

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2018**

Members Present:

Chairman Wallace
Jeff Funke
James Holderfield
Tom Pretz
Peter Vargulich
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tom Schuetz
David Pietryla

Members Absent:

Tim Kessler

Also Present:

Russell Colby, Community Dev. Division Manager
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

Chairman Wallace called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Presentation of minutes of the December 5, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Holderfield, seconded by Ms. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the December 5, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

4. Prairie Centre PUD (Shodeen Group, LLC)

Application for Final Plat of Subdivision

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

Motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Mr. Funke to recommend approval of the application for Final Plat of Subdivision for Prairie Centre PUD (Shodeen Group, LLC) subject to resolution of all staff comments.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Pretz, Purdy, Vargulich, Schuetz, Wallace, Pietryla, Funke

Nays:

Absent: Kessler

Motion carried: 8-0

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, January 9, 2018
Page 2

- 5. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff**
- 6. Weekly Development Report**
- 7. Meeting Announcements**
 - a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, January 23, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers- Anticipate cancelling.
Tuesday, February 6, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, February 20, 2018 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room
 - b. Planning & Development Committee
Tuesday, January 16, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, February 12, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- 8. Public Comment**
- 9. Adjournment at 7:18 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: :
Regular Meeting including :
Application for Final Plat of :
Subdivision; Prairie Centre :
PUD (Shodeen Group, LLC). :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, January 9, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 168439
Pages: 1 - 20
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2
3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400
7
8
9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand
11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a
12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Transcript of Hearing - Application for Final Plat of Subdivision
Conducted on January 9, 2018

3

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

4 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

5 DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

6 TOM PRETZ, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10
11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 ROBERT SKIDMORE, Shodeen Group, LLC

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Hearing - Application for Final Plat of Subdivision
Conducted on January 9, 2018

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let's go ahead and start.
3 This meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission
4 will come to order. Tim isn't here, so I'll do
5 the roll call.

6 Funke.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Holderfield.

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pietryla.

11 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Here.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin-Purdy.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Vargulich.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And Wallace, here.

21 All right. Item 3 is presentation of the
22 minutes of the December 5th, 2017, meeting of the
23 Plan Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So moved.

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

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

4 (Ayes heard.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 4 is Prairie
8 Centre PUD (Shodeen Group, LLC) Application for
9 Final Plat of Subdivision.

10 Russ, do you want to go ahead and walk us
11 through it?

12 MR. COLBY: Yes. So the Prairie Centre
13 PUD was approved by the City back in March of
14 2017. You'll recall that is a redevelopment of
15 the former St. Charles Mall property that includes
16 commercial mixed use and commercial buildings.
17 There was some information regarding the subdivision
18 and phasing contained in the PUD ordinance, and it
19 specifically outlined the review standards for
20 final plats of subdivision for the development.

21 The first requirement is that the property
22 needs to be initially platted in its entirety with
23 the first subdivision, which is the case as is
24 proposed on the plat that has been provided.

1 Access utility easements also need to be
2 provided, which has been done.

3 Individual building lots within the site
4 can be proposed as determined by the developer --

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry. The access
6 easements have been provided?

7 MR. COLBY: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

9 MR. COLBY: Individual building lots within
10 the site can be proposed by the developer, and the
11 plat that's been provided shows a number of building
12 lots as part of this initial subdivision.

13 There's no requirement for internal streets
14 to be designated. However, there are cross access
15 easements provided across the site and the location
16 of the main accessways which will serve as private
17 streets, and the developer has the ability to phase
18 the building and site improvements based on the
19 order in which they construct the buildings.

20 So right now City staff is reviewing final
21 engineering plans for the entire development and
22 has been in that process for some months, and we've
23 reached the point where we think nothing additional
24 will be changing on the subdivision plat, which is

1 why we're bringing it forward tonight.

2 The remaining comments are relatively minor,
3 and the applicant, Shodeen, LLC, has been agreeable
4 to incorporating the staff comments on the plat
5 which are identified in the staff memo.

6 We also have a representative from Shodeen
7 here who is in attendance who can respond to any
8 questions regarding the development, but staff is
9 recommending approval of the final plat subject to
10 the resolution of the outstanding staff comments.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, Residential B1 and
12 Residential D1, I thought that those were going to
13 be mixed use with commercial on the first floor,
14 or maybe it was D1 and D2.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That was along Prairie;
16 right?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, the ones that are --
18 like the one that's behind Jewel next to the lake
19 and then the one across from that. So residential
20 B1 and D1 on the plat.

21 MR. COLBY: There was some discussion
22 about -- during the preliminary approval process
23 about possibly converting those to mixed use, but
24 the plan that was approved is this version which

1 identifies the mixed use versus residential
2 buildings.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: At what point will they
4 make a determination whether those mixed use will
5 be mixed use?

6 MR. COLBY: There's some language in the
7 PUD ordinance I can flip over to.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What I'm getting at is,
9 how many of these buildings potentially could be
10 residential? I mean, obviously, not the outlots
11 along 38.

12 MR. COLBY: Yes. The buildings that have
13 been discussed as potentially being converted to
14 residential use or mixed-use B1, mixed-use B2
15 along Prairie Street and mixed-use D3 along
16 Prairie Street. And there's a timeline which I'm
17 going to try and locate here.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that's all spelled
19 out in the ordinance?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So it's not really
22 under our authority to make any suggestions to
23 modify that at this point?

24 MR. COLBY: It's not but I can provide that

1 information.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: Russ, just for clarification,
4 I thought several months ago when we were first
5 taking a look at this we were coming up with a vote
6 so that the Shodeen Group could put in an
7 application with the developer or the developer
8 was going to do it that C3 and B2 were going to be
9 a senior living facility.

10 Because I remember something that there
11 were some time lines that they were talking about
12 that they had to get the application in, there
13 were tax credits or it would held for financing.
14 Is that still a go for those or is that --

15 MR. COLBY: Yes.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: -- something that's been lost?

17 MR. COLBY: Part of the PUD ordinance
18 approval requires that affordable units be provided
19 as part of the project, and those two buildings
20 were identified as locations for affordable units.
21 The timeline associated with that is dependent on
22 some receipt in terms of assistance with tax credits.
23 There was a time frame to apply for those tax
24 credits which I believe is three years as outlined

1 in the ordinance.

2 So that's a process that they have been
3 undertaking since the project was approved. They
4 can certainly speak to that.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Once again, which
6 buildings are we talking about, Tom?

7 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, if I recall correctly,
8 I thought it was going to be the affordable living,
9 or senior care, or whatever terminology we want to
10 use. The first buildings would have been C3 and B2.

11 We had a lot of discussion talking about
12 the northern portion and a little bit with that
13 roundabout and not necessarily with the road --
14 more of the construction of the road being on the
15 north end to be able to accommodate that.

16 And it just threw me off a little bit when
17 I saw that the first two units are F2 and E as
18 being -- which to me would be 100 percent
19 residential -- I'm guessing apartments -- and it
20 just throws me off a little bit on some of the
21 process that was going on.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I seem to recall that
23 it was F2 and C2 were going to be affordable housing,
24 and there was going to be a bridge between those

1 two buildings on the second level.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think you're both right
3 because I remember both. I remember the discussion
4 both ways, but I think that they discussed that
5 first, and then they had changed it.

6 MR. COLBY: I think both scenarios were
7 discussed. Within the approved plan there was not
8 a specific location identified, but both of those
9 locations were identified as potential locations
10 for the senior affordable units.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: And I realize the ordinance
12 has been taken care of on that, and it's not really
13 within our, you know, authority to be able to
14 continue, but I just want to say I'm concerned
15 that the development is residential, residential,
16 residential, and it continues going that way. My
17 personal -- my personal feeling is mixed use is a
18 little bit more important in the overall scheme
19 with the city. So I just thought I would say that.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
21 questions?

22 MR. COLBY: I was just going to point out
23 that that section I was looking for earlier, it's
24 a PUD ordinance. It's an ordinance on page 15,

1 Exhibit E under the section titled "Uses" which is
2 Item 8.

3 It talks about the mixed-use buildings B1,
4 B2, B3, and it sets a time frame for when the
5 developer can make a determination that there's
6 not enough demand and they cannot locate users for
7 the commercial space within those mixed-use
8 buildings, then they may provide notice to the
9 City of their intent to construct those buildings
10 as entirely residential.

11 So there's a time frame identified there of
12 basically three years, four years, and five years
13 after the approval of the project.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, if they convert
15 the two buildings along Prairie, B2 and B3 to just
16 residential, are they allowed to construct the
17 parking on Prairie?

18 MR. COLBY: I think -- the ordinance I don't
19 think specifically addresses that, but I think the
20 concept was that that parking would not be
21 constructed and that the green parkway that exists
22 there would remain.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: Also, a question regarding
24 Lot 4 with the detention and the park district

1 property. Has Shodeen resolved everything with
2 the park district regarding that?

3 MR. SKIDMORE: We have been in contact with
4 the park district, and pursuant to our conversations
5 with the City, also, we -- in the final draft of the
6 plat, that will be divided into two lots respective
7 to if the park district does not want the detention
8 area, then that will be solely a part of our
9 development. If they choose to take a portion of
10 it or the whole thing, then we can convey it over.
11 But we will be splitting that into two lots for
12 that concern.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: And, also, a follow-up
14 question. Where does your process stand with IDOT
15 for Route 38 and access?

16 MR. SKIDMORE: We just -- the City just
17 received a letter, I believe it was last week with
18 some comments, and we are working with the City as
19 well as their traffic engineer to resolve the last
20 few comments from IDOT.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: And does IDOT require a
22 sidewalk along 38?

23 MR. SKIDMORE: I'm trying to remember our
24 plan set. We do have sidewalks to the bus stop. I

1 believe -- I would have to look at the engineering
2 plans to confirm a sidewalk along the whole thing.

3 MR. COLBY: Yes, I believe that IDOT made
4 the comment that they would like to see sidewalks
5 along Route 38. I'm thinking that's one of those
6 items, though, that's not entirely resolved.

7 The scope of the improvements throughout
8 38 is still an item of discussion. We've been
9 going back and forth with IDOT regarding the
10 traffic study and Route 38 improvements.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. To the extent
12 that the City can, if you will, push that forward
13 with the support of the developer, I think it
14 would be a great idea to see that sidewalk installed
15 whether all within the right-of-way or within an
16 easement on your property. But that shouldn't --
17 if they do put it in the easement, there shouldn't
18 be any impact to your setback. The setback should
19 be from the property line, not from the sidewalk.

20 Because I understand the park district is
21 pursuing a bike path to the west of Randall Road,
22 and it would be nice to have this frontage include
23 that. And then, obviously, it's up to the City to
24 resolve east and west connections so that literally

1 you could come from downtown Geneva and go all the
2 way west past Meijer, et cetera.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

5 MEMBER PIETRYLA: One clarification.

6 Russ, you mentioned in the ordinance the
7 developer has three years, is that right, to get
8 back to the City?

9 MR. COLBY: Regarding the mixed-use
10 buildings, yes. Because there's three different
11 buildings it's three years for one building,
12 four years for the next one, five years for the
13 third.

14 MEMBER PIETRYLA: As of now do you have
15 any thoughts on that?

16 MR. SKIDMORE: We do not know at this point
17 in time. We are working diligently to get the
18 final engineering done, as well as we have the
19 two building permits, and see how the market
20 progresses.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: How was it determined
22 what buildings were going to be built first?

23 MR. SKIDMORE: That was just our internal
24 decision for those two buildings.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: You don't know your
2 reasoning behind that? I'm just wondering if it was
3 because it was along the main road, residential --
4 you don't have any mixed use.

5 MR. SKIDMORE: For the residential portion,
6 in our other developments we've found the best use
7 is to bring people to the site first and then after
8 that bring in the mixed use so there's people to
9 go to the businesses close by.

10 And it also is we do know that through our
11 first phase of development that we have committed
12 to build the roadway all the way from Prairie Street
13 down to Route 38, and then obviously both those
14 buildings are adjacent to the roadway.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Anything else?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If there's
18 nothing else, anything from the audience?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If there's
21 nothing else then, Russ, are you done?

22 MR. COLBY: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And the staff's
24 recommendation is to recommend approval to the

1 City Council subject to resolution of all staff
2 comments. So at this time I'd entertain such a
3 motion.

4 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll make the motion as
5 just stated.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll second.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
8 moved and seconded. Discussion on the motion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.
11 Funke.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Holderfield.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pietryla.

16 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin-Purdy.

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Vargulich.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And Wallace, yes. And
2 that passes unanimously.

3 That concludes Item 4. Thank you.

4 Item 5, any additional business?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Has Ellen
7 come back yet?

8 MR. COLBY: Not yet. She'll be back on
9 the 22nd.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Everyone is doing well?

11 MR. COLBY: Yes. She's doing very well.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Good.

13 Weekly development report you all should
14 have received. We have the next meetings coming
15 up. Do we have anything of note?

16 MR. COLBY: We do not. At this point we're
17 anticipating canceling the January 23rd meeting
18 because we don't have any items scheduled, but I
19 expect we will have the meeting on February 6th.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Public comment?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion to
23 adjourn?

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: Motion to adjourn.

Transcript of Hearing - Application for Final Plat of Subdivision
Conducted on January 9, 2018

19

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

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

4 (Ayes heard.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
8 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

9 (Off the record at 7:18 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 14th day of January, 2018.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois