

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2017**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Tim Kessler
Jeff Funke
James Holderfield
Tom Pretz
Peter Vargulich
Laura Macklin-Purdy
David Pietryla
Tom Schuetz

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
Rita Tungare, Community and Economic Development Director
Chris Bong, Development Engineering Division Manager
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Vice Chairman Kessler 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 October 3, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Pietryla, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

MEETING

**4. First Street Redevelopment PUD – Phase 3, Building #2 (First Street Development II, LLC)
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 Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the Application for PUD Preliminary Plan for First Redevelopment PUD – Phase 3, Building #2 (First Street Development II, LLC) subject to resolution of any open staff issues.

Roll Call Vote:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 17, 2017
Page 2

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

Nays: None

Absent:

Motion carried: 9-0

5. First Street Redevelopment PUD – Presentation of Conceptual Streetscape and Riverwalk Design

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

Discussion only; no action taken.

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

7. Weekly Development Report

8. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, November 7, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, November 21, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, December 5, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

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

Monday, December 11, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment at 8:39 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: :
Application for PUD :
Preliminary Plan; First :
Street Redevelopment PUD - :
Phase 3, Building 2. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, October 17, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 126928A
Pages: 1 - 43
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

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

7 DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

14 Development Director

15 CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering

16 Division Manager

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

4

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

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This meeting of
the St. Charles Plan Commission is now in session.
Welcome everybody.

We'll move on to the roll call.
Holderfield.

COMMISSIONER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

MEMBER PIETRYLA: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler here.

No. 3 is presentation of the minutes of
the October 3rd, 2017, meeting of the Plan
Commission.

I'd entertain a motion to approve.

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

5

1 MEMBER PIETRYLA: So moved.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

4 (Ayes heard.)

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. No. 4

6 on the agenda is the First Street Redevelopment

7 PUD, Phase 3, Building No. 2, First Street

8 Redevelopment II, LLC, application for PUD

9 preliminary plan. I know that the applicant is

10 here and ready.

11 Anything from staff before we start?

12 MR. COLBY: Yes. I'm just going to make a

13 brief introduction --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

15 MR. COLBY: -- of the First Street project

16 for members of the Plan Commission who may not be

17 familiar with it.

18 A little bit of background, it's a

19 large-scale mixed-use redevelopment of the

20 downtown that dates back to the City's 2000

21 downtown strategy plan. There was a PUD plan

22 approved in 2006 for the entire project, including

23 zoning deviations for all the phases of the

24 project.

1 It is a public/private partnership. There
2 is the City-owned property involved, and the City
3 will own the public improvements that are made on
4 the project, including the Riverwalk and plaza
5 areas in addition to the streetscape. So the City
6 has a role in this project.

7 Here's an overall view of the entire First
8 Street project. I think these are aerial photos
9 from 2014, but this shows the project as
10 constructed prior to the economic downturn. So
11 you can see the large Building 4 parking deck. I
12 think everyone is familiar with this part of the
13 project, in addition to the plaza that's to the
14 north of that parking deck.

15 The relocation of the Blue Goose store,
16 the construction of what's labeled as Building 7A,
17 which is the Harris Bank building, those are all
18 part of the initial phases of the project; and
19 then the later phases are identified with those
20 yellow lines that show where building footprints
21 are to be located.

22 The site that we'll be talking about
23 tonight is the Phase 3 property, which is shown
24 here prior to any construction activity.

1 Buildings 1, 2, and 3 are planned in addition to
2 the parking deck that's now constructed; and then
3 the later phases of the project are these other
4 building lots that are identified here on the
5 plan.

6 So the project -- when it was approved in
7 2006, there was a plan for the Phase 3 site. That
8 plan approval expired, and the developer came back
9 later and requested approval of the new plan in
10 2015; and it is this plan that you see before you
11 that shows Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on the Phase 3
12 site.

13 Building No. 1 here, which is the building
14 that has ALE Solutions in it, is now constructed.
15 The parking deck shown here is now constructed.

16 Building No. 2, which we'll be talking
17 about tonight, is this building shown here. This
18 was initially thought to be the second building
19 constructed; however, the order of the
20 construction has changed.

21 And Building 3, which is shown as this box
22 here, is the one that's under construction now.

23 Also you'll see in the background is a
24 shadow of a building that was called One West Main

1 Street. This was previously planned for the
2 corner where the former Manor building foundation
3 is located, and it involves some City property.
4 I'll be making reference to that later when we're
5 talking about the Riverwalk plan; but that was a
6 building plan that had been proposed but is not
7 currently planned to be constructed in that form.

8 I have made reference to Building 3. I
9 should go back. When this plan was prepared,
10 there was no design for Building 3. The plans
11 were presented in 2015 and were approved for this
12 design that's shown here. This is the building
13 that's under construction now, and this shows the
14 street-facing elevations: the elevation facing
15 Illinois Street and the elevation facing the
16 Riverwalk. We'll be talking about this a little
17 more during the streetscape discussion.

18 But the topic of this first agenda item is
19 Building No. 2. This was the plan that was
20 approved back in 2015. It's a four-story building
21 with commercial uses on the ground floor and
22 residential uses on the upper levels.

23 The plan at the time was a similar
24 building footprint. You can see here the

1 appearance of the building from the north. If
2 you're looking from First Street, Building 1 is
3 here in the distance, here's Building 2, and
4 there's a plaza area planned for north of the
5 building. So this plan is proposed to be replaced
6 with a modified design for the building that,
7 essentially, is within the same footprint.

8 And so I will now turn it over to the
9 developer who will be presenting some information
10 on the new building.

11 MR. KOTCHE: Thanks, Russ.

12 As Russ pointed out, we're here for a PUD
13 preliminary plan approval for the new Building
14 No. 2.

15 The order was changed. It was fortunate,
16 I guess, for all of us involved that we did change
17 the order when Sterling came into play on Building
18 No. 3 because I really don't know how we would
19 build Building 3 if we had Buildings 1 and 2 up.
20 It's a very, very tight site, and the new order
21 benefits all of us.

22 The changes in Building No. 2 that we're
23 requesting are changes in the use. Originally, we
24 approved apartments with retail on the first

1 floor. The new plan is going to have retail on
2 the first floor, offices on the second floor, and
3 residential for-sale condominium units on floors 3
4 through 5.

5 The reason for the office on the second
6 floor is to create a buffer between the retail
7 restaurants on the first floor that also have the
8 outdoor dining and the residential units above.
9 In the current Building No. 3, we have office on
10 the first floor with the condominiums on floors 2
11 through 5.

12 The other changes are the overall
13 footprint and design of the building that we have
14 here and the square footages.

15 The architecture has gone before the
16 Historic Preservation Committee, and we did
17 receive a unanimous recommendation for approval on
18 that.

19 The building size and footprint has
20 changed a little bit. We're going to have a
21 couple of modifications. Because under the old
22 building, there were some jogs that aren't on this
23 building; and on this building, there's a couple
24 of jogs that weren't on the old one. So it's just

1 a matter of inches here and a foot or so here and
2 there. That will be done with a revised plat, and
3 we've been going through that with engineering and
4 staff.

5 Some of the big changes in this building
6 are the addition of that fifth floor and
7 elimination of all of the balconies that were on
8 First Street. The old plan with the apartments,
9 every one of the floors -- every one of the units
10 had a balcony overlooking First Street. Some
11 people liked that. Some people didn't.

12 Overall the consensus was it probably was
13 better to get rid of that; and with the
14 condominium design, we've got a common corridor
15 walkway for the units on the street, the First
16 Street side, and then all of the units go from
17 that corridor to the river on the east. Very
18 similar to -- it's basically exactly the way that
19 we've laid everything out in Building No. 3 right
20 now.

21 Is it at the end of this, Russ?

22 MR. COLBY: Elevation 2.

23 MR. KOTCHE: Sorry for that.

24 So you can see on this the elevations. It

1 shows all of the balconies for all the different
2 units that were on First Street; and then the new
3 building doesn't -- it has the balconies on the
4 east side overlooking the river and the
5 elimination of all the balconies on the First
6 Street side.

7 Overall square footages on page 3 of the
8 staff memorandum show what the PUD ordinance was
9 for the maximum. We are well under all of the
10 maximums as far as square footages go.

11 As far as the height, the PUD ordinance
12 provides for 75 foot to the top of the parapet
13 wall. We're at 70 feet to the top of the parapet.
14 We do have the one little design feature that goes
15 up to 81 feet, that little tower that you see in
16 the middle, the glass atrium.

17 The total building size differences -- the
18 old Building 2 had a footprint of 11,846 feet.
19 This new Building 2 is 12,251 square feet. The
20 total square footage of the building has increased
21 from 47,384 to 60,543, with the addition of that
22 fifth floor.

23 The architecture of this building, we
24 spent a lot of time on it with Dan Marshall, Bob

1 Rasmussen. They worked very, very diligently on
2 it to get something that would fit but be a little
3 bit different than the other buildings. So each
4 building, 1, 2, and 3 of this phase are all a bit
5 different. They all have their own little
6 character. That makes it unique. We've broken it
7 up so it's not just one giant mass.

8 So when you have the -- when you have the
9 various columns and the little juts going in and
10 out, it gives it some definition, that you don't
11 have just one giant straight warehouse type of
12 wall look.

13 Under this new plan, none of the public
14 space changes. That's all there. It's the same
15 as it was. By changing this to for-sale
16 condominiums, we have sufficient parking for all
17 the residents in the basement, basically the lower
18 level that we're digging out.

19 If you go in the Klinkhamer garage right
20 now, go to that lower hall, go down to the north
21 end, you'll see where the driveway is going to go
22 underneath this Building No. 2 to provide parking
23 for those. So there's 28 places, including the
24 two handicapped spaces.

1 Refuse is going to be located partially in
2 the building, and also there's a private little
3 walkway in the back that will also be able to have
4 a trash corral located between the parking garage
5 and the building itself.

6 Right now I'll open it up to any questions
7 anybody might have.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Can you hear me?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: I have a question about the
11 residential apartments. Up above you've got these
12 layouts, you've got unit -- let's just take, for
13 instance, the fifth floor, a typical unit, 5B.
14 It's 2500 square feet.

15 How many bedrooms do you propose that's
16 going to be?

17 MR. KOTCHE: Two.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Two bedrooms?

19 MR. KOTCHE: Two bedrooms. It will have
20 an office if somebody -- or a library or whatever
21 you want to call it. Somebody could convert it to
22 a third bedroom if they needed it. But right now,
23 we're setting up for all of those to be
24 two-bedroom units.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: So the bedroom is going to
2 be on the -- what is it the east facade? And the
3 other bedrooms or the office is going to be on the
4 west, or I don't see how that would lay out.

5 MR. KOTCHE: Each one of these is going to
6 be a custom unit, just like we have on Building
7 No. 3 right now. So you have the basic shell, and
8 then the homeowner can design how they want their
9 layout interior to be. So we're not building them
10 per set plan for us.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. So I've never seen a
12 two-bedroom that's 2500 square feet; and getting a
13 room on that west side, you're not going to have
14 any light or vent for that room, so if you're
15 putting an office in there --

16 MR. KOTCHE: Yeah. It's the same layout
17 that we have right now in Building No. 3.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah. I've got two
20 questions.

21 MR. KOTCHE: Uh-huh.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: First, I understand the
23 concept by the additional floor where you have the
24 residential units, the office, and then down below

1 commercial, so you have the buffer there.

2 However, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe we see
3 units as far as residential units reduced
4 significantly; is that correct?

5 MR. KOTCHE: Correct. We've gone from the
6 studio one-bedroom apartments to the condominiums.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Because by any
8 chance, Sterling is pre-sold, sold out, your No. 3
9 Building?

10 MR. KOTCHE: No. 3 we have -- out of our
11 units, we have sold or have under contract --

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. I understand.

13 MR. KOTCHE: -- 10 of 12 units.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. I'm just
15 curious by eliminating them -- it seems like
16 there's a demand for those units. I'm just
17 curious. I'm a little concerned about the office
18 space, if there is a demand for that.

19 MR. KOTCHE: We really need to have some
20 type of buffer between --

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, I understand that.

22 MR. KOTCHE: -- between that, and really
23 the only buffer we could have would be the office.
24 If it's a rental program, it's a little bit

1 different than it is if it's an owner occupied.

2 When this plan first came out in '15, you recall
3 the housing market was --

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, yeah.

5 MR. KOTCHE: -- relatively flat.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

7 MR. KOTCHE: There wasn't any demand, and
8 that has improved dramatically, so we're going to
9 go to that.

10 Building 6, according to the overall
11 layout, is still set for apartments, rental units.
12 So that and Buildings 8 and 7B could have that mix
13 where you could have your apartments, then the
14 owner occupied, which was originally thought of in
15 the 2006 plan, and that gives us our mix with
16 retail, office, et cetera.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So if the offices aren't
18 filled, do you have any alternative plan?

19 MR. KOTCHE: No.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

21 MR. KOTCHE: Leasing. We've had a pretty
22 strong demand. The building across the street is
23 substantially full, No. 4, and has been since day
24 one, and we have strong demand right now on the

1 first floor of Building 3.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. All right.

3 MR. KOTCHE: So we're hopeful.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: My last question, I think
5 you may have answered it. I'm not really sure.

6 So you eliminated the balconies on the
7 First Street side, and I understand that. By
8 eliminating them, did you enhance the design? I
9 know you said -- you were explaining it steps in
10 and out.

11 MR. KOTCHE: Yeah.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Did it not step in and
13 out before, and did you enhance it with some kind
14 of architectural features?

15 MR. KOTCHE: Yeah. It did step out
16 before, and you can see there's step-outs right
17 here on the -- let's take a look at the fourth
18 floor. This is the First Street side.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

20 MR. KOTCHE: So we do have these little
21 step-outs coming in and out, and then we also have
22 the step-outs on the ends.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. Were those there
24 before?

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

19

1 MR. KOTCHE: Yes, they were there before
2 in the old plan too, but it was a little different
3 configuration. They were narrower. We had more
4 units. So each unit had a little step-out where
5 things were going.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So you feel as though you
7 enhanced the design a little bit.

8 MR. KOTCHE: Yes, yes, without a doubt.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

10 MR. KOTCHE: And I don't want to put words
11 in staff's mouth, but I think they thought it was
12 enhanced also.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That it was what?

14 MR. KOTCHE: Enhanced also.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Hi, there.

18 MR. KOTCHE: Hi.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. On the first
20 page of the summary, it says, "No change to the
21 building footprint, however, the building lot will
22 need to be re-platted to slightly adjust the
23 building line along the First Street sidewalk."

24 Can you explain that a little bit more?

1 MR. KOTCHE: If you look at what I have up
2 right now, this area has got to change a little
3 bit, and a couple of these step-outs are changing
4 just a little bit. Where we had the parking
5 garage, there was a line that was drawn. That's
6 what we built off of.

7 And, Bob, maybe -- or, Russ, maybe you can
8 explain a little bit better. Yes, if you want to
9 show them the actual slide.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Can you explain to
11 me which side is First Street here?

12 MR. KOTCHE: First Street is on the
13 bottom.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

15 MR. RASMUSSEN: So, Laura, if you want to
16 look at what Russ is pulling up here, this is an
17 overlay of the existing site plan or existing
18 plat. The existing plat -- see the light-colored
19 line here? It's right here.

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

21 MR. RASMUSSEN: Okay. In our new building
22 that goes away, and the black line is now new
23 building. Oh, I'm sorry. The black line is the
24 existing plat as it was platted for the apartment

1 building.

2 So right here where I'm pointing, now
3 there's a little space that we're going to put
4 back into sidewalk; but over here where the light
5 line is, that's the new building. So basically,
6 the articulation of the facade has changed, and
7 that's what the difference is.

8 So there's really no fundamental change to
9 the footprint except these in and outs. So right
10 here it's identical; but on this portion here, the
11 old plat came all the way out to here for that
12 building. That was a stairwell. The new one
13 steps back to here.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So at the smallest
15 area where it says -- you have an arrow there.
16 What is the --

17 MR. RASMUSSEN: This 2 feet?

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: No. Where it comes
19 out.

20 MR. RASMUSSEN: Oh, right here?

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

22 MR. RASMUSSEN: 10.5 feet.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: That's 10.

24 MR. RASMUSSEN: That's this number here,

1 yeah.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

3 MR. RASMUSSEN: So, again, our mission was
4 to not fundamentally change the size of the
5 building.

6 And, Tom, to get back to your question,
7 significant changes architecturally to better the
8 look of this building. The features on the end of
9 the building -- if we can jump up to here real
10 quick. Well, anyhow on the end of the building,
11 we've got those steel structures that come out at
12 an angle, and that adds just a little touch of
13 contemporary flare to it. Very significant, very
14 positive, I think it will make this building super
15 special.

16 If you look at the first building, which I
17 designed with Dan as well, I think it's a great
18 building, but it's kind of a box, and it looks
19 like an apartment building.

20 This building looks pretty significant I
21 think with what we've done. The atrium in the
22 middle was created for the elevator, and I think
23 that's a pretty special feature as well, and it
24 kind of opens up some daylight there to the street

1 which I think is significant.

2 And then to answer one of you guys -- your
3 other question on the two bedrooms, what we did on
4 the west wall corridor, and the same is true in
5 Building 3, it's full of glass all across here.
6 Then on that corridor, these are 12-foot, 8-foot
7 to floor ceilings. So we put transom windows up
8 high on those two bedrooms or offices. So you get
9 all kinds of natural light. Now, they're fixed
10 windows, you don't open them, but there's a lot of
11 light in there. I'm in Building 3 every day, and
12 I think it's very friendly.

13 We've had a lot of success with people who
14 want to purchase and get rid of their big houses,
15 and that's where this market is. In our
16 Tri-Cities right now, we have one thing lacking,
17 single-floor residential living for people, empty
18 nesters.

19 This is a need that we have to meet in the
20 Tri-Cities. I mean, we're the only place doing
21 it. Geneva doesn't have it. Elgin doesn't have
22 it. Batavia doesn't have at it. It's pretty
23 significant.

24 Then the rental market, we believe, should

1 be just a little further down the street, a little
2 more simple buildings, but not the showpiece, and
3 that's what we tried to accomplish here.

4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just have a
5 comment --

6 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- in regards to
8 administration.

9 The building has a very contemporary look;
10 and when I look at the windows, the Chicago-style
11 windows, there is a picture and two levels on each
12 side. Have you guys considered encasement
13 windows, which would be a more contemporary look?
14 I'm just curious. Have you ever thought about it?

15 MR. KOTCHE: We have double hung on the
16 other buildings.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I know across the
18 street they are a duplicate of that, but we're
19 looking for a little bit of change, and I'm just
20 throwing that out there.

21 MR. RASMUSSEN: So and Dan is really the
22 brainstorm behind this and just a tremendous
23 architect. But when he did this in Building 1 and
24 Building 3, that's supposed to kind of mirror what

1 you see downtown Chicago in the old warehouses
2 that were infilled, and you bust those windows out
3 and put those in.

4 Then what he did in between here where he
5 got into a different style of window and he
6 articulated that building out, he changed it up a
7 little bit. He got you some more storefront-type
8 windows that actually don't open, and it's more
9 contemporary.

10 So you've kind of got this blend of a
11 building that has some fundamental characters of
12 an old town, but yet here's these contemporary
13 flares pushed into it. So that was his logic. I
14 like it. I think it works pretty well.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm not being
16 critical.

17 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. That was his logic.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Just looking at it,
19 it's very contemporary looking to me in some
20 respects; but, you know, in the atrium center,
21 it's all vertical panes. That's all.

22 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. And if you look at
23 that atrium, it looks like you've busted out the
24 middle of the building and put that in and the

1 same thing with those two steel ends that angle
2 out.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yeah. Those are
4 pretty.

5 MR. RASMUSSEN: And the one on the north,
6 you're going to see from North Avenue. So it's a
7 pretty neat feature, and we do have a hand drawing
8 of what that will look like. It's a pretty neat
9 feature. It will look cool coming across the
10 bridge.

11 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Regarding the atrium,
12 I'm just curious, you mentioned that's covering
13 the elevator, is that correct, or is that merely
14 decorative, or people are going to be in there?
15 I'm just curious.

16 MR. RASMUSSEN: So you all saw the
17 building stall out on Building 3 for a while. We
18 decided to add a roof deck. Let's go back to no
19 west exposure. So not one unit in here has a good
20 west exposure, just that common corridor, except
21 the end units, of course.

22 So we decided the only way to catch a good
23 sunset or look across our town is to put a deck up
24 on the roof. To do that, the elevator needs to

1 get to the roof for handicap compliance. So that
2 shaft goes up above the roof, allows the elevator
3 to get up there, and then there will be a roof
4 deck which you'll never see because it's behind
5 the parapet walls, but that glass atrium gets the
6 elevator up there, and that's its purpose. We did
7 the same thing in Building 3, except it's not
8 glass, it's an enclosed structure.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, sir.

10 MEMBER PIETRYLA: One more. Regarding the
11 facade, out of curiosity again, in our packet it
12 looks rather gray; whereas in your presentation,
13 it's a little bit of a beige, brown. What do
14 you -- just curious, on the outside --

15 MR. RASMUSSEN: Well, we haven't picked a
16 color yet.

17 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Okay.

18 MR. RASMUSSEN: Personally, I probably
19 wouldn't go gray on it. You can't tell the color
20 of Building 3 yet because the brick is not washed.
21 It's a fairly light brick on the large southern
22 end. Then we get into the maroon, and then
23 there's kind of a reddish orange on it. There's
24 three colors of brick there.

1 We're going to have two colors here. I
2 don't anticipate us doing a gray building, but we
3 have not made that decision at this point.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Will the materials, the
5 clotting materials be brick or stone? It's a
6 little hard to tell on these.

7 MR. KOTCHE: Brick. Brick with the same
8 type of materials, traditional materials that we
9 used on the other two buildings.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I wasn't done with
11 my questions.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: In the change from
14 the residential unit count, you originally -- or
15 originally, the plans were approved for 36 units.
16 They weren't all studio apartments, were they?

17 MR. KOTCHE: Studio, one bedroom.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Studio, one
19 bedroom. So there was only a capacity for 72
20 people to live in that building, if I did my math
21 correctly.

22 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes. That's correct.

23 MR. KOTCHE: Yes.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And now we're down

1 to about 14 units, possibly 2.5 people living
2 here. So we've reduced the population of
3 potential residents by over half.

4 MR. KOTCHE: In this one particular
5 building, correct.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Now, was this based
7 off of the -- to piggyback off of a previous
8 question, was this based off of the demand that
9 you were seeing in the Sterling Banks building,
10 Building No. 3?

11 MR. KOTCHE: No. Because when we first
12 came with the original Building 2 plan, that was
13 in 2015, and the for-sale market just was dead.
14 There wasn't any interest in people having units.

15 That market has changed. So it's to, I
16 think, everybody's benefit to keep this as owner
17 occupied, so that this section is owner occupied,
18 and then we moved the for rent back to where it
19 was: 7A, 7B, 6, and 8.

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I guess I just want
21 to voice a concern that I think the original
22 thought was to bring some millennials, if you
23 will, downtown to shop, dine, engage in our town;
24 and we've reduced that amount by almost -- by over

1 half.

2 MR. KOTCHE: We have what we have -- we've
3 satisfied parking demand and parking needs
4 because we can --

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

6 MR. KOTCHE: -- we can park everybody
7 that's going to live here in this building. The
8 other one we couldn't.

9 MR. RASMUSSEN: I think, Laura, to meet
10 the needs of our community -- the rental community
11 is big. I don't think this is a rental location.
12 This is a premium location. We have a significant
13 need for empty nester housing, that if we don't
14 meet it, somebody else is --

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So what was the
16 thought process originally?

17 MR. RASMUSSEN: -- down the river.

18 Well, back then you couldn't even get a
19 loan to build a condominium building, not even a
20 chance until the last 24 months. No bank would
21 even lend on it. You had to be 50 percent sold,
22 and people can't get mortgages. It had to be cash
23 deals. So it was a deal we couldn't do.

24 Apartments are easy. We're big landlords.

1 We own a lot of apartments. We could do that all
2 day long.

3 We have the opportunity as a city to walk
4 down the street into Building 6, fill that full of
5 millennials, go down to the milestone pad, which
6 we still own, which I fully believe is going to be
7 rentals; and those are the locations, I think, are
8 better rental markets than this location.

9 And what I've found out by building the
10 townhomes at Heritage Green and the townhomes I'm
11 doing in downtown Geneva, the market is crazy,
12 what people want. People like us who want to get
13 rid of their homes and single-story live and walk
14 to a restaurant.

15 And the biggest thing this building is
16 going to gain us is a lunch crowd. We need people
17 downtown. Saving ALE in this town was so
18 significant to help downtown. Those guys go to
19 lunch. They go to breakfast. They go to Kilwins.
20 They go to Jeans and a Cute Top. That is saving a
21 lot of our stores.

22 Well, at 10,000, 11,000 square feet of
23 office space, you know, we're going to have
24 another 44 people working on that floor every day,

1 which I think is significant.

2 We do need to meet that rental need,
3 there's no question, but we have that opportunity
4 down the street; and I don't want to miss this
5 opportunity to handle the empty nesters that want
6 to purchase and live in the urban setting that
7 we're creating. Because that is the market today
8 in every single town.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And I don't know
10 how much we're going to get into this because I
11 think there's another discussion about the
12 Riverwalk; but in this plan that I have received,
13 there is also a discussion of a bi-level
14 Riverwalk. Is that in the next discussion?

15 MR. KOTCHE: Yes.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

17 MR. KOTCHE: The Riverwalk is owned by the
18 City.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

20 MR. RASMUSSEN: And we haven't asked to
21 change any of that. That's really the City's
22 decisions there. We've backed everything they've
23 done all along the road, so I don't see that
24 changing from what we began at.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

2 I might have a few more questions.

3 MR. RASMUSSEN: And, Laura, I can also
4 point out to you. We're selling shells. So we
5 can only guess right now, and this is my best
6 guess at how we would divvy up that square
7 footage. But if somebody wants 12- or 1400 square
8 feet, we'll get two units out of the 25. We don't
9 know that yet.

10 The same thing we thought in Building 3,
11 however, we sold all but two with the way we
12 planned. So we don't know that answer yet, and
13 there will be a point where we're going to want to
14 create smaller, maybe less expensive units. We
15 can do that here.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's a good
18 segue into a question I have now.

19 You know, not that I take it lightly, but
20 is there some -- this may be for staff -- so we
21 have the 2500-square-foot shell, so you can build
22 out to the owner's spec, and you say two bedrooms,
23 but it's a shell.

24 Is there any kind of control? I mean,

1 could it be five bedrooms? Not that I take it
2 lightly, but it could be. I mean, we could
3 increase the number of units or the population of
4 this beyond what a two-bedroom, you know, 14-unit
5 development would be.

6 MR. COLBY: Yes. So there is a table of
7 development data that's attached to the PUD
8 ordinance that lists all the different uses within
9 the buildings and square footages and the unit
10 counts.

11 So provided that, you know, it doesn't
12 change from what's on that list, they could
13 reconfigure the units in the building. If there
14 was an increase, they would need to make a change
15 to that list, which might involve some kind of
16 approval process.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't know what
18 page I was looking at. I thought I saw one.

19 MEMBER PIETRYLA: 22.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 22.

21 MEMBER PIETRYLA: On the ordinance. In
22 your ordinance.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I'll find
24 it. All right. Thanks.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question about
2 the office and the residential. How do you
3 separate them? I mean, you have one elevator,
4 and, you know, you're going to have two different
5 uses.

6 MR. RASMUSSEN: There's a very good chance
7 we'll have two elevators in here to meet that
8 need. Otherwise, there will be key cards that
9 will stop it at that second floor.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

11 MR. RASMUSSEN: And your only way to use
12 it for the office is through that key card.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

14 MEMBER PRETZ: I was just going to say I
15 don't have any new questions for Bob, and I will
16 say that what we're seeing here is an exchange
17 that took place between the preservation
18 commission, questions and the challenges that were
19 thrown back to Bob and to Dan, and their ability
20 to listen and to respond and have a good dialogue
21 is what we're taking a look at here.

22 And, again, I don't have any new questions
23 because they've all been answered on what we're
24 seeing here.

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

36

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Anything else?
2 Plan Commission?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any members
5 of the public?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
8 further from staff?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. In that case, is
11 it in order to approve the application at this
12 time?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. It's listed on the
14 agenda for action.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Is there a
16 motion?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

18 Or do you have more comments?

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a couple
20 comments. I don't really have a question.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I just have some
23 suggestions, and I don't know when that comes
24 around.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Just suggestions
3 for the whole project in general, of course I do.

4 Being in the position that I am in, I
5 actually work at Jeans and a Cute Top on the
6 weekends also, you know. So I am in -- for those
7 of you who don't know, I work for the Downtown
8 Partnership.

9 So I'm able to look at this from a couple
10 different viewpoints, from a resident and from
11 somebody who does this for a living, who sees and
12 oversees business and talks to these owners and is
13 really engulfed in the business community here in
14 St. Charles. And there's a couple things I just
15 want to comment on and maybe open up for a
16 discussion.

17 One of the things that I have noticed is
18 that since Brunch Cafe opened up, there's been
19 people lining up outside. Jeans and a Cute Top
20 has doubled their sales, which is awesome. It's
21 fantastic.

22 So having people outside, having people
23 integrate into the community is vital for First
24 Street and for our whole business community. One

1 of the things that I have done, and I've gone out
2 and visited a couple different -- I've been to
3 Naperville. I've been to Arlington Heights. I
4 was just in South Carolina this weekend. I go to
5 the city a lot, and I observe business communities.

6 And one of the things that I think we are
7 missing the boat on is the outdoor cafe. Now, I
8 distinctly remember you and I having this
9 conversation, that if I could do all these small
10 little cafes on First Street, I would do it.

11 Well, that being said, the way that they
12 have been structured and the way that they are
13 built right now do not allow for community
14 integration. You can't -- there's no openness.
15 There's no open windows or -- I mean, I would love
16 it if you had garage-door windows where you would
17 open it up and integrate the restaurant or the
18 cafes with the people in the community.

19 And I think that it shuts it off. People
20 don't see the interaction that could happen to
21 create that kind of piazza or whatever that we --
22 that's urban, that we're looking for in
23 St. Charles.

24 I understand on the other side of Building

1 3 you have a whole area for outdoor seating;
2 correct?

3 MR. KOTCHE: Building 2.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Building 2, sorry.

5 But just doing some research, I'm just
6 going to read some excerpts, just one little
7 excerpt from some research that I did. "Outdoor
8 cafes are an excellent way to improve and enliven
9 a street. Not just bringing flare to a city, but
10 they also enhance the economy. The implementation
11 of cafes should be encouraged by cities."

12 And it goes on to say, "It seems as though
13 most successful cafes would be the ones that had
14 great views and sun exposure, but this is not
15 true. As mentioned previously, the biggest
16 attraction to outdoor cafes is people watching."

17 So one of the things -- like Vintage 53, I
18 think that is totally missing the boat not having
19 those open windows that he could have in the
20 summer months with people sitting outside,
21 enjoying people watching and all that.

22 And the way that Pueblo and Neo have the
23 outdoor seating, I just feel like it was retro
24 done, and it wasn't planned. It wasn't planned

1 previously. It was like, Oh, wait a minute, let's
2 have some outdoor seating. So they have two
3 tables out there, or Neo has six tables.

4 I think that -- I mean, I'm reading that
5 plans for the east plaza and Riverwalk will be
6 prepared later, and my thought is that it needs to
7 be prepared now. It needs to be integrated into
8 the plans. I'm sure that Kilwins would like more
9 than one table out there. I'm sure that Vintage
10 53 would like to have some outdoor seating other
11 than what he's got right now. It's not working.

12 So I guess I just want to comment that I
13 want some more thought -- I would encourage the
14 thought process to integrate some of the Riverwalk
15 and the architecture to be in the process of
16 building the building.

17 That's what I really want to say because I
18 think it could be amazing what we could create
19 there. I love your building. I love what you've
20 done. But just talking to Mario at Vintage 53, he
21 said he thinks about it every day; but he says
22 that -- I don't know what his problems are that he
23 can't have something like that. Whether it's the
24 landlord or whether it's financial or what it is.

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

41

1 But I just think some of those options
2 need to be thought about so that we can have more
3 of an open, like, societal downtown where people
4 are integrating in the business. That's all.

5 MR. KOTCHE: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other comments?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. All right. Is
9 there a motion?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a
11 motion to recommend approval of the application
12 for PUD preliminary plan for the First Street
13 Redevelopment PUD, Phase 3, Building 2, First
14 Street Redevelopment II, LLC, subject to
15 resolution of all staff -- any open staff issues.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
19 moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, Tim.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

Transcript of Application for PUD Preliminary Plan
Conducted on October 17, 2017

42

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.
2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.
3 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.
4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.
5 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.
7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.
9 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.
11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes
16 unanimately. That concludes Item No. 4 on the
17 agenda.
18 Thank you, gentleman.
19 (Off the record at 7:40 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of October, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois

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: :
First Street Redevelopment :
PUD - Presentation of :
Conceptual Streetscape and :
Riverwalk Design. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, October 17, 2017
7:40 p.m.

Job No.: 126928B
Pages: 1 - 56
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

Transcript of Conceptual Streetscape
Conducted on October 17, 2017

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

7 DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

14 Development Director

15 CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering

16 Division Manager

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 5 is First Street
3 Development PUD, presentation of conceptual
4 streetscape and Riverwalk design.

5 MR. COLBY: Yes. This is a presentation
6 just looking for feedback from the Plan Commission
7 prior to the City preparing the detailed plans for
8 the streetscape along Building No. 3, and this
9 includes the streetscape on Illinois Street and
10 the Riverwalk adjacent to the building.

11 This plan that you're looking at here
12 shows the currently proposed buildings, Buildings
13 1, 2, and 3, and the parking deck. The footprint
14 is laid over the original streetscape plan for the
15 First Street project that dates from 2008.

16 What this plan shows is that these
17 buildings that are being constructed now are
18 within the framework of those open space and
19 public areas that had been previously planned with
20 the original project.

21 One of the things that the City
22 acknowledged when the plans for these three
23 buildings were approved in 2015 was that we would
24 need to go back through this public space plan and

1 redesign some of these individual areas to better
2 match the buildings that were being constructed
3 and also to improve upon the usability of those
4 spaces.

5 So some of that has already taken place.
6 This area that's shown in green here, there is a
7 streetscape plan approved for the entire frontage
8 of First Street along Buildings 1 and 2, then
9 along Illinois Street adjacent to Building 1 and
10 the parking deck; and a portion of those
11 improvements have been installed, the portion
12 specifically along Building 1 and the parking
13 deck. And obviously, the portion on Building 2
14 would be constructed once Building 2 is built.

15 The portion we'll be discussing tonight is
16 this section here which is highlighted in blue
17 where we have a conceptual layout that's being
18 presented for feedback, and that involves the
19 Illinois streetscape and the Riverwalk here. In
20 this portion, there's really only an upper-level
21 Riverwalk that's accessible.

22 As you move further to the north, there's
23 a bi-level Riverwalk that has a lower level close
24 to the river and an upper level up here that runs

1 along adjacent to the parking deck and the outdoor
2 dining area for Building 2 that was just
3 referenced.

4 There's also a plan for an east plaza
5 which is shown here north of Building 2, and you
6 can see this was rather narrow and sort of
7 functioned primarily as a corridor to walk from
8 the existing west plaza across First Street to the
9 Riverwalk.

10 And part of the reason for this was that
11 there was a building planned in this location,
12 which I'm highlighting here. That was the One
13 West Main building that involved both what was the
14 former footprint of the Manor restaurant and also
15 some City-owned property adjacent to it right
16 here.

17 So this dashed line here shows the area
18 that will be planned in the future. This is both
19 the plaza and the bi-level Riverwalk. You can see
20 the area of property that the City owns shown as
21 this dashed line is much larger than the east
22 plaza that had been planned.

23 So one of the considerations that has
24 delayed the City, among other things, designing

1 this is there's some uncertainty about what's
2 going to happen with this area and whether there's
3 going to be a building constructed here; and if
4 there is, what it will look like and if there
5 would be an interest in expanding the footprint at
6 all into the City property.

7 Obviously, if this area were included
8 within the plaza, it would create opportunities
9 for more usable spaces, such as the idea for
10 outdoor dining, for some other kind of usable
11 space as opposed to this walking corridor as
12 originally planned.

13 Also, I mentioned the stairs. Here's the
14 two stair locations. One of these is adjacent to
15 the area we'll be talking about along Building 3,
16 and the other one is at the end of the plaza. So
17 this area really is sort of designed as a
18 continuous walking route along the Riverwalk and a
19 connection to First Street. So it really is tied
20 together.

21 What we've tried to do with the Building 3
22 plan is to limit the improvements really to the
23 area that's directly adjacent to the building.
24 Really it's just more -- has more of a functional

1 utilitarian purpose because it's primarily a
2 walkway. And this dashed line just shows what the
3 footprint of that Manor foundation is, wherever
4 that's located.

5 So here's another view. This is an aerial
6 view from a couple years back showing Building 1
7 under construction, and this gives you an idea
8 sort of how the different building footprints lay
9 out and what the existing Riverwalk looks like,
10 how wide and where the future plaza is located,
11 the City-owned property here, and then the Manor
12 property there.

13 So I mentioned there was a streetscape
14 plan developed for Buildings 1 and 2. This is
15 that plan shown here. It shows the paving and the
16 landscaping.

17 You may recall one of the major reasons
18 for this type of design was the reaction to how
19 the streetscape improvements on the west side of
20 First Street function. I think there's a concern
21 that there were too many planters and too many
22 obstructions on the sidewalk, and it would be more
23 beneficial in this next phase to try and open up
24 the sidewalk to a grater extent, move the

1 landscaping out closer to the street.

2 So what was done is this plan was laid out
3 with 10-foot walkways along the building, and then
4 the trees and all the planters were moved away
5 from the building to an area so there wouldn't be
6 conflict with the building.

7 One of the issues with the other side of
8 First Street was there were often planter boxes or
9 trees located in front of businesses that really
10 were not ideal locations. So we tried to plan
11 around that with this layout.

12 So these improvements were constructed
13 along Building 1. These are pictures of when it
14 was -- after it was just installed, and you can
15 sort of get a feel for the layout of the sidewalk
16 and the landscape beds relative to the building.

17 And so there's a similar plan that was
18 developed for Building 2 that would be -- that
19 would be constructed further down the street here.
20 There needs to be some slight adjustments to that
21 plan based on the changes to the front face of the
22 building as we've discussed previously.

23 So the portion we're focusing on is the
24 section adjacent to Building No. 3. Some of the

1 design considerations -- there's a very large
2 building entrance on Building 3 facing Illinois
3 Street, which will be the location for Sterling
4 Bank's lobby. So that facade of the building is
5 really dominated by one central entrance.

6 Along the Riverwalk side, it's fairly
7 limited in width. It varies to a narrow point of
8 about 9 feet, but then it's generally about
9 15 feet wide.

10 From the City's standpoint in terms of
11 maintaining this area, there's limited access to
12 be able to get large equipment back there. So
13 there's a concern about one having items on that
14 Riverwalk section, that particular stretch that
15 would be difficult to maintain if there was a need
16 for large equipment to go back there both in terms
17 of the width and also whatever kind of maintenance
18 needs to be done.

19 As I mentioned, it's primarily a walking
20 corridor. Given that it's limited width and the
21 fact that it connects Illinois Street to the
22 entrance to the parking deck and also the
23 Riverwalk plaza area, the wider area that has more
24 usable space, it's primarily going to be a

1 connector.

2 There's also portions of the Riverwalk
3 that sort of overhang the wall that's there. If
4 you look -- and I have some pictures of the view
5 from the Illinois Street bridge. You can see that
6 part of the walkway that has been planned actually
7 overhangs the wall, and that creates some
8 complications with planning where landscape
9 planters can go.

10 There's also a narrow portion of the lower
11 river wall that is not directly accessible that is
12 located there adjacent to this section which could
13 be planted with some kind of low-maintenance
14 plants. And I also wanted to show how the
15 building facade along the Riverwalk varies, and so
16 that has led us to come up with some
17 modifications, not really a standard, consistent
18 design across the front of Building 3.

19 So here's a photo showing the building
20 under construction and what this Riverwalk area
21 looks like. Down here is the lower wall that I
22 was referring to. There's the shelf here where
23 right now there's some weeds growing. This isn't
24 directly accessible from anywhere. This wall sort

1 of wraps back in here. This is just wide enough
2 that someone could -- if they needed to, they
3 could climb down here, but there's going to be a
4 railing on top. So it isn't really accessible for
5 regular maintenance.

6 You can also see there's this area that's
7 a shelf that's overhanging. When this wall was
8 installed, the intent was to add these shelves to
9 widen some of the space here between the river
10 wall and the building. You can see around this
11 corner here, there's also another large shelf that
12 sticks out around the corner to widen that point
13 from the corner of the building.

14 Here's a view from the other direction
15 which shows the lower section of river wall here
16 and the point which it ends. It also shows the
17 overhang for the corner at Illinois and also this
18 overhang that's along the corner of the building
19 here.

20 This location is where one of the
21 stairwells is planned leading from the upper
22 Riverwalk down to the lower Riverwalk. And so the
23 extent of the improvements shown on the plan
24 really are all the way from Illinois Street,

1 around the face of the building, and then adjacent
2 to the building here and sort of creating the
3 retaining walls where the stairs would go, but not
4 constructing the stairs yet because they would be
5 part of the later phase.

6 So this is the east elevation of Building
7 3, and I just wanted to point out a few things
8 about the way it's laid out. If you look at the
9 first-floor portions of the building, this portion
10 of the building, which is the Sterling Bank
11 portion, has walls and sort of standard windows
12 along the first floor.

13 And this portion, as you're moving from
14 this door to the north has storefronts. So
15 there's sort of a different interaction between
16 the building and the Riverwalk. I also noted on
17 here this is the point on the building which is
18 where the building face starts to step back here
19 as you move along the corner and the Riverwalk
20 curves inward.

21 There's a main entry door here which is
22 the lobby for the residential building. There is
23 also a corridor leading through the building
24 located here, and this is the approximate location

1 where those Riverwalk stairs are coming up.

2 There are also some projections on the
3 building. This large window here bows out. It's
4 a rounded window that overhangs this area below,
5 and there's a bracket here that holds it up.
6 There is also areas of balconies shown here in the
7 circle area that overhang the Riverwalk. So in
8 laying out the plantings, planters, I tried to
9 account for all of these features in the layout.

10 This is just sort of a generic idea of how
11 the different planters lay out against the
12 building. First, this planter box is actually
13 against the building face here where there's no
14 storefront. It's rounded and sort of follows the
15 bow window that's there.

16 And then these other locations show where
17 trees have been proposed. There's an area at the
18 corner of the building where you have the ability
19 to locate a larger shade tree that could fill in
20 the larger space at the end of the Riverwalk.

21 There's also a location as the building
22 steps back here where another larger tree can be
23 placed; but because of the balconies that are here
24 and the doorways, there's not a lot of

1 opportunities for large trees to be placed.

2 What we've proposed are some more
3 ornamental-type trees that could be located
4 adjacent to that main entrance door. This is sort
5 of what it would look like if you've only seeing
6 the mature landscaping once it had grown somewhat.

7 So the plan -- the general characteristics
8 of the plan, concrete is the primary walking
9 surface with paver bricks for accent areas, which
10 is consistent with what we've done along First
11 Street with Building 1. They're maintaining a
12 minimum width of 10 feet of walking path along the
13 Riverwalk. Planters have been located based on
14 the building facade design, as I mentioned.

15 On a couple of the planter boxes, there's
16 integrated seating walls that are sort of metal
17 bench seats that are along the walls of the
18 planter beds. There's pedestrian-style lighting
19 along the walkway, and also there's bollard
20 lighting proposed for accents at each of the
21 planter boxes.

22 There will be a railing installed along
23 the top of the river wall along the full length of
24 this plan; and then as I mentioned, on the lower

1 river wall, there will also be some type of
2 low-maintenance planting that's been proposed.

3 This is what the concept looks like. It's
4 really being presented at this stage just to get
5 feedback on the overall layout and see what kind
6 of comments the Plan Commission might have based
7 on what's been presented.

8 With that, I'll take comments, questions.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So the stairway
10 that you were talking about goes down. Can you
11 explain that goes down to what?

12 MR. COLBY: There is the lower Riverwalk
13 section here. So if you're walking on this upper
14 level, this stairwell will take you down to this
15 lower level.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can you just go
17 back to that slide, Russ.

18 MR. COLBY: To the aerial?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That shows the
20 low -- yeah, that.

21 MR. COLBY: This. Yes. That's where this
22 stairwell is located. Then you'll be able to,
23 once this is improved, walk down to this level and
24 then walk along this lower section.

Transcript of Conceptual Streetscape
Conducted on October 17, 2017

17

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: How wide is that?

2 MR. COLBY: Actually, it varies, but in
3 many sections it's 12-plus feet wide. It narrows
4 here, but then it widens as you move further down.
5 We don't have a good view of this here.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And is there going
7 to be a railing down there too?

8 MR. COLBY: That needs to be determined.
9 We haven't planned that section yet. It was
10 talked about in the previous plan, that that
11 railing would be an option, but that's to be
12 determined.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Kind of like by
14 the apartments, there's no railing.

15 MR. COLBY: Yeah. There's areas where
16 there are railings, and there's areas where there
17 are not. But along the upper wall because of the
18 distance that you would fall, there needs to be a
19 railing up there.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Russell, the
21 Riverwalk lower level, how far south does it go?
22 It doesn't go under the bridge, does it?

23 MR. COLBY: No. Well, this is as far
24 south as it could go here because the wall sort of

1 wraps in here, but this is too narrow really here
2 to even walk to. But at this point, there's sort
3 of a break in the wall, and then this other
4 section opens up which is really just --

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Plantings.

6 MR. COLBY: -- where plantings would be
7 because it's not accessible, but it widens as you
8 move this direction.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So the Riverwalk over by
10 Pottawatomie that has no railing, I'm going to
11 guess, what is it, 8 feet? 10 feet? How wide is
12 that?

13 MR. COLBY: The walkway?

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah.

15 MR. COLBY: Yes. I forgot what that was.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I think where it gets
17 really narrow, I don't know how narrow it gets,
18 you're probably -- I would think there needs to be
19 a railing because -- I don't know how you guys
20 feel, but when I walk over to Pottawatomie, I stay
21 about 3 feet away from the water, even though I
22 swim like crazy. It's just kind of creepy.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There is a way to
24 get out. You could climb out.

Transcript of Conceptual Streetscape
Conducted on October 17, 2017

19

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I could, yes, Tim.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, you couldn't
3 here.

4 MR. COLBY: And I would think that the
5 need for the railing would be partially based on
6 how this is laid out. If it ends up being a
7 situation where there is a narrow walkway along
8 the edge, then maybe there's more of a need; but
9 if it ends up being more of a paved surface where
10 there's a wider corridor, then it wouldn't be
11 likely to be as confined an area where you
12 might --

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And these walkways --

14 MR. COLBY: -- feel less secure along the
15 shore.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: These walkways or plazas
17 or wherever they're larger, you know, you have
18 that fountain interest over by ZaZa's in that
19 courtyard. Is there anything like that considered?
20 Is it big enough?

21 MR. COLBY: There were plans for that in
22 the original plan for the east plaza area, that
23 would be north of Building 2. So that's something
24 that's going to have to be reassessed when that

1 area is planned, and that will be based on a
2 determination of how much space is actually going
3 to be in that plaza, which we haven't determined
4 yet.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: What about lighting?

6 MR. COLBY: Along?

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Along the Riverwalk.

8 MR. COLBY: Yeah. Well, along this
9 section, there's these pedestrian light poles
10 which are similar to the poles that are along the
11 street, along First Street here; and then also
12 there's these lighting bollards located in each of
13 the planter beds along the Riverwalk.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: For nighttime?

15 MR. COLBY: Yes. So this lighting scheme
16 will likely continue along the rest of the
17 Riverwalk in this design.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Russell, where does this
19 Riverwalk go? Is it connected to that future
20 plaza on the -- near North Avenue?

21 MR. COLBY: Yes.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Main Street.

23 MR. COLBY: Yes.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: And then the stairs that go

1 down to the lower Riverwalk, where does that go
2 to? Is it just a dead end, or does it come back
3 up at --

4 MR. COLBY: Yes. Let me back up to this
5 plan. So here's the location of those stairs to
6 the lower Riverwalk. So you will be able to walk
7 down here and then continue all along this walkway
8 up to the point at which it intersects with this
9 plaza area, and then those stairs would come back
10 up to this area.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Is that outdoor dining
12 still proposed in that area, Building 2?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes, yes. So there would be
14 an upper-level walkway that would continue from
15 the area that we're discussing tonight, from this
16 point over along here. There will be an access to
17 the parking deck at this corner, and there's
18 stairs and a ramp up at the top; and you'll also
19 be able to continue walking along this way, along
20 the outside of the outdoor dining area.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: How is that parking deck
22 going to be affected? How is it going to affect
23 the outdoor dining? You can look at just an open
24 deck on that side or --

1 MR. COLBY: Well, it does have finished
2 walls on the outside of it with brick facing.
3 Actually, I think over there the lower level is
4 far enough down that you can't see down into the
5 lower level. So all you would see, essentially,
6 is the side wall of the upper level when you're
7 out there.

8 There's also opportunities for some
9 landscaping along there, which is one of the
10 considerations in this area as planned. This
11 really has an opportunity for more trees to be
12 planted. We're a little confined within this area
13 we're talking about here, but once you move past
14 the north end of Building 3 -- because this area
15 is all going to be open. There's a lot more space
16 for a tree canopy to be established. So it's
17 likely that this area will be more heavily planted
18 with trees than this area we're discussing
19 tonight.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I guess my concern is that
21 you have this outdoor dining, similar to what
22 Laura says, this idea of this Piazza, this plaza,
23 you really only have one building that faces
24 activity, and is that really going to survive?

1 You can't really people watch out there. Are
2 people going to be coming from the office
3 building? I mean, I see offices on the first
4 level of Building 3; is that correct?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: So the activity on that
7 Riverwalk is going to be more for the people who
8 are -- you know, I guess, where are they going?
9 Are they going to go Illinois all the way to Main
10 Street? Is it going to be --

11 MR. COLBY: Yeah. I think the expectation
12 is it will probably be people who -- similar to
13 the crowds that are in the west plaza. You know,
14 they're patronizing the adjacent businesses, and
15 they may just want to walk down to the river -- to
16 that river access and to this area.

17 Because, you know, the intent is it will
18 be a unique space that's really meant to be sort
19 of a gathering space. But it's -- it's still
20 connected to the Riverwalk this direction. So
21 there may be some tenants of these buildings or,
22 you know, people who are out walking and just want
23 to walk through this way. That's likely who would
24 be on that Riverwalk.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Has it been
2 discussed about anything different other than
3 office space on the riverside of Building 3, other
4 than the Sterling Bank?

5 MR. COLBY: Well, there is -- the
6 first-floor space, the PUD would allow it to be
7 occupied by office, or it could be occupied by
8 other commercial uses, and it's the decision of
9 the building owner.

10 There is some opportunity in the plan for
11 an area that is not heavily developed right along
12 here, along the storefronts where it could be wide
13 enough that some kind of seating could be
14 established, if there was a need, for a business
15 that was located in this portion of the building.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: The pedestrian walkway, if
17 I'm walking and I'm going south and I come up to
18 Illinois and I see across the street on the
19 Shodeen side the continuation of the Riverwalk
20 over there, is there going to be a crosswalk that
21 goes across there, or will the City because of it
22 being in the middle force people to go down to the
23 corner to come around? Because it would seem like
24 it would be a nice flow to finish off that coming

1 from Mount St. Mary's.

2 MR. COLBY: Yes. Right now there's no
3 crossing proposed there because it is a mid-block
4 location. It's something that the City has looked
5 at previously.

6 If it's a comment that the Plan Commission
7 would like to pass along, we can pass that along
8 to the City Council and see if they'd like that to
9 be analyzed again; but in the past in previous
10 plans, there was a decision made not to provide a
11 crossing there because of visibility issues and
12 the fact that it's not -- it's a mid-block
13 location.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: The reason I was asking is
15 so it would be in support for traffic coming
16 towards the outdoor dining, if they were coming up
17 north. Without disruption of that traffic, they
18 could come all the way.

19 MEMBER PIETRYLA: You'd have to be jogging
20 west a little bit. You don't have to do that.
21 That's a good idea.

22 MS. TUNGARE: If I may, without the
23 crosswalk, the City's preference would be to make
24 people get to the intersection and then at the

1 intersection cross. Because there's a lot of good
2 reasons that there's no crosswalk there, given the
3 visibility and the grade.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: I was going to say you're
6 probably going to have to put up some barrier
7 along Illinois to force people, but you're still
8 going to have people going across, just as a
9 safety feature.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I mean, I'm a
11 runner, and we cross there all the time. I mean,
12 we just do. It just happens. You know, so it's
13 very difficult to turn left if you're coming from
14 Mount St. Mary's and then cross and go around.
15 There's not a lot of space there. It's going to
16 happen.

17 MR. COLBY: Yeah. And it may happen. The
18 issue for the City is if we provide a crossing
19 there, we take on the liability and the safety of
20 that crossing; and if the traffic is not
21 controlled, that's a concern for the City.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question.

23 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Go ahead, Tom.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Go ahead.

1 MEMBER PIETRYLA: I have a question. So
2 is there any possibility that the bi-level
3 Riverwalk, if you extend that shelf -- I don't
4 know if there's space or if it's too complicated,
5 like the Corps of Engineers or Army Corps. But
6 can you extend that out to the river and actually
7 have that crosswalk go under the bridge and make
8 that connection rather than --

9 MR. COLBY: I think it would be difficult
10 to do. I mean right now it's not wide enough for
11 that and also the river level -- the Illinois
12 bridge is not very high. You know, when the water
13 level gets high, it comes close to the bridge, and
14 often the bridge is closed because of that. So
15 it's not a location where there's a lot of room.
16 So with the other bridges, the Main Street bridge,
17 the bridges are higher from the river level.

18 MEMBER PIETRYLA: So then forget that
19 idea. What about just extending it to Illinois so
20 that you have the bi-level walkway that goes all
21 the way to Illinois Street, and you can put some
22 stairs there, extend that shelf. Is that even
23 possible?

24 MR. COLBY: Yeah. That portion, it's

1 really narrow here. I mean, there's parts of it
2 that are only maybe a foot or two wide.

3 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Could we bring it out,
4 if that's possible, or do you have to get
5 permission from the Army Corps of Engineers?

6 MR. COLBY: Yeah. It's complicated
7 because you're filling the floodway. Part of the
8 reason that the City was able to construct this
9 Riverwalk here is that this wall was already
10 established. You may remember this wall was --
11 this lower wall was here before any of this
12 development was constructed.

13 And for the City to be able to construct
14 this development here, this secondary wall was
15 constructed in the back here as a -- more like a
16 flood wall, and the City filled in some of the
17 floodplain that was here in exchange for -- an
18 area further down the river along Route 25, there
19 is an area excavated, and there is additional
20 flood storage added there. So it's fairly
21 complicated to be able to do what's being
22 constructed here. So it would be --

23 MEMBER PIETRYLA: So, no, basically.

24 MR. COLBY: Theoretically, it's possible,

1 but it would be very complicated.

2 MEMBER PIETRYLA: I was just curious.

3 Thanks.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question on
5 where the Manor was. Back in the day when we all
6 were mad about that, what was planned for that
7 area because I have a suggestion. What was
8 originally planned?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: McNally's; right?

10 MR. COLBY: Yeah. This was the footprint.
11 You know, I can show you on this plan here. This
12 shows this outline of what the building was to
13 look like. It was a four-story building
14 constructed on the corner. Part of it was on the
15 Manor footprint, and part of it extended back onto
16 the City property. It had a tower right at the
17 corner, and it was originally the first floor, and
18 I think lower level, the plan was restaurant uses
19 and the upper level was office.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So that's not going to
21 happen; right? So would you be looking for a
22 smaller, lower profile, or are you looking for
23 revenue producing or something to bring people to
24 the area?

1 MR. COLBY: Well, really right now the
2 City does not own that entire property. The City
3 owns this blue area that's dashed in, and then
4 this area that's shown in the orange is privately
5 owned.

6 So at this point, the City's intent is
7 really to plan for this area as part of the plaza.
8 But if that was constructed, it would, you know,
9 make this foundation here difficult to build on as
10 it's a very limited footprint.

11 So it would really be up to this property
12 owner to make a decision if they want to try and
13 construct something there or not. And if they do,
14 would it need to involve any of the City's
15 property to be able to make it functional. So
16 that's something that the City Council will have
17 to decide, how they want to utilize the City-owned
18 property, and, you know, if they have an interest
19 in a building being constructed.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I forgot it was privately
21 owned. I was going to make a suggestion it could
22 be a band shell or something, bring in
23 entertainment, but that's not going to be
24 feasible.

1 MR. COLBY: Probably not.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: It's privately owned, so
3 they're not going to want something on here.

4 MR. COLBY: You know, it's a possibility,
5 but it's really up to that property owner.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. Right. All
7 right.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Russ, I have a
9 question. Why are we just talking about the
10 streetscape and not the whole thing?

11 MR. COLBY: Well, under the redevelopment
12 agreement between the City and the developer, the
13 City is obligated to construct these improvements
14 at the same time as this building is being
15 constructed. So in that agreement, this portion
16 has really been separated out as one project, and
17 then the remaining portion is required to be
18 constructed after Building 2 is built.

19 The City has deferred planning for this
20 primarily out of concern for what may happen in
21 this area because I think the design of this
22 entire Riverwalk could be different if this space
23 is available for a plaza or if it becomes
24 narrower.

1 So it's sort of a conscious decision to
2 hold off and wait and see what happens here before
3 we start laying out the main gathering space
4 because if there's not large spaces available in
5 this area for more usable area, there may be more
6 interest in trying to find places for that in the
7 rest of the Riverwalk.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Makes sense. I
9 have to say that the streetscape that you're
10 presenting tonight, I mean, it's attractive, it
11 looks fine, but I don't see its ultimate use
12 without the rest of it being -- it doesn't --

13 MR. COLBY: Yeah.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's like an
15 island with just nice paving and some trees, and
16 it is attractive. It's not unattractive. I mean
17 one of the things I think is you included the
18 stair in this streetscape, but yet the walkway
19 that it leads to is not developed. So you don't
20 want to do the stairs. We don't want anybody
21 going down there.

22 MR. COLBY: Yes. The stairs will not be
23 open. The issue is we need to provide access
24 along the face of Building 3 in this area. So to

1 be able to provide level-paved access, we have to
2 construct a retaining wall adjacent to the stairs.

3 So, essentially, we're going to be putting
4 in the structure around the stairs, and it will be
5 temporarily fenced off so that, you know, you
6 won't be able to go down to that location and the
7 stairs won't be constructed, but there will be
8 sort of an area defined where the stairs will go.

9 But we need to keep this paved area along
10 the building here and also provide for a temporary
11 walkway up to the parking deck entrance at the
12 corner.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That makes sense.
14 I was just using that as an example of something
15 that is there that, I mean, we don't know how it's
16 going to be -- how it's ultimately going to end
17 up.

18 MR. COLBY: Yes. Now, we've gone far
19 enough to design the stairs. We know how the
20 stairs will be constructed and that they can be
21 constructed in that area, and then an access will
22 be provided here.

23 Once you get down to the lower Riverwalk,
24 we know the intent is for this to be an open

1 pedestrian corridor, but we don't know exactly
2 what it will look like.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. And, again,
4 I was just using the stairs as an example of the
5 whole streetscape that you're showing us and not
6 sure how it's all going to be -- here's my
7 question. For once I have a good question.

8 What kind of feedback are you looking for
9 from us? I've looked over the materials, and what
10 I really see here is a walkway with some paving
11 and I think -- my opinion is it's attractive but
12 beyond that --

13 MR. COLBY: Yeah. That's essentially what
14 it is.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- I can't really
16 speak to it because I don't know how it's going to
17 interact with Building No. 3 or the rest of the
18 whole streetscape.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: You know, I agree with Tim.
20 I'm having a hard time visualizing how this
21 parking garage is going to integrate with this
22 plaza and the retail. You know, retail right now
23 is one-sided on the west, and how are you going to
24 get, you know, the restaurants or whatever, cafes

1 in there to take over this plaza area.

2 I think it's really segmented, and I don't
3 think it flows without, you know, thinking about
4 the facade and how it's going to interact with the
5 streetscape. Especially, what bothers me is that
6 garage that's just there. I see that as a
7 disconnect, and I think that unless you do
8 something nice with the facade of that garage,
9 it's going to become, you know, a one-sided plaza,
10 which I know they don't work very well.

11 Then you have this beautiful river, and
12 you have these stairs that integrate to a lower --
13 I think it should be opened up more. I think
14 there should be visual connections from Illinois
15 to this new piazza that we're creating. There
16 needs to be some sort of visual connection there.

17 Just planting a bunch of trees -- you
18 know, I think it needs to be thought out more, and
19 I think the architecture needs to be incorporated
20 into this streetscape, you know, so it all works
21 as one and not just pieces that are added on to
22 each other over time.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, I have a couple
24 maybe larger scale on this, detailed comments

1 regarding the Riverwalk.

2 Could you go back to the plan that shows
3 the entire area? There were some different
4 dividing lines regarding how this was getting
5 phased and all that stuff. I understand there's
6 some contract things in phasing it, and there's
7 cost limitations to those things.

8 But where it says "Building 2 outdoor
9 dining" --

10 MR. COLBY: Yes.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- that doesn't seem to
12 be a part of anybody's plan to design anything.
13 So who is designing that?

14 MR. COLBY: Well, the developer for
15 Building 2 will have that area really as a paved
16 surface to utilize for outdoor dining. If they
17 want to propose anything different, any kind of
18 structure, anything like that, they'd have to
19 submit a plan to us showing what that's going to
20 look like.

21 But the intent is that the City will be
22 designing the entire area along the perimeter. So
23 along the border of the outdoor dining area, that
24 will all be part of the Riverwalk. So that area

1 is to remain really as sort of open-paved area.
2 Then it's likely that the landscaping along the
3 Riverwalk will be along the outside of that
4 either as a --

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: But we're approving
6 Building 2, but we're not approving a dining area.
7 Why is that?

8 MR. COLBY: Well, at this point we don't
9 have a design for any improvements there other
10 than it will be paved. We do have the --

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: If we're approving a
12 building, why can't that be part of what we're
13 approving?

14 MR. COLBY: It could be.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Can they answer that?

16 MR. KOTCHE: It's really going to depend
17 on the tenant that goes into that north end on how
18 they want to design their space both inside and
19 outside. We've got that area carved out that it
20 can be used for outdoor dining.

21 Then as we go through the tenant process,
22 we're going to identify a tenant, we're trying to
23 do that now, to take a certain portion of Building
24 2, which would be on First Street and go all the

1 way back through to the outdoor dining area.

2 Then they will design their landscaping
3 inside butting up against the parking garage, how
4 lighting is going to be, where fencing is going to
5 be if alcohol is served outside. It's got to be
6 fenced. And how that's all going to interact with
7 whatever Russ and the City does for the rest of
8 that part that isn't built yet, and that doesn't
9 have to be built yet until we start construction
10 to get up out of the ground on Building 2.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. So as far as
12 that tenant and the one that you identify, that
13 sounds like it will be a sizeable tenant that will
14 take that area, plus take on the dining area also
15 because that adds a lot of square footage and
16 getting a liquor license --

17 MR. KOTCHE: Correct.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- and all that kind of
19 thing. There certainly would be opportunities to
20 design that to have some of the flow of ideas and
21 connections that Laura was talking about, you
22 know, not just doors, but those open sections, and
23 those interrelationships that you see in more
24 urbanized areas.

1 So I guess it would be more a comment that
2 we would hope that those kind of things could be
3 done when, in fact, a tenant is identified. I
4 understand that you can't --

5 MR. KOTCHE: That's our hope too.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: You don't want to
7 commit to one thing or too much or too little
8 based on whoever the tenant is.

9 MR. KOTCHE: What we have committed to and
10 what was on the plan originally and is on this
11 current plan is the delineation of that outdoor
12 dining area. Then the rest of the landscaping
13 will happen later on.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: You're showing two tenants
15 here at the end of the building; right? Are you
16 showing two tenants? I thought I saw some
17 demising walls.

18 MR. KOTCHE: The demising walls are just
19 where columns sit. We don't have any set up for
20 how many tenants we have in Building 2 at all.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: Right now you're going to
22 have a corridor that's leading to the trash
23 enclosure in the back on that side, right, so
24 potentially --

1 MR. KOTCHE: Everybody is going to have to
2 have access.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: -- you're going to have to
4 have that, and half that piazza could be or the
5 plaza could be a corridor going to a trash
6 location.

7 MR. KOTCHE: No. It's going to be up
8 against the parking deck. It's not going to be
9 on -- no trash enclosures on the piazza/plaza
10 area.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a couple more
12 questions or comments related to the Riverwalk.

13 Understanding we have a private property
14 owner that abuts Main Street and it's a really
15 small parcel, has there been any consideration
16 given to moving their parcel or having a
17 discussion with them about moving their parcel
18 back, and whether they want to trade or they want
19 more land, but moving them back off of Main Street
20 and turning the east plaza into more of a corridor
21 and actually putting our east plaza on Main
22 Street.

23 So I think one of the things that happens
24 with any building even if it's just a simple

1 one-story building is when it's butting up to
2 where Main Street is now or where the parcel is
3 right now, you lose the view of the river as you
4 drive on Main Street and you come to that traffic
5 light. And so that's like a missed opportunity to
6 have the City's presence on the Fox River, open up
7 at that point.

8 When you're driving to the west, you don't
9 see the plaza that's behind Main Street and part
10 of the First Street property, if, in fact, you
11 allow that building to sit where they're talking
12 about or you give them some more land.

13 So by moving them, their whole piece back,
14 that would open up the view to the First Street
15 plaza and put an open space there on the corner
16 across from the Baker Hotel. I think that would
17 be a much better way to see the city and see what
18 those options are as you come up to Main Street
19 and the river, both from the east and west
20 direction.

21 It just seems like, otherwise, you have a
22 plaza -- that you come from the west plaza, and
23 you head to the east plaza, and your view is you
24 look at nothing. You look across and you see -- I

1 mean not nothing, but there's not as much interest
2 there versus if you -- from the plaza, you turn
3 and went up to Main Street, you would be looking
4 at the actual City Hall, which I think if you came
5 out of the west plaza and you walked up to that,
6 that doesn't mean you still can't have a
7 connection, but if there was a big plaza on the
8 corner, you would actually view City Hall.

9 I think it's terminus to a view and gives
10 it the architectural importance in a small
11 community of City Hall. That seems like a better
12 relationship. Realizing it introduces a
13 negotiation with a property owner, private
14 property owner. But if we're talking about trying
15 to make the plaza bigger so we can do things, I
16 think there's some things to work on maybe if
17 there's more interest in that, so just as a
18 thought on any of that.

19 The question on the Riverwalk itself is in
20 the plan that you had shown, there was kind of an
21 earlier streetscape that was approved that
22 surrounded Buildings 1, 2, and 3. And the
23 property and material identified for all of the
24 Riverwalk and the streetscape on Illinois

1 associated with Building No. 2 was brick pavers
2 and some other introduced materials and almost no
3 concrete. Why the change?

4 MR. COLBY: That direction actually came
5 from the City Council during the review of the
6 Building 1 and 2 streetscape plan. That plan did
7 originally have all paver brick to match what's on
8 the other side of First Street. There's an
9 interest from the City Council in having a walking
10 surface, a main walking surface that was not paver
11 brick.

12 MS. TUNGARE: And the main basis for that
13 was for maintenance purposes. The City has had
14 issues related to maintenance that it had with
15 pavers, and concrete is a better surface for
16 walking and maintenance.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm not sure I agree
18 with that but okay.

19 There were no pictures or anything
20 relating to what this railing might look like.
21 Since we have a lot of railing that runs starting
22 at Illinois in theory all the way to almost Main
23 Street, other than making sure that it meets
24 safety standards of the 4-inch sphere and all

1 those kinds of things, is that going to be
2 forthcoming?

3 MR. COLBY: Yes. So this is just a
4 conceptual layout. There is going to be an actual
5 engineered plan for this and landscape plan.

6 We have looked at options for that
7 railing. It will likely be something that is
8 designed to match some of the existing railings
9 that the City has. There's green ones. There's
10 vertical posts. Some of them have decorative
11 chevron detail. It may be something like that.
12 That still needs to be determined.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: As far as the actual
14 Riverwalk itself from Illinois going north, it
15 seems like -- from the building entrance facing
16 the Fox River heading south to Illinois, it seems
17 like that area doesn't really require access from
18 a building standpoint, the main entry -- other
19 than the main entry.

20 MR. COLBY: This area?

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: No. Along the river,
22 starting at the southeast corner of the building.

23 MR. COLBY: Yes.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: So there is really

1 no -- and this just seems like a missed
2 opportunity to have more planting against the
3 building facade that doesn't need to address
4 windows and, you know, access points and things
5 like that. There's just a few windows, and the
6 projection for the window is starting out quite a
7 ways. It's down on the first floor.

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. One reason that we
9 proposed the planter originally in this location
10 was that there was a concern because this portion
11 is some of the shelf that overhangs the river
12 wall. There's a concern that you might not be
13 able to maintain the grade across this walkway
14 based on the height of that shelf because it's
15 fixed the way it was constructed.

16 I think we have determined that you can
17 maintain those grades. So it would be possible to
18 shift this closer to the building and have a
19 larger planter at the corner where you're
20 describing it. I think you'd end up with more
21 planter area and probably still an adequate
22 walkway. That's something that could be explored.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: You could start with
24 the current planter as shown now and wrap that

1 corner and head north up towards the main entry,
2 and really the Riverwalk paved area would be from
3 the railing coming towards the building, and you
4 almost don't need that little planting bed with
5 that little tree there. Again, assuming that the
6 technical issues related to grade and cross slopes
7 for ADA accessibility, you know those things can
8 be met. Obviously, those are important comments
9 also.

10 MR. COLBY: Yes. I do think it's
11 feasible. That's something we'll look at.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: I mean, there's already
13 limited areas for planting because of these
14 things. We need just kind of a consolidation to
15 trade those off. To do that would seem
16 reasonable.

17 Is it the intent of the beds -- however
18 many we end up with, are they going to need to be
19 irrigated?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. And I would just
22 say there, given that it's all stone fill, I would
23 recommend that we have them irrigated and
24 underground because of the compaction that you

1 usually get to the bed and a minimum of 2 feet of
2 extensive roof mix use. Because otherwise, if
3 you're going to put in 6 to 8 inches a foot,
4 that's kind of a waste of time. Plantings don't
5 survive well in those conditions.

6 So I understand we're still working
7 conceptually; but as we work towards the details,
8 I think that that would be worthwhile. And
9 particularly -- obviously, if the beds are raised
10 up because of that bench, at least it sits up on a
11 curb --

12 MR. COLBY: Yes.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- if you're using the
14 same kind of detail or approach that they used in
15 the west plaza, but really the planting bed starts
16 at the top of the curb, you know, down from there.
17 So it may not be as a deep as you like.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thanks.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, Russ, I've
21 got to tell you I think it's a beautiful
22 streetscape, very attractive. I don't dislike it
23 at all. I understand the agreement is that it has
24 to be built when this building is built and that's

1 part of the agreement.

2 All I would say is that I see that on this
3 drawing, not this drawing but the previous one,
4 there's some plans for the north section of this
5 perimeter streetscape to the east of, you know,
6 the restaurants, you know, the outdoor dining.
7 So, you know, I guess all I could hope and expect
8 is that the continuation will be similar, and
9 we'll have a chance to tie it together.

10 If you're asking my opinion on what I
11 think the streetscape looks like, I think it looks
12 fine. I'm not sure what it does, but I think it
13 looks fine.

14 MR. COLBY: Yes. And I would say this is
15 more of a utilitarian section compared to the
16 balance of the Riverwalk. So we would expect to
17 have much more usable spaces along the rest of the
18 Riverwalk, and so that can be a more detailed
19 design than what we're looking at here. This is
20 really just what's necessary for access to
21 Building 3.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I guess I would
23 just like to say it's difficult to look at this in
24 segments, which we are, which is what we're doing.

1 And if we are indeed looking at a Riverwalk, it
2 wouldn't -- even though it would be a huge
3 liability to the City, I'm just going to say that
4 it would be nice if the Riverwalk could continue
5 south to the new restaurant that's going in that's
6 on the river through to all the beautiful scape
7 that we have going south at least to Mount
8 St. Mary's. It would just be nice to have a true
9 Riverwalk, and, you know, continue with that.

10 I mean, if we could only go as far north
11 as Main Street, and it's hard to cross there, and
12 then once you hit Hotel Baker, it's done and
13 then -- so it would be nice to have that
14 continuation.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, I have a
16 question. Did the City install the brick paver
17 paths going south from Illinois, or was that by a
18 different organization?

19 MR. COLBY: No. The City did install
20 those.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. It just seems
22 very odd that we have blocks of brick pavers going
23 south, and then where you could find the most
24 intense activity likely, okay, which would be at

1 this location with three buildings and all the
2 office and retail and residential, that we're
3 switching from a high-end material to a
4 utilitarian material solely based on maintenance.
5 That makes no sense to me at all.

6 MR. COLBY: Yes. And we can pass that
7 comment along. I think there are some differences
8 in this area in that it's going to be relatively
9 flat because, essentially, it's been engineered so
10 that the first-floor entry into the building to
11 the river wall is flat. So there's opportunities.

12 There were concerns I think related to the
13 pavers more with areas that were sloped. This may
14 present an opportunity, if there's an interest in
15 doing so. But the City has used pavers in the
16 past.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you.

18 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Russ, Laura pointed out
19 the continuation south. Is there anything that
20 you know of going off the bridge? Is there any
21 traffic management options that can be
22 implemented, even though we're talking, what's
23 that, 100 yards or so, not even to the light, that
24 we could put there to allow maybe to mitigate the

1 liability on our part?

2 MR. COLBY: There's probably something
3 that could be done. I think the issue is it's in
4 pretty close proximity to two intersections --

5 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Right.

6 MR. COLBY: -- in both directions.

7 MR. BONG: Hello. I would just add that
8 one of the -- a couple of the concerns that the
9 City has with that crossing is that you have the
10 Illinois bridge which has a bit of a crest over
11 it, and so traffic is really moving along when
12 it's going over that bridge, and then it may be a
13 bit of an unexpected mid-block crossing right
14 there.

15 So that's the main concern with it being a
16 mid-block crossing. That's kind of a no-no and
17 pedestrian -- when you're managing pedestrian
18 crossings, it's always advisable to -- I know that
19 people will just do it, but you don't want to
20 encourage people to cross there and get maybe a
21 false sense of security. If they see that, Oh,
22 there's a crosswalk here, I can just go and people
23 will stop for me when they may not. So it's
24 always encouraged to go down to the nearest

1 signal.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: I think there might be, as
3 he mentioned, alternatives, and wouldn't an
4 alternative be if somebody could cross like at
5 school crossings, and the light changes for, you
6 know, four seconds to allow somebody to get
7 across? Something that's sequenced with the other
8 lights, you know, so that they have to wait, but
9 at least they get a safe passage across.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It could be done.

11 MR. BONG: Yeah. I mean, I think you
12 would have to have -- the only thing I can think
13 of is some kind of -- you'll see these in school
14 areas where there's flashing lights.

15 MEMBER PIETRYLA: In Geneva they have
16 those lights to prepare to stop.

17 MR. BONG: We'd have to look to see if
18 that would be feasible here on a street such as
19 this.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, on Route 64 in
21 Sycamore, they have that right in front of the
22 courthouse, where it's four lanes. I was just
23 thinking they did it on Green Street down in
24 Champaign, where, I mean, huge heavy traffic and a

1 lot of pedestrians, and they did a lot of calming
2 measures there to allow a pedestrian crossing
3 where there was no stoplight.

4 MEMBER PIETRYLA: You have a lot of
5 college kids crossing.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, you did. But
7 they did some interesting things where they didn't
8 decrease the size of the road. I would have to
9 think about exactly what they did, but yeah, I
10 think there is.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think for pedestrians
12 when you're heading -- well, either direction but
13 definitely when you're heading north when you get
14 to that point, if you have to turn left to go to
15 Second street, just where the building is adjacent
16 to the sidewalk and the back of the curb, it is a
17 tremendous ending point.

18 You know, it's physically, what, about 4
19 feet wide or something like that. I mean, it's
20 just uncomfortable anyways, and I think that
21 drives a lot of people not to bother and maybe
22 like Laura where they just basically wait and kind
23 of take their view and then skip across.

24 Certainly, if we could use something to

1 encourage them to do that in a safer way and, of
2 course, traffic, understanding that those aren't
3 the ideals.

4 MR. BONG: Right.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: You know, but if we can
6 increase a lot of people to the downtown, which is
7 what the goal of all of this is, you're going to
8 get more people doing what Laura is doing, and it
9 isn't going to help anything.

10 And then you treat this light the way IDOT
11 does. You wait until somebody dies or there's a
12 serious accident and then we do something to
13 address that. It would just seem to, you know,
14 with a little more push, that something could be
15 done that would address all of these pedestrian
16 issues. If we're trying to encourage people to
17 use all of this, I think that's a good step in the
18 right direction, but understanding there's a lot
19 of issues.

20 MR. BONG: Yeah. There are a lot of
21 issues, and we can take a look at it, but yeah.
22 The main concern, the rule of thumb would be with
23 mid-block crossings, you don't want to create a
24 false sense of security. That is the key.

Transcript of Conceptual Streetscape
Conducted on October 17, 2017

55

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I do have
2 an urgent announcement. The score is 1 to 1 in
3 the bottom of the second.

4 All right. So any other comments?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
7 additional business? Thank you, Russ.

8 MR. COLBY: Thank you.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you, Russ.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The weekly development
11 report, meeting announcements. Anything further
12 from staff? No.

13 Okay. Is there a motion to adjourn?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Second.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?

18 (Ayes heard.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 8:39 p.m.

22 (Off the record at 8:39 p.m.)

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of October, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois