive lenses today,
6 so bear with me while I try to read my writing. I'm
7 going to go back chronologically. I'm going to take
8 us from where we are now.

9 My first concern is that in the traffic
10 study, HLR took a high view of the cut-through
11 routes because of the cost, and that is the very
12 thing that the neighborhood wanted to see.

13 So I can't fathom why -- I do appreciate
14 that the Shodeen Group is purchasing this, is paying
15 for this at their expense, but why that very thing
16 that came up during the Towne Centre did they --
17 it's still there.

18 I live at 16th and Howard, and regarding the
19 idea of a traffic circle as a possible solution,
20 there's an offset traffic circle at 16th, and I
21 travel that every day, and there is a near crash
22 every day, and that traffic circle is very small.
23 It's not 100 feet.

24 And they keep struggling -- the City keeps

1 struggling with changing the signage there to try to
2 prevent crashes, and you all know who lives there.
3 I mean, I live -- when you're looking down 16th at
4 the circle, that's my house, 1610 Howard. You can
5 go right straight up 16th, up my driveway, and into
6 my backyard, and that did happen once.

7 Every day one member of our family or
8 another almost has a near collision. So the idea of
9 a traffic circle -- that's my two cents with that.

10 Again, I'm confused with the authority of
11 HLR to make a recommendation whether or not the
12 County or the City takes care of the safety issues
13 that exist now. For example, 14th and Prairie,
14 again an intersection that I drive every day, and
15 just tonight, again, the site lines are very poor on
16 Prairie at 14th, very poor.

17 And the congestion is very deep on weekdays
18 and weekends without change, and the acceleration of
19 cars on Prairie as they're going westbound --
20 anticipating Randall Road, the cars are accelerating
21 way beyond the speed limit. I can attest to that.
22 I've lived here 19 years.

23 I'd also like to speak to the idea of the
24 traffic study not going further towards Route 31.

1 Do the cars evaporate into thin air? I was just the
2 victim of an accident at 3rd and Walnut going
3 eastbound on Walnut. My car was totaled, and
4 there's no signalization there.

5 So my concern is if there is already, again,
6 poor sight lines, again, people -- I was told by the
7 police that people go northbound on 3rd anticipating
8 the signal at 64, at North Avenue, Main Street, and
9 so they accelerate. And so there are areas of
10 acceleration within our community now.

11 So I would suggest that you don't have the
12 authority also to say whether or not the City or the
13 County are going to take care of it, especially
14 respectfully you, yourself, said Kane County said --
15 you know, as Mr. Kessler said, the project is
16 stalled. There is no funding for it. You know,
17 just pass that along to the County as if there's not
18 a problem now. The concern is now.

19 And last, as I try to read the last point,
20 did HLR consult with the St. Charles Police
21 Department for their anecdotal crash report? Every
22 year they come out with an annual top five crash
23 sites in the city. Were you able to do that?

24 MR. GARBE: No, we didn't get any crash

1 reports.

2 MS. BELL-LASOTA: I'd like to recommend that
3 the Plan Commission suggest recommending that to HLR
4 because I learned of them through the Citizens
5 Police Academy. It's very valuable, and when I
6 attended the police academy, it was about 2014 or
7 possibly earlier, and Prairie and Randall were one
8 of the top five crash sites, so is Illinois and 31,
9 and I don't really recall the other ones. But I
10 think that would be very valuable to know now with
11 our current traffic patterns without a development
12 of Prairie Centre, what that -- what might ensue.

13 And I think I'll stop there because frankly
14 I'm getting a headache. Thank you so much.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Yes.

16 MR. NORGAARD: My name is Larry Norgaard.
17 It's N-o-r-g-a-a-r-d, 1214 South 6th Street,
18 St. Charles.

19 Are we just dealing with the traffic issues
20 here or the project issues?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

22 MR. NORGAARD: Okay. I don't want to live
23 in a development area that mirrors Arlington
24 Heights, Naperville, and some other areas. I don't

1 want to become a big city with the congestion and
2 everything. I live in a residential area, the one
3 you're talking about just east of the Jewel, for
4 example. And I don't think that needs to be changed
5 with high density, 670 units in that area. That
6 just creates congestion.

7 The traffic report, to the extent that I
8 understood it, and pardon me, it was a legal
9 document that went on forever, as you well know, did
10 suggest that there were some issues with the bypass
11 because of the congestion at the intersections on
12 7th Street. 14th wasn't taken as that serious a
13 thing, but 7th Street and 3rd Street and 31 -- 31
14 definitely was not dealt with, but that definitely
15 is there.

16 We have already taken the bypass through
17 Horne Street and, of course, Oak Street as well to
18 get past the traffic. This idea of a roundabout at
19 any of those locations, I think, is a little bit
20 bizarre because you've got school buses. Besides
21 students, you've got school buses going through
22 there; and if you don't have stopping, how are the
23 kids crossing to the grade schools, from one grade
24 school to the other and to the middle school. That

1 is one of my concerns.

2 The discussion in there, which was maybe not
3 a solution, as I understood it, was that the Jewel
4 access might be a problem, and it probably has to do
5 with that extra lane that you're talking about, and
6 that's a big thing.

7 I mean, you live in a community because --
8 like this because you want easy access, easy to get
9 around. You don't want the traffic jam like Oak
10 Park and Naperville and Arlington Heights. You want
11 to be able to get to your stores and get home. You
12 don't want to sit there waiting forever and fighting
13 traffic, and to change the complexion of this city
14 would be a terrible thing.

15 The proposed mixed-use development still has
16 to deal with the realities of commercial development
17 growth and decline in the Charlestowne Mall area,
18 for example. They haven't been able to fill that
19 mall for years.

20 There's two empty spots on Randall Road west
21 of the Jewel, that's the strip mall that Shodeen has
22 just on Randall Road. There is five empty spaces at
23 the strip mall where the barbershop is along Prairie
24 Street which is just west of the Jewel again.

1 You've got -- okay. That's five empty spots.

2 You've got six empty spaces on Randall just west of
3 the Jewel. That would be just across the street
4 from them. You've got six empty spaces in the
5 Saddle Brook strip facilities off of 14th Street.

6 You've got an economy that you've got, what
7 is it, Macy's, you've got Walmart, big stores are
8 cutting back. They have overbuilt with the economy
9 that we have. Commercial online purchasing has
10 changed things. I don't think we're going to build
11 this thing as a development with retail stores very
12 fast. There is plenty of empty stores south of Best
13 Buy, the sport center, for example. They're all
14 empty. Those are some concerns of mine because
15 we're not going to really have the ability to fill
16 that in.

17 This density of 670 places is absolutely
18 ridiculous, and I thought I had read someplace that
19 the fire department, I think it was in the
20 Chronicle, has some concerns about access with this
21 congestion in that development for safety in case of
22 a fire. So there's another question that needs to
23 be looked into, and I don't know the answer to that.
24 You can talk to the fire department about that.

1 Of course, you have on Bricher Road -- you
2 have those two big open area spaces on the north
3 side of Bricher Road that have been empty and
4 haven't been developed for a long time. The signs
5 are up there, very large.

6 The shopping center where the Dominick's
7 used to be, you've got a -- let's see, I forget what
8 it's called now -- Salvation Army store there.
9 There's several empty spots there that aren't
10 filled. I mean, we're just not going to fill this
11 retail stuff very fast, and I'm concerned about the
12 whole project basically.

13 It's not building the kind of city I moved
14 into 41 years ago, and it's just going to make
15 commuting much more difficult, and the traffic study
16 definitely points that out.

17 Thank you.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: May I ask you a
19 question?

20 MR. NORGAARD: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm curious. Are
22 you suggesting that you're opposed to the commercial
23 portion of this project or the residential portion
24 of this project?

1 MR. NORGAARD: I'm opposed mostly to the
2 residential, but the commercial I think is almost a
3 gimmick because I don't think it's going to develop.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No project at all,
5 leave the site as it is. Is that what you're --

6 MR. NORGAARD: No, I'm not saying that. I'm
7 saying cut the density down to 250, 300 units. We
8 should be developing things for the city, for the
9 residents, for the voters, not for the developers
10 who want to make a big buck.

11 I mean, Shodeen is building a four-story
12 place in downtown Batavia, downtown. They're going
13 to lose the character of that town. They proposed
14 a big development on Randall Road in North Aurora.
15 Where are all these people going to live?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just wanted to
17 clarify what you're suggesting. Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. NORGAARD: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?
20 Yes.

21 MS. BELL-LASOTA: Can I comment on the
22 architecture of the presentation?

23 Vanessa Bell-Lasota. I'm sorry. I did want
24 to make a comment to the architect's presentation

1 that I think is very important.

2 My question is you embedded flexibility.

3 You mentioned that there needs to be a potential for
4 the buildings to increase in length to accommodate
5 market need. That seems to speak to Mr. Norgaard's
6 point, that if there is no demand for commercial,
7 you're possibly already laying the groundwork for
8 the argument for more residential within the
9 residential that we are considering accepting.

10 So my question is why embed to accommodate
11 more density that the area can't bear? That is a
12 conundrum to me.

13 The idea of value adding, you also
14 mentioned, sir, and my question is the anticipated
15 solution to our community's objection of the
16 original eight-story buildings, that's embedded
17 solution for the future so that we're going to build
18 out horizontally through the landscape of the
19 development.

20 Lastly, in the revised building elevations,
21 I don't see a solution to the prairie style of, you
22 know, all the aspirational things you said, the
23 landscape. I know that's all coming. There will be
24 more detail coming, but I thought that was one of

1 the answers that we were going to have regarding the
2 footprint, the circle, the fountain element that was
3 discussed. We were going to see an option for that,
4 for the walkability and the flow through.

5 I don't see how anything changed except some
6 colors and textures there on the original building.
7 So I'm still looking for that.

8 I believe that's it. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. Any other
10 questions or comments?

11 Yes, sir. Sorry. You go ahead and then
12 you.

13 MR. VARGULICH: Good evening. My name is
14 Peter Vargulich, V, as Victor, -a-r-g-u-l-i-c-h, 503
15 South 16th Street.

16 We're allowed to have comments beyond
17 traffic and that kind of stuff today; right? Is
18 that still correct?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry. Could you
20 just raise that up?

21 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. The discussions today
22 or comments today can exceed just the traffic study
23 that was discussed; correct?

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. We were going to

1 focus on that for the presentation, but go ahead.

2 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

3 I have some semi-prepared remarks, so I
4 apologize if I jump around a little bit.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You're good.

6 MR. VARGULICH: I have attended at least
7 three out of four of the public hearings and have
8 kind of generally followed the project since January
9 of last year, and I will have to say that the
10 current plan in general is an improvement over what
11 was originally proposed in January.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm sorry. I can't
13 hear you.

14 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. I'll tell you what.
15 Better?

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There you go. Thank you.

17 MR. VARGULICH: Sorry about that. And so I
18 appreciate that there has been a number of
19 improvements to the site plan which I think starts
20 the project in the right direction.

21 I think on the positives, the boulevards,
22 the boulevard through the site north and south with
23 the accent pavers and the continuous median, some of
24 the parking areas with the continuous medians. I

1 think that overall the architecture has made a lot
2 of progress visually with respect to both mixed-use
3 and the residential-only buildings.

4 I think that's something that's been missing
5 in a lot of the St. Charles area is sufficient
6 patios with restaurants. So I'm glad to see at
7 least conceptually those things are being suggested
8 for the outlots primarily on Lincoln Highway.

9 I think that the reduced parking is always
10 good. And, you know, with the caution that,
11 hopefully, that if for some reason everybody's
12 expectations are wrong, that there's a way to
13 correct that, but sometimes failure of too little
14 parking is an okay solution.

15 I think that the PUD in general is a good
16 approach, and some things that are typically
17 required as part of the PUD are superior landscaping
18 and buffering and innovative stormwater management,
19 and I would have to say that I don't see either of
20 those in this project. So I'm wondering how the
21 Plan Commission feels or if the Petitioner can
22 please explain where their innovative stormwater
23 management is and also superior landscaping and
24 buffering.

1 As I see their plans, at a minimum they seem
2 deficient along Route 38 as the street ordinances
3 require screening of parking areas from public
4 roads, and that does not seem to be illustrated. I
5 understand these are preliminary, but I think also
6 before we approve something, we should ask for some
7 explanation as to how does their plan facilitate
8 those issues, if they just met the straight
9 ordinance and where they've exceeded them by having
10 a PUD.

11 I think that the screening of the back of
12 the Jewel continues to be missed in the site
13 planning standpoint as well as in their landscape
14 architecture drawings.

15 There's a letter or a memo from some
16 management-level person at Pace where they recommend
17 four things for the project -- the sidewalk along
18 38, how they are handling the bus stop being flipped
19 to the west. I think those are excellent ideas as
20 far as pedestrian connectivity.

21 I think the City should think about why --
22 whether it's -- maybe it's going to be built later,
23 but it seems like CVS is complete, but why is there
24 a missing segment of sidewalk along the driveway on

1 the back side of CVS. Since there is only one
2 sidewalk on that access driveway, there's not one on
3 each side, you have to walk in the street for
4 100 feet, 150 feet, whatever. It seems like that's
5 something that could have been addressed.

6 As well as why a sidewalk along Route 38 was
7 not included as part of their requirements for
8 redevelopment, considering that we're now looking at
9 IDOT and Pace suggesting that this project would do
10 exactly that.

11 One thing that seems -- I understand that
12 the Petitioner and the park district have had
13 numerous conversations that they've alluded to with
14 letters related to creating a park.

15 The submitted land cash sheet that was
16 provided indicates about 11 to 12 acres of land that
17 if they increase the density or increase the request
18 for 670 units plus or minus right now, it seems like
19 it will be closer to 12 acres. Why is not a park
20 part of this project? I ask that to all of you.

21 Why has that never been requested?
22 Understanding that the Petitioner is working with
23 the park district or has had discussions, but it
24 seems that they're not of a meeting of the mind as

1 to what that really means. So I wondered why the
2 City is not requesting that. I would say a minimum
3 of 2 acres, and the rest would be a donation of cash
4 and probably would not include the pond.

5 The current engineering drawings show their
6 detention pond of 1 acre, but it has 8 feet of
7 bounce. I'm trying to understand how that 8 feet of
8 bounce represents something that a mixed-use project
9 would find interesting or aesthetic; and there was
10 nothing in the engineering drawings that showed a
11 side slope, as to what that slope is from high water
12 line to normal water line. But 8 feet of bounce
13 seems excessive unless it's like an industrial park
14 or, you know, something that's not intended to
15 include a lot of people walking around it as an
16 amenity.

17 In the form of innovative stormwater
18 management, it also appears that based, again, on
19 their engineering submittal, that about half,
20 40 percent of the site is going -- is being detained
21 offsite to the pond next to 14th Street so that, you
22 know, only a portion of the property is actually
23 being detained in the pond that's onsite.

24 And so I wonder if there would be a way to

1 involve some sort of green infrastructure that would
2 help to create a more innovative -- I realize green
3 infrastructure is something that is maybe not
4 considered innovative by a lot of people in the
5 industry today because it's been around for more
6 than 5 or 10 years. But I think in St. Charles, it
7 doesn't really exist as a solution to stormwater
8 management.

9 And that would probably also -- if some of
10 those techniques were used, could possibly reduce
11 the amount of fluctuation or bounce from normal to
12 high water line, and maybe that would be a way to
13 make the pond a little more interesting and bring it
14 up to a level where people would see it.

15 With respect to traffic, if I'm
16 understanding, and respecting that I have no great
17 understanding of how a traffic engineering study is
18 done, but it seems to defy layman logic as to why
19 there would not be any traffic control suggested at
20 Prairie and 14th, inasmuch as 7th and 3rd have
21 traffic control at Prairie and all -- and both 7th
22 and 3rd extend to Main Street and traffic at
23 signalized intersections.

24 So why wouldn't this project now kind of

1 make sense to introduce at least a stop sign for all
2 the traffic in both directions or all three
3 directions at Prairie and 14th, given that the
4 opposite end of that stretch of road is a signalized
5 intersection.

6 The IDOT recommendation, as indicated from
7 the presentation tonight, suggests some right-turn
8 lanes and those kinds of things at Prairie and
9 Randall, and I would suggest that those were well
10 worthwhile inasmuch as if you increase pedestrian
11 traffic, having a place for the right-turn lane cars
12 to pull over to the side to make their turn to go
13 northbound on Randall would allow the flow traffic
14 to go straight across without having to wait for the
15 right turn. It would increase a lot of pedestrian
16 traffic. People crossing at that intersection will
17 slow down at all the right lanes -- or all the
18 right-turn movements.

19 The traffic study didn't address the
20 proposed parking on Prairie Street, or at least I
21 must have missed that, inasmuch as there could be
22 two mixed-use buildings that are facing Prairie, and
23 they're proposing angled parking on Prairie. How
24 would that impact traffic to have those cars pull in

1 and back out. Understanding that from a retail
2 standpoint, that makes sense; but if the intent is
3 for traffic flow, that kind of is counterproductive.
4 Yet we didn't hear about how that could impact
5 traffic on Prairie from a movement standpoint.

6 So I would suggest that maybe that should be
7 addressed, if, in fact, those buildings do go to
8 mixed use inasmuch as we don't know right now
9 because we're waiting to see how the market
10 develops.

11 I think that about does it. I appreciate
12 your time and, again, I have -- I'm not concerned
13 about the level of density as many other people have
14 commented on. I think if it's done well, it's not
15 an issue. And you can add to so many things with
16 respect to users and people to use services and
17 retail and enliven areas. I think that is positive.

18 In my recommendation for a pure park that is
19 just for the park district for them to program
20 however their process is is based on the fact that
21 the three closest parks are not of a size based on
22 the park district standards that could handle
23 another 1200 people even if you divide them up
24 between the three parks that are nearby. Their

1 standards say that they're not capable of handling
2 1200 people that were not planned for this area.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

5 Yes, sir.

6 MR. REED: Good evening. My name is Patrick
7 Reed, R-e-e-d. I live at 17 Westfield Drive. I
8 would like to address a few concerns.

9 I'll start with the traffic study the
10 previous commenter touched on. I was disappointed
11 that the traffic study didn't look at the eastbound
12 parking along Prairie, the angled parking. The
13 gentleman talked about how Prairie is great because
14 it has the capacity of the continuous bi-directional
15 turn lane in the middle of it.

16 But when you put the angled parking in
17 there, cars are backing up and pulling out, you're
18 going to lose some of that capacity that you've
19 hinted is such a benefit of Prairie Street.

20 Another thing is the lack of the examination
21 of the cut-through traffic down Horne. Horne is a
22 busy street. There's a big park there. I live
23 right across the street kind of. That park is
24 frequented by a lot of kids. There's a lot of

1 sports. It's just packed with soccer, baseball,
2 football, all sorts of people. So if you add all
3 these cars to it, you're increasing, you know, the
4 chances of something else happening.

5 Also with respect to 7th, moving down to 7th
6 and Prairie, with the school district's plan to move
7 all of the middle school students from two buildings
8 to one building on the south end of that property,
9 if you take Haines to Thompson, it could be inferred
10 that there is going to be more pedestrian traffic
11 coming down 7th Street now because all the kids are
12 going to be on the south end of that property. So
13 all the kids who may have cut through on 9th and
14 10th and 11th out by Haines may now cut through on
15 7th. So I wish the traffic study would have come
16 down a little bit more, but they can only work with
17 the information they have.

18 As far as the density and as far as my
19 school comments, I live in the Davis-Richmond area.
20 We right now have a school mobility rate that is
21 twice the district average, and that's due to the
22 high density of apartments we have. So that means
23 the move-ins and move-outs in our area are twice
24 that of the district. So there's anywhere between

1 10 to 15 percent.

2 So if you add more apartments to that, the
3 teachers have less time to teach these students that
4 they have. They're spending more time dealing with
5 influx and out-flux of renters because that's what
6 people in apartments do. They move in and out.

7 Further concerns I have are regarding the
8 sewer and the sanitary system. Our neighborhood has
9 been inundated, I would say, with flooding in recent
10 years. The City is doing the best they can; but if
11 you get a big rain event in our neighborhood, it's
12 hit or miss whether your block is going to flood.

13 And unless the Petitioner is willing to pay
14 for all of the upgrades or a majority of them, I
15 don't see how this project is a net benefit to those
16 people surrounding it who have to deal with the
17 downstream flow that comes with having 670 units.

18 Another impact is the police and fire. I'm
19 looking at how many additional calls for service are
20 going to be needed on a 670-unit 1200-person
21 development as compared to something that was
22 entirely more commercial. You're going to have less
23 of an impact to the City services. We're going to
24 get benefits, more in tax dollars, more in

1 commercial taxes. I think it's just a better way
2 for the City to have more commercial and a little
3 less residential.

4 As far as the layout is concerned, I do have
5 concerns about looking at 600 linear feet of
6 apartment buildings. That's what's proposed if
7 those two are connected in the middle. I believe
8 the one building was 264 and one building was 283.
9 There is about a 70-foot gap.

10 So you're looking at 600 linear feet of
11 apartment buildings that's 60 feet wide; and on that
12 northeast corridor, you would have 600 feet, you
13 have another one, and another 600 feet. So
14 basically you'd have a giant cavern of apartment
15 buildings, and I don't think that's aesthetically
16 pleasing to our neighborhood. I don't think it's
17 what St. Charles wants in, you know, the community
18 as a whole.

19 Am I opposed to residential development of
20 this property? No, I'm not. But it needs to be
21 done responsibly with smaller outer buildings, maybe
22 more of a senior housing concept as opposed to so
23 many units and encourage the commercial viability.

24 You have big roads here. You have Randall

1 Road. You have Lincoln Highway. You have a lot of
2 potential for frontage, and people drive by there;
3 and to shove 670 apartment buildings in here, and
4 maybe more. We don't know. It's all based on what
5 the market says. So 670 could go to 7, it could go
6 to 8. We could end up with 868,000 square feet of
7 all commercial.

8 Right now as it stands, the residential
9 component, my quick calculation, is around 751,000
10 square feet, and the commercial is 116,000. 116,000
11 commercial square feet on a property of that size
12 with that kind of frontage seems a little on the
13 light side.

14 Thank you. I appreciate it. Thanks for all
15 your time. You guys have any questions of me?

16 Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Great. Thank you.

18 Anyone else?

19 MS. NASON: Donna Nason, N-a-s-o-n, 629
20 Katherine Street.

21 There was an article about former Mayor Fred
22 Norris that was in the paper a year ago, and I saved
23 it because I thought it was applicable to this
24 situation.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can you pull that mic
2 down. Thank you.

3 MS. NASON: Oh, I'm sorry. It was an
4 article in the local paper about former Mayor Fred
5 Norris. He came to visit in St. Charles, and he was
6 interviewed by the paper. And this is what he had
7 to say about our town.

8 He said, "The quaintness, the quaintness of
9 the tri-cities is a very good thing. It's easy to
10 establish that tri-city residents generally love
11 their communities and hate to see changes that take
12 away established charm. So it begs the question why
13 are we even talking about apartments or multifamily
14 living."

15 He said, "The focus should be on the faster
16 growing demographic, building a set of townhomes or
17 smaller units in a setting with a walking path and
18 core areas for activities for retired baby boomers
19 who aren't going to get any younger. A good example
20 of this strategy is the Highland Garden Village just
21 outside of Denver, Colorado."

22 He said, "Shodeen should be thinking more
23 about senior housing. Nearby residents would not
24 have to worry about a major uptick in traffic,

1 crime, or kids flooding the schools.

2 "I'm thinking we are going to have a lot
3 more empty commercial and retail buildings in the
4 coming years that could become cool loft apartments
5 for urban housing for the younger generation."

6 I thought his comments were so good, and I
7 still look at this as this could be a wonderful
8 potential there on that property. 670 apartments
9 when we already have 1500 or more apartments on the
10 west side of St. Charles, I think it's
11 unconscionable that we would develop that property
12 in that way because once we change that whole
13 demographic area, it will stay that way; and it
14 certainly affects our property values, our taxes,
15 our crime, safety, traffic.

16 And so I hope we will look long and hard at
17 this before there is any approval of what's going to
18 be done there.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
21 else?

22 Tom, did you have something?

23 MEMBER PRETZ: I had one item that I didn't
24 want to pass us by here, and this was to Mr. Bazos,

1 and it's in relation to your response to the
2 comprehensive plan. I think that was, what,
3 26 pages?

4 I wanted to just take the time to thank you
5 for putting that together, your time and effort and
6 most importantly the thought process that you went
7 through in your response for that. We didn't go
8 through that. It's reading material and that, and
9 I'm not going to go through it, but I just wanted to
10 take a moment to thank you for that portion.

11 But I also wanted to say that in going
12 forward, at some point we'll conclude here and go to
13 the PUD, that you make it a point -- because it will
14 be written material and the assumption is that
15 everybody reads the written material, that you may
16 want to highlight and go through that a little bit
17 for that PUD so that they see from the thought
18 process and how you took a look at that and it fits
19 into the comprehensive plan.

20 So I just wanted to take a moment to thank
21 you and your team.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Yeah, Jim.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes. I have a question
24 procedurally. Should I present what I have brought

1 to the Plan Commission now or wait until the close
2 of the meeting?

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, no. Go ahead and
4 present it.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This is shown on -- we
7 had already entered this as Exhibit D.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Do you have this copy?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's a drawing by Jim
10 Holderfield.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: You got it. Okay. All
12 right. So there's really three areas I want to talk
13 about briefly here.

14 I'm very impressed with the new proposal of
15 the elevations. I think the -- home in Springfield,
16 Illinois, and the elevations is a great step towards
17 accomplishing the prairie look, the color scheme
18 seems nice. I'm very happy with that in terms of a
19 residential unit.

20 One thing I am concerned about and to carry
21 this through, we have to be authentic. The way I
22 have scaled the drawing, it seems like the roof
23 overhang is 2 feet, 6 inches inches. Perhaps it
24 could be extended out to 3 feet or more to get a

1 better shadow line of the building. It's very
2 narrow for that height of a building. So I think
3 that would be good.

4 I'm also really concerned about when I look
5 at the elevations of the residential units, the
6 front elevation, the shadow lines. When I look at
7 the footprint of the building as proposed, I don't
8 see projections on the footprint that appear on the
9 elevations.

10 So I'm wondering are those projections that
11 show on the elevations, or are they cantilevered up
12 from the foundation; or is the foundation going to
13 be projected out from this prairie simplistic
14 rectangle that has been presented?

15 It looks like there's little details there.
16 If we can get that view up of the footprint, I just
17 want to show what I'm talking about.

18 MR. TALTY: I know exactly what you're
19 talking about.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. I just want to
21 make sure.

22 MR. TALTY: So you're talking about the idea
23 of the footprint not --

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Do you have another

1 view that's more detailed, that closes in just on
2 the footprint of the building?

3 MR. TALTY: Sure. Let's go to the landscape
4 plan. We have -- here.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: All right. So let's go
6 with the residential unit. I'm not seeing any
7 projections there.

8 MR. TALTY: We're not representing the
9 articulation that would manifest itself in the
10 building itself. This is indicative -- this is a
11 simple footprint.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I wanted to make sure
13 of that.

14 MR. TALTY: Correct. The elevations are a
15 more accurate portrayal of the ins and outs of how
16 the building would really look.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I understand that. I'm
18 concerned about the depth of those projections and
19 how that would be. There could be a little turn
20 for -- I know this is a preliminary plan.

21 MR. TALTY: Sure.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I want to make sure
23 that that's part and parcel of what we're talking
24 about here.

1 On this new proposal I didn't see any side
2 elevations that we have in the past. Not that
3 that's totally important, but I'd like to see, you
4 know, what it's looking like from the side.

5 MR. TALTY: Sure.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And one other thing in
7 regards to the entryways, looking at the front
8 elevation of the residential buildings, are there
9 three entrances there? I know primarily the one
10 with the arch double door is an entryway, but
11 there's two smaller ones.

12 MR. TALTY: Correct. These are exits from
13 stairs.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So you just have one
15 grand entry through the building.

16 MR. TALTY: Correct.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. That brings me
18 to my other point. And this goes further down the
19 line when we were talking about the spirit carrying
20 through the engineering. I just want to make sure
21 that, as in the photographs that you show of house
22 building and entryways off of the highway, that we
23 get some sort of an entry that's prominent going
24 into the building.

1 MR. TALTY: Agreed.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That's just carrying it
3 through. I don't want to just compromise this.
4 We're getting down to the right road. I want to
5 see --

6 MR. TALTY: Yeah. Completely agree. We
7 want a private place for the residents --

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

9 MR. TALTY: -- and we want their front door
10 to be not -- again, not just -- well, that's a pair
11 of doors, so that must be where I go, but instead a
12 celebrated event --

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

14 MR. TALTY: -- in the length of this
15 building that has appropriate, you know, landscaping
16 and amenities around it --

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Precisely.

18 MR. TALTY: -- which begin to identify it as
19 a point of entry.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And I know this is too
21 early too, but we've never really seen a floor plan.

22 MR. TALTY: Correct. We've not developed
23 unit plans yet.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Sure. I wasn't sure

1 where the entryways were at.

2 All right. Then I have another concern.

3 MR. TALTY: Okay.

4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I did a little work,
5 drawing, and I'm talking about the mixed-use
6 buildings, primarily those D1, D2, and D3 along
7 Lincoln Highway.

8 I was okay until when I first got your
9 proposal on the small piece of paper, and I
10 contacted Mr. Bazos and got a large-sized drawing,
11 and I'm concerned about the height of the buildings
12 D1 and 2 and 3.

13 MR. TALTY: Uh-huh.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: What I proposed here is
15 that they would be reduced one level, and I think
16 scale is more appropriate as we leave 38, Lincoln
17 Highway, going into the project, that it transitions.

18 At first, I thought removing the flat roof
19 might be a good answer. I'm not so sure of that
20 looking at the third-floor level of apartments and
21 that flat roof. I don't think that that's the deal.

22 The other proposal was to eliminate once
23 more, put the hip roof that we had on the
24 residences, and I'm afraid with the mixed-use

1 buildings, it's going to act as a barrier that's
2 going to separate what we have accomplished as far
3 as the residential.

4 So I think the mixed-use building B1 there
5 could be the same height. I'm not talking about
6 that, nor am I talking about those on Prairie as
7 much, but I'm looking at the grand entryway that
8 we're proposing off of 38, and you want to emphasize
9 this as a entryway into St. Charles and Geneva. I
10 think that's just something I'd like for us to
11 consider or you consider as we go down the road
12 a bit.

13 MR. TALTY: Understood.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That's two of my
15 points.

16 MR. TALTY: Okay.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: My last point is
18 something that we really have not talked about too
19 much, and that's the retail buildings along 38, and
20 I'm talking about building A, C1, B2 --

21 MR. TALTY: Yep.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- the smaller
23 buildings, and looking down at the plan through
24 here, there's nothing on here; but I hope that the

1 Shodeen development is not planning to place in
2 regard to commercial chains, I'll just use
3 McDonald's or Panera Bread. Are they going to be
4 held accountable to following our prairie style of
5 architecture for this prairie concept? I'm a little
6 concerned about that.

7 We haven't talked about it as a group, but I
8 wanted to put that out on the table that I want some
9 assurances that the Shodeen development is aware of
10 that. I think they probably are. But I just want
11 it to be a matter of record.

12 So these three areas are what I'm concerned
13 with.

14 MR. TALTY: Understood. Thank you, sir.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think you have done a
16 great job of moving forward.

17 MR. TALTY: Thank you.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Russ, could you
20 speak to that, if a national chain came in,
21 following the design guidelines, the requirements of
22 following the design guidelines of the PUD.

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. There's design guidelines
24 that are in the zoning ordinance for the BR Business

1 Regional District which is the zoning district this
2 property is in.

3 Those buildings, the outlot commercial
4 buildings, there has not been a preliminary
5 architectural design submitted for those buildings,
6 so that needs to be submitted and reviewed as a
7 preliminary plan later.

8 At that time, the Plan Commission will have
9 an opportunity to review the architecture of those
10 buildings; but unless the PUD ordinance itself
11 states that there is a requirement involving the
12 architectural style, there will not be any specific
13 standards to review for the compatibility with the
14 rest of the development.

15 So if that's something that the Plan
16 Commission would desire to see, that could be
17 included as part of the recommendation, to have
18 specific design guidelines or some language that
19 addresses the issue of compatibility of the
20 architecture with the rest of the project.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Does that --

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have seen cases where
23 out buildings like this haven't been held to task to
24 make their --

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's the whole
2 point; right?

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes. I don't want to
4 see that happen. That's all.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, you know, I
6 appreciate the fact that we have Jim to add -- with
7 the architectural, I think you've really contributed
8 a lot to the direction that this project has gone
9 and the work we have done to the project.

10 I want to be careful about one thing. I'm
11 going to throw this out there. I'm not opposed to
12 anything you say, but I want to make sure that this
13 doesn't become a cookie-cutter project. I don't
14 want it to look -- personally, I would prefer that
15 while there is a prairie theme throughout the
16 project, that all the buildings don't look the same,
17 all the same hip roofs.

18 I think there needs to be -- it would look
19 like a campus. I don't want it to look like a
20 campus. It needs to have some -- you need to be
21 able to have some variations on it, and, you know,
22 there is pure prairie style, and then there's
23 prairie style appearance.

24 I know that there are different schools of

1 architecture that blend -- that can blend together.
2 So to be able to have some creative improvements in
3 there, I want to make sure we can. I'm not opposed
4 to having some flat-roof buildings as long as they
5 generally appear -- but I don't want to get into
6 that too deeply because we're not -- we don't have
7 those drawings yet. I just want to make sure the
8 Applicant understands that not every building needs
9 to look the same.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And I think you made a
11 great point. What is proposed here, as I said
12 earlier, is just one particular prairie building,
13 and that's that Springfield. That's what he showed
14 here. There are other adaptable service entries
15 that can be used that mix this up, and I think
16 that's very possible, very possible.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a couple
18 questions. I think two of them -- well, I think
19 they're easy questions to ask. They may not be easy
20 questions to answer, and it has to do with phasing.
21 I'm concerned about the phasing.

22 I want to talk about how -- I know it's a
23 very difficult question to answer because this is
24 driven by the market; but given that this project

1 could take some years, what does the Applicant see
2 as a beginning point? Where would you start? How
3 would you begin? Would you begin with multifamily?
4 Would you begin with the residential units in the
5 center? Would you begin with some commercial on the
6 main trunk roads and then -- that's the first part
7 of it.

8 The second part of the question, while this
9 project is underway, have you given any thought to
10 what the site is going to look like for a long
11 period of time? I mean one of my -- one of the
12 reasons that I feel that we need to do something
13 there is because the place is an eyesore, and I
14 suspect you don't want the site to really be an
15 eyesore while you're trying to market any portion of
16 it or any portion that you do, and so I wonder if
17 you could speak to that a little bit.

18 MR. PATZELT: David Patzelt, Shodeen Group,
19 77 North First Street, Geneva, Illinois 60134.
20 Patzelt is P-a-t-z-e-l-t.

21 Tim, to your point, I think using the mouse
22 pointer here, just like constructing any building or
23 your home, you really have to look at what the front
24 door is. The front door is this main entry at this

1 point.

2 Then after the front door, I believe that
3 you need to start to establish what is the flair or
4 flavor of this development going to be, and I think
5 it starts to drive the question does this boulevard
6 or some portion or all of this boulevard get
7 constructed to identify what type of center this is.

8 And then from there, it starts to beg the
9 question, this cross boulevard, and potentially,
10 then you're left with clay paths for the various
11 building sites.

12 So that's all thought of how it could
13 progress through construction; but, certainly,
14 having a plan that is approved by the City Council,
15 and I know and I've received calls that there are
16 people waiting to see whether they have interest in
17 this project, to see if this project is even going
18 to get approved because they've been here before,
19 and they've seen it before where it doesn't get
20 approved. So the first step is to have a plan
21 that's approved that we know we can build.

22 Take that to market, and I think all of a
23 sudden then there's going to be a couple
24 opportunities that will surface, and is that a key

1 restaurant at the front entry? Is that somebody
2 taking a certain portion of the retail? I can't
3 answer that specifically now, but I believe that
4 once you have a plan that's approved and people know
5 that the plan is approved, all of a sudden different
6 uses will become available.

7 We do know for starters that there is an
8 affordable senior housing tenant that we're under
9 contract with. They want to be at this site. How
10 did they hear about this site? Through the papers,
11 and through the press. They're anxious to get
12 sited; however, they're not going to wait a long
13 period of time for this site. They may go somewhere
14 else if they have to.

15 So, again, just marketing and advertising
16 has brought that user to the surface which could be
17 one of those initial buildings. But something will
18 go alongside them. It's not as clear and specific
19 as saying, as an example, building mixed-use D3 will
20 be the first building. D2 will be the second
21 building.

22 I can't tell you exactly which building will
23 be number one, two, three, but I can tell you that
24 in order to sell it, we need a plan. And then also

1 to let people see what this development is really
2 going to look like, you need to have a front door
3 and how grand and what that front door looks like
4 and a boulevard and a street, and then people can
5 start to -- tenants will start to understand what
6 this development really means and really is.

7 Does that help?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It does help, and,
9 you know, I realize that this discussion is
10 probably -- I wanted to bring it up now so that it
11 was discussed while we're in public hearing, but I
12 think a lot of this discussion will come -- a lot
13 more will come when we discuss as a Commission our
14 recommendation.

15 So it does help. I understand that you
16 can't say you're going to plant grass on the whole
17 site right now before you've even been approved. I
18 do understand that. But we will be talking, I
19 think, when we get to that point where we talk about
20 our recommendation of things that we might want to
21 ask you to do or to attach to our recommendation to
22 the City Council because once it leaves our hands --
23 and I don't know to what extent we can do that, but
24 that is the concern I think that we have.

1 Personally, I've talked to a number of
2 people on the Commission. We want this project as
3 much as you do, probably for different reasons, but
4 we want this project; and we want to make sure that
5 if it does move forward, that it's done in a way
6 that we can work together to make sure that it
7 continues to go in the way that we agree on in the
8 beginning. And those are the things that we'll talk
9 about, you know, after the public hearing.

10 But that does help, and knowing that there
11 is a plan -- I mean, I know it's a difficult
12 question to answer. There is a plan that -- there
13 is a plan that's good and an appropriate plan when
14 the plan is approved. Is that what you said?

15 MR. PATZELT: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

17 MR. PATZELT: I would just caution you with
18 putting too many requirements on the approval where,
19 in essence, all of a sudden you've made it
20 impossible to build, but I don't know what your
21 requests will be.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Those requests I
23 think will come through the full review, just to be
24 aware of the things that we might be addressing.

1 The fact of the matter is at the Plan Commission
2 level, there are only certain things we can do with
3 the City Council to say this is what we think should
4 happen. It's not that -- we can't drive it like
5 they can. So I don't think that's a concern. I
6 don't think it needs to be a concern.

7 But I wanted to bring it up so that we can
8 all talk about it so that there's no surprises, and
9 that when we do make a recommendation, that you've
10 had a chance to discuss it with us and talk about
11 the things. But phasing is going and what that site
12 is going to look like during the project are
13 important things for us.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I know a lot of it is
15 market driven, but is there anything about how long
16 the project is going to take?

17 MR. PATZELT: I don't mean to be evasive,
18 but right now I have one user. That's all I've got.
19 And, again, I can't even go to market and say would
20 you like to be in Building No. 2 or Building No. 3.
21 They look at me, and they say we are looking for
22 sites that we know we can build on. We don't know
23 that we can build on this site in St. Charles.

24 That's a difficult position to be in to try

1 to attract somebody to come to this site. And
2 unfortunately, this site -- not pointing fingers at
3 anybody, but the site has a long history of not
4 being able to be built upon.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple
6 of questions that I'd like to try to get answers to
7 before we consider closing the public hearing.

8 Actually, Mr. Patzelt, I might have a couple
9 questions for you.

10 Just following up on some public testimony
11 that we heard tonight, could you, first of all,
12 remind me regarding sidewalks on Route 38 and the
13 recommendations from Pace? What is the plan right
14 now?

15 MR. PATZELT: Pace's recommendation --
16 looking at the site plan currently, the Pace bus
17 stop is located generally at this corner. We
18 plan -- Pace has requested that the Pace bus stop be
19 shifted to the west corner, and the purpose of that
20 is so that the bus, when it comes to the stop to
21 allow pedestrians or riders to get on and off, that
22 it's already made its way through the traffic signal
23 at that corner.

24 So we have no objection to relocating the

1 bus stop at that location. The prior plan or this
2 plan, you can see here that there's sidewalks
3 located coming around this corner which we're
4 bringing it out to that bus stop. Those on this
5 side you don't -- on the west side you don't see
6 those sidewalks and that's -- those sidewalks would
7 be flipped to the west side so, again, pedestrians
8 can get out to and from the bus stop.

9 The sidewalk along Route 38 has been in the
10 plan, out of the plan, in the plan, and out of the
11 plan. The latest thinking is that to try to keep
12 the people walking at this location in front of the
13 mixed use and along this boulevard -- by eliminating
14 or not having the sidewalk out front here would
15 bring those people more inward to the project and
16 would be walking in front of the mixed-use and
17 residential buildings.

18 It is correct that the CVS off to the far
19 east, they did not add sidewalks out along 38, and
20 none of these -- the Jiffy Lube, the Salsa Verde
21 Taco, the swimming pool, none of those buildings
22 have sidewalks out along 38.

23 So if we install a sidewalk at 38, it would
24 really just take you from one end of the development

1 to the other end, right in, right out, really
2 nowhere to go beyond that point. So that's the --
3 that's the issue of the sidewalks there.

4 There has been some discussion with
5 potentially a bike path at some point going in along
6 Route 38 all the way out west of Randall Road,
7 perhaps all the way to Peck Road. That would be a
8 great amenity to have the bike path in lieu of a
9 sidewalk. But, again, that's not proposed as part
10 of this project.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. My second question,
12 and this is really directed both to you and to
13 staff, concerns the draft PUD ordinance, and
14 specifically the percentage thresholds for major
15 changes and administrative changes.

16 I have a couple of things, but I'll focus,
17 first of all, on one of them is the increase in
18 total number of dwelling units, the threshold of 10
19 percent for a major change.

20 I guess my first question is for staff. Are
21 these thresholds typical in PUD language? Is this
22 sort of what we would expect to be the default
23 language for what triggers a major change and what
24 triggers an administrative change?

1 MR. COLBY: Yes. There is a table in the
2 zoning ordinance that is formatted similar to this
3 that has a percentage of the changes in land use and
4 changes in open space. It also talks about changes
5 in street classifications and plan elements that
6 would constitute major changes to an approved plan.

7 This table, though, that you reference
8 regarding the unit count, the current draft states,
9 essentially, that the unit count is capped at what's
10 proposed, and any increase would constitute a major
11 change. So there is no flexibility to increase the
12 unit count as a minor change to the PUD. So that's
13 been set at no percentage threshold. It's at
14 maximum.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: So disregard the 10 percent
16 there. I mean, it's there, but there's some other
17 language that supercedes it?

18 MR. COLBY: Yes. And you're referring to
19 the current draft, which is the one that's dated
20 January 10th. Under that percentage threshold for
21 that table, this is not applicable because it states
22 an increase of total dwelling units above 670. So
23 really any increase would constitute a major
24 change --

1 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

2 MR. COLBY: -- and require a amendment to
3 the ordinance.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Then my other question
5 regarding -- so there's language in the --
6 administrative changes. I'm trying to see if it's
7 in administrative or major changes. Okay.
8 Actually, it's in major changes.

9 It reads, Change in the types of dwelling
10 units from attached multifamily to detached
11 single-family, for example. That made me wonder.
12 So the plan right now shows mixed-use D1, D2, D3,
13 mixed-use B1, B2, and B3. We have spoken in the
14 public hearings about the D1, D2, and D3 mixed-use
15 buildings being a more definite part of the plan
16 that's, like, solidly mixed use, and B1, B2, and B3
17 being market driven.

18 My question is if there was a proposed
19 change to say make any one of the mixed-use D
20 buildings full residential, under the draft language
21 now, would that be a major change, or would that be
22 a minor or administrative change?

23 MR. COLBY: I believe it would be a major
24 change. If you go to the section that's PUD

1 Standards Departures and Deviations, it spells out
2 where residential uses are permitted, and it
3 specifically identifies that residential uses are
4 not permitted as first-floor uses for those
5 buildings you listed -- D1, D2, D3.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Item No. 1.

7 MR. COLBY: Yes.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Great. That addresses
9 two of my questions.

10 I guess my last question for Mr. Patzelt is
11 regarding the Jewel entrance, the concept of moving
12 it further west. Is that something that you're
13 actively looking at or thinking about? Is this
14 something you're open to? What are the
15 considerations there?

16 MR. PATZELT: Could it be discussed? Sure.
17 Has it been discussed in the past? Yes. It came up
18 at the Towne Centre development; however, when the
19 Towne Centre was proposed, it was a higher intensity
20 use, more traffic, and other requirements were
21 pushing that. But I think those requirements or
22 what's happening along Prairie Street, the bigger
23 picture needs to be looked at.

24 The outlot development that -- where my

1 mouse is pointing here, that is not owned by us.
2 When that came through the Plan Commission for an
3 expansion, there was also a recommendation at that
4 point in time to put a physical raised barrier to
5 prevent left-hand westbound Prairie Street to
6 southbound into that development movements, to
7 prevent that.

8 So that's one simply taking away the left
9 turn into the Jewel and the left out at that
10 location. It's not going to solve everything.

11 Perhaps when there's a discussion with the
12 Randall Road lane addition, the improvements to
13 Prairie, that driveway at that outlot, the in and
14 out entrance at the Jewel, all of those could be
15 looked at as more of a comprehensive plan as to
16 what's happening along Prairie.

17 MEMBER DOYLE: I think any remaining
18 questions I have on these topics can be handled when
19 we look at the actual recommendation agenda, not in
20 the public hearing. So I don't think I have any
21 other questions.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. Anyone
23 else?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Would the
2 Applicant like to give any other remarks?
3 Mr. Bazos.

4 MR. BAZOS: Excuse me, just one second.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6 MR. BAZOS: Thank you, gentlemen and lady.

7 I'm going to give you my remarks as though
8 we're at the end of the public hearing. I'm not
9 sure if that's what your intent is tonight, but let
10 me just give a quick wrap up, if I may.

11 Part of this is to you, sir, Mr. Pretz, the
12 26-page response that we prepared we think
13 adequately addresses the comprehensive plan; but
14 having said that, I understand it's a lot of reading
15 and pretty ponderous. I just want to mention a few
16 parts of your comprehensive plan.

17 There's a section entitled "Mixed Use" at
18 page 42 that says, "The land use plan of St. Charles
19 includes a designation for mixed use within
20 downtown." And then I'll skip a section, and then
21 it says, "Although the land use plan designates only
22 downtown St. Charles as a mixed-use area, the
23 residential area's framework plan identifies other
24 locations where mixed-use development could occur,

1 including the former St. Charles Mall site.

2 Along Route 38." So your plan specifically
3 contemplates this kind of a project here. The next
4 part -- and that's page 42.

5 The next part says, "The Prairie Centre is
6 located in the west gateway sub-area of the
7 comprehensive plan." In the plan it's stated, "The
8 west gateway sub-area provides unique opportunities
9 with a specific context of a corridor capable of
10 competing with other commercial areas in the city.
11 These opportunities and goals are not meant to
12 create competition with downtown, rather they strive
13 to compliment each other.

14 And then skipping ahead, "One of the
15 sub-area objectives is redevelopment of the
16 St. Charles Mall site with activities and a
17 character that compliment Randall Road and maintain
18 an appropriate relationship with neighborhoods."

19 So Randall Road is obviously commercial, and
20 neighborhoods are residential. Once again, there's
21 a clear comprehensive plan suggestion that this
22 needs to take both of those activities into account,
23 and that appears on page 94.

24 The next section identifies the Prairie

1 Centre development property as a catalyst site that
2 could have a catalytic impact on the surrounding
3 area, and I'd like to read this quote. It's a
4 little bit long, but it will only take a minute.

5 "This 30-acre area site" referring to this
6 Prairie Centre site, "may represent the most
7 significant redevelopment opportunity within the
8 Randall Road corridor. Despite great potential, the
9 opposition voiced by some members of the St. Charles
10 community to past development proposals has
11 highlighted the need for a clear vision for this
12 site.

13 "Throughout the outreach exercises conducted
14 as part of the comprehensive plan, the citizenry
15 remain split on appropriate uses for the site.
16 Chapter A sub-area plans provides three development
17 alternatives for this site; however, the ultimate
18 solution may be an even different concept
19 altogether.

20 "Currently the vacant site is impacting the
21 commercial vitality of the area and negatively
22 impacting nearby sites. What is desired by many
23 residents may not be economically feasible, which is
24 likely the primary reason the site remains vacant."

1 That can be found on the comprehensive plan,
2 page 97.

3 Very quickly, the Kane County 2040 plan at
4 page 60 has a chart that distinguishes between smart
5 growth and sprawl. In the smart growth column is
6 high density/clustered activities; and in the sprawl
7 section is low density dispersed activities.

8 In the smart column is infill development,
9 and in the sprawl is urban periphery; and in the
10 smart is mixed land use, and in the sprawl is
11 homogenous uses.

12 This project certainly fits the smart column
13 of what the Kane County 2040 plan is, even though
14 that's subordinate to your own plan; and it
15 specifically places housing close to the urban
16 corridor along Randall Road where jobs are
17 available.

18 The next and last plan I want to talk about
19 is the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for planning or
20 CMAP study that was entitled "Homes for a Changing
21 Region." This study was issued in September of 2014
22 in collaboration with St. Charles, Geneva, Batavia,
23 and North Aurora, and as I understand it, approved
24 by all of those communities.

1 In the section -- there were sections then
2 devoted to each of those four communities; and in
3 the section devoted to St. Charles, it speaks of the
4 housing needs of your community. Across income
5 levels, housing for seniors is needed.

6 I would like to point out to you, and this
7 was stated at maybe our first of these three public
8 hearings, one of the things that we testified to is
9 that these buildings, these residential buildings,
10 even the mixed-use ones are very senior friendly
11 because there is underground parking and elevators
12 from the underground all the way up to each of the
13 floors, and so people like myself and my wife who
14 are certainly seniors would be very able to live
15 long term in a building like that.

16 Rental -- the next point made in the CMAP
17 study is rental housing demand is expected to grow
18 for all income levels driven predominantly by
19 seniors and younger adults. So rental housing is
20 identified and was approved by your City Council as
21 a need for your city.

22 And then it stated between 2014, which was
23 the date of this study, and 2040 it's expected that
24 St. Charles will need an additional 1,718

1 multifamily units. So we've heard a lot about do we
2 need rental units, and the study that your Council
3 approved said we do.

4 Beyond its conformity to your comprehensive
5 plan and the County's plan and CMAP, we also think
6 that you've heard testimony that shows that this
7 plan satisfies other planning issues. It can be
8 served with the existing potable water supply. It
9 can be -- its needs can be met by the existing
10 sanitary sewer system.

11 You heard that there are downstream
12 narrowing points, if you will, when you have a rain
13 event that occur today; and while they'll still be
14 able to handle our project, that's something that is
15 an existing condition that needs to be remedied.
16 But remember this project used to be improved with
17 the St. Charles mall and was using that same sewer
18 system, so.

19 We will also be meeting all stormwater
20 requirements. We heard something today about
21 bounce, and my client assures me, and I think the
22 City's engineer can back this up, that this project
23 will meet your ordinances and Kane County's
24 ordinances as to the allowable levels of bounce in a

1 stormwater -- in the stormwater system. We're not
2 asking for any departures from the stormwater
3 requirements.

4 We also think that this project conforms
5 with the reasonable traffic impact. We thought it
6 was an excellent report tonight. The report states
7 that the project may exacerbate existing traffic
8 loads, but it does not create any new issues.

9 One of the things that's interesting to note,
10 and the traffic engineer said as much, although it
11 was quick, and I frankly -- Mr. Patzelt had to point
12 it out to me. The current zoning of this site is
13 BR, regional business. If this site were developed
14 as regional business, the traffic load or the
15 traffic generated from the site would be double what
16 the traffic generation projected for this site is.

17 So ironically, not only are we not proposing
18 something that's onerous from the traffic standard,
19 but frankly will bring you half the traffic that you
20 would have if someone suddenly popped up and would
21 develop this all under its current zoning
22 classification of BR.

23 The project also meets the City's newly
24 adopted affordable housing requirements and has been

1 approved by your housing commission. It will
2 provide both short-term economic benefit and also
3 sustained long-term benefit with increased sales tax
4 and property tax. It will put this piece of
5 property back in production that has sat dormant for
6 the past 13 years. The last building was demolished
7 in 2003.

8 It will, as the staff points out in its
9 report, hopefully, the quicker it can build out, it
10 will that much more quickly relieve the City of its
11 current need to support the TIF bonds that it issued
12 and sold in 2000 for the demolition of this site.
13 The City is now reaching into your general fund to
14 the tune of \$97,000 a year until these bonds are
15 paid off which is through 2024.

16 The quicker this site can develop some TIF
17 increment, the less or hopefully not at all will the
18 City have to any longer reach into its general fund
19 to pay these bonds. Over the next seven years, if
20 nothing is done, that could amount to almost
21 \$800,000 of general fund money.

22 It's going to create short-term construction
23 jobs, and it's going to meet the needs of the City
24 with respect to affordable senior housing, senior

1 living. As Mr. Patzelt said, we have a party that
2 we're in negotiations with, so it's not a certainty,
3 but we're spending a lot of time on the contract.
4 So we think that's going to happen.

5 We really appreciate the courtesy and the
6 cooperation of the City and Russ and Rita and other
7 senior staff. We've voluntarily gone through, I
8 think, three neighborhood meetings on this project.

9 Then last January we went through concept
10 review with your Commission and then with City
11 Council, following which we filed the petition.
12 We've listened to comments, and we've made a number
13 of changes in the plan.

14 Although we have already filed, and when we
15 filed this PUD petition -- I think I said this to
16 you the first night. When we filed this PUD
17 petition, we also filed a straight rezoning petition
18 for the part of this project that's north of the
19 retail frontage along Lincoln Highway.

20 We filed a petition to go from BR to RM3
21 which is multifamily residential with the thought
22 that if we couldn't get the PUD plan approved, we at
23 least would have to then just build out with more
24 ordinary multifamily housing as exists elsewhere.

1 The site just can't sit vacant any longer from an
2 ownership perspective, and hopefully, the City feels
3 that way as well. So that petition remains
4 suspended, and we're very much in hopes that, you
5 know, it will be supported.

6 I think it's pretty clear not everyone would
7 be -- is happy with every aspect, but, again, your
8 own comprehensive plan acknowledged that there will
9 be differences of opinion.

10 It doesn't sound to me like you're going to
11 vote this evening. We'd sure love to have you do
12 it. Remember, please, what this is is preliminary.
13 If and when it goes to City Council and gets their
14 preliminary support, we'll be coming back with
15 final, and it will have all kinds of details and
16 foundation and actual drawings, et cetera.

17 The longer it takes us to get this project
18 approved through final, the longer it will be before
19 we can break ground and start putting this property
20 back in service.

21 So I hope that wasn't too windy. Thank you
22 very much. We would sure appreciate your
23 recommendation of approval. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

1 All right. Plan Commission members, if you
2 feel that we have gathered enough evidence to be
3 able to make a recommendation, then a motion to
4 close the public hearing will be in order.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I move to close the
6 public hearing Prairie Centre, former St. Charles
7 Mall, Shodeen Group, LLC, application for special
8 use for planned unit development and application for
9 PUD preliminary plan.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: I second.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion has been made
13 and seconded. Discussion on the motion?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

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

7 Now, on our agendas we have action on this
8 application here tonight. Item 5 is Prairie Centre,
9 former St. Charles Mall site, Shodeen Group,
10 application for special use for PUD and application
11 for PUD preliminary plan.

12 And I guess that I'll put it out for the
13 Plan Commission whether this is something that we
14 should take action on tonight. Go ahead.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question
16 for staff. We have a meeting next week.

17 MS. TUNGARE: Next Tuesday.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Next Tuesday. Do we
19 have a full agenda?

20 MS. TUNGARE: We do not.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would suggest that
22 we table it until next week and have a discussion on
23 the recommendation.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second the motion.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. It's been moved
2 and seconded to continue this until January 17th at
3 7:00 p.m. Are we in this room?

4 MS. TUNGARE: So the meeting will be held in
5 Century Station across the street in the basement.
6 This room will not be available.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Could I --

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, go ahead.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: -- have some discussion on
10 that?

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes. Discussion on the
12 motion.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: So to cut to the chase, I
14 have a work engagement that will run later into the
15 evening. I believe I can be here, but I might not
16 be here at 7:00 p.m. obviously, I want to be here
17 for that portion of the agenda. Are there other
18 items already on the agenda for next Tuesday?

19 MR. COLBY: No. We have no items scheduled.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. I will make every
21 effort -- if we resolve to table it until next
22 Tuesday, I'll be here.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a feeling that
24 there will be a prolonged discussion, more so than

1 typical just because of the scope of the project.

2 Okay.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you have any
4 idea -- do you want us to wait?

5 MEMBER DOYLE: I need to check.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any further discussion on
7 the motion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And the
10 Applicant will be available on that evening. Thank
11 you.

12 All right. Tim.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
3 concludes Item 5.

4 Item 6, additional business from Plan
5 Commission members or staff. None. Okay.

6 Weekly development report. Meeting
7 announcements -- as we discussed, we have a meeting,
8 and the next meeting then is not until February 7th.
9 It's three weeks after that; correct?

10 And then public comment. Any? All right.

11 Is there a motion to adjourn?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's moved and seconded
15 to adjourn.

16 All in favor?

17 (Ayes heard.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes, and the
21 St. Charles Plan Commission will adjourn at
22 9:31 p.m.

23 (Off the record at 9:31 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, Joanne E. Ely, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 13th day of January, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois