

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2021**

Members Present: Chair Peter Vargulich
Colleen Wiese
Suzanne Melton
Zachary Ewoldt
Jeffrey Funke
Jennifer Becker

Members Absent: Vice Chair Laura Macklin-Purdy
Laurel Moad
Karen Hibel

Also Present: Russell Colby, Acting Director of Community & Econ. Dev.
Ellen Johnson, City Planner
Rachel Hitzemann, City Planner
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

Chairman Vargulich called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the October 5, 2021 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Ms. Wiese, seconded by Ms. Melton and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2021 Plan Commission meeting.

5. Pheasant Run Industrial Park (GSI Family Investments of Arizona, LLC)

- Application for Zoning Map Amendment
- Application for Preliminary Plat of Subdivision
 - a. Public Hearing

Motion was made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Mr. Funke to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Wiese, Funke, Melton, Ewoldt, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent: Macklin-Purdy, Moad, Hibel

Motion carried 6-0

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 19, 2021
Page 2

b. Discussion & Recommendation

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

Motion was made by Mr. Funke and seconded by Ms. Melton to recommend approval of Applications for Zoning Map Amendment and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for Pheasant Run Industrial Park (GSI Family Investments of Arizona, LLC) subject to resolution of staff comments.

Motion was made by Chairman Vargulich and seconded by Mr. Funke to amend the motion to add a condition that the plans be revised to incorporate the Plan Commission comments regarding landscaping, specifically adding trees around detention ponds and along internal driveways where possible.

Roll call vote (on Motion to Amend):

Ayes: Wiese, Funke, Melton, Ewoldt, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent: Macklin-Purdy, Moad, Hibel

Motion carried 6-0

Roll call vote (on Original Motion, as amended):

Ayes: Wiese, Funke, Melton, Ewoldt, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent: Macklin-Purdy, Moad, Hibel

Motion carried 6-0

6. First Street Redevelopment PUD – Sterling Bank, 10 Illinois St. (Sterling Bank)
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 Ms. Wiese and seconded by Mr. Funke to recommend approval of an Application for PUD Preliminary Plan for First Street Redevelopment PUD, Sterling Bank, 10 Illinois Street.

Motion was made by Chairman Vargulich and seconded by Ms. Melton to amend the motion to add a condition that the recommendation for approval is subject to resolution of outstanding staff comments.

Roll call vote (on Motion to Amend):

Ayes: Weise, Funke, Melton, Ewoldt, Becker, Vargulich

Nays:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 19, 2021
Page 3

Absent: Macklin-Purdy, Moad, Hibel
Motion carried 6-0

Roll call vote (on Original Motion, as amended):
Ayes: Wiese, Funke, Melton, Ewoldt, Becker, Vargulich
Nays:
Absent: Macklin-Purdy, Moad, Hibel
Motion carried 6-0

- 7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None**
- 8. Weekly Development Report**
- 9. Meeting Announcements**
 - a. Plan Commission
 - Tuesday, November 2, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Tuesday, November 16, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Tuesday, December 7, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - b. Planning & Development Committee
 - Monday, November 8, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Monday, December 13, 2021 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- 10. Public Comment – None**
- 11. Adjournment at 8:45 p.m.**



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

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park

Date: October 19, 2021

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

- - - - - x

In Re: Application :
for Zoning Map :
Amendment and :
Application for :
Preliminary Plat of :
Subdivision for :
Pheasant Run :
Industrial Park. :

- - - - - x

HEARING

St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, October 19, 2021
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 336738
Pages: 1 - 70
Reported By: Courtney Petros, RPR, CSR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3

4 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

5 2 East Main Street

6 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

7 630.377.4400

8

9

10

11

12 Before Courtney Petros, a Certified Shorthand
13 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a
14 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

1 PRESENT:

2 PETER VARGULICH, Chair

3 ZACHARY EWOLDT, Member

4 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

5 COLLEEN WIESE, Member

6 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

7 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

8

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSS COLBY, Community Development Manager

11 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

12 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

13 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Good evening. I'd
3 like to start the Plan Commission. Roll call.
4 Colleen Wiese.

5 MEMBER WIESE: Here.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Macklin-Purdy.
7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sue Melton.

11 MEMBER MELTON: Here.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zachary Ewoldt.

13 MEMBER EWOLDT: Here.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

15 MEMBER BECKER: Here.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laura Moad.

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel.

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Please join me in the
21 Pledge of Allegiance.

22 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Next is
24 our presentation from the October 5th Plan

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

5

1 Commission meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

2 MEMBER WIESE: So moved.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: A second?

4 MEMBER MELTON: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Those in favor.

6 (Ayes heard.)

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion passed. This
10 is Item 5. Pheasant Run Industrial Park has been
11 submitted by GSI Family Investments of Arizona,
12 LLC. This is an application for a zoning map
13 amendment and preliminary plat of subdivision.

14 This is a public hearing and the role of
15 the Plan Commission is to conduct public hearings
16 on zoning applications that are filed with the
17 City. All testimony and evidence both for and
18 against this application shall be given under
19 oath.

20 Regarding our procedures, first, the
21 applicant will make a presentation. Then we'll
22 take questions from the Commission followed by
23 questions from the public. After that, we will
24 take any comments from anybody else wishing to

1 give testimony.

2 The Plan Commission will discuss all the
3 evidence gathered relative to the findings of fact
4 for a zoning map amendment. There are ten
5 findings of fact for this application. Not all
6 the findings need to be made in the affirmative to
7 recommend approval, and the Plan Commission
8 recommendation shall be based on the preponderance
9 of the evidence.

10 When the Plan Commission feels it has
11 gathered enough evidence to make a recommendation
12 to the Planning and Development Committee of the
13 City Council, we will close the public hearing and
14 then go on to a recommendation for both the map
15 amendment and the preliminary plat of subdivision.
16 The applications will then go on to the Planning
17 and Development Committee.

18 Before we begin, whoever wishes to give
19 testimony, ask questions, or provide comments will
20 please be sworn in. So if you can all just rise.

21 (Multiple witnesses sworn by the
22 Chairman.)

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So when
24 you are speaking, please come up to the lectern,

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

7

1 state your name and spell your last name and state
2 your address for the record. We have a court
3 reporter who will need to get all this put
4 together. Is our applicant ready?

5 MR. POSSIN: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Start.

7 MR. POSSIN: Good evening, Plan
8 Commissioners. My name is Jeff Possin. I am with
9 Greco/deRosa Investment Group, also the applicant,
10 GSI Family Investments of Arizona, LLC. Address
11 is 1307 Schiferl Road, Bartlett, Illinois.

12 Russ, how do we go back? Great start.

13 Thank you.

14 Good evening, again. I'd just like to
15 introduce our team for this development. We have
16 Brett Duffy from SPACECO here, Grant Brandenburg
17 from Ware Malcomb, Randy Metz from Metz & Company,
18 Javier Millan from KLOA, and Kate McCracken from
19 HMMC, P.C.

20 So I'd like to start with kind of
21 highlighting the differences on the site plan that
22 we submitted from our concept plan. And the good
23 news is there weren't many changes. The major
24 change that we had on the site plan was we

1 flip-flopped the buildings per the recommendations
2 that we got from the Plan Commission and the
3 Planning and Development Committee.

4 Building A, as you see here, was to the
5 west where Buildings D and C were. And one of the
6 recommendations was that building might be -- the
7 masthead of that building might be too big to have
8 it on Kautz Road, so we moved it to the east. And
9 then we moved Buildings D and C to the west.

10 Other highlights from the site plan, we're
11 proposing 1.1 million, plus or minus, square feet,
12 which is very similar to the concept plan. We
13 have roughly 235 docks proposed, 1,064 parking
14 positions, and 150 trailer stalls.

15 The other thing -- the other difference
16 that we had from our initial concept plan is we
17 had the bulk of the detention along Tower Road and
18 also on the eastern border of Building A. And now
19 we have -- another one of comments was maybe we
20 should spread out the detention, which we have,
21 and we have detention across the site.

22 The detention will be dry bottom ponds
23 with native plantings, as we talked about last
24 time. One of the restrictions we had with the

1 DAA, they wanted to limit wildlife and dry bottom
2 ponds, hopefully, will help us do that.

3 As far as traffic goes, this site is
4 blessed with many ingress and egress points. We
5 have -- starting from the east, we have auto and
6 truck access on Keil entering this -- entering the
7 site. We will have auto and truck access on North
8 Avenue and Pheasant Run Drive. And we will have
9 full access for auto and trucks on the northern
10 intersection of Kautz. The southern intersection
11 we have at Kautz near Illinois will be for autos
12 only. And then, internally, we have roads to get
13 to Buildings A, B, C, and D as well.

14 And then another highlight of the plan
15 that's really hard to see here is just north of
16 the detention basin on Tower Road, there's a
17 five-foot pedestrian sidewalk that runs the whole
18 length of that detention basin and then goes north
19 on Kautz to the property line.

20 So that kind of highlights the site plan.
21 Our plat is shown here. And as in the staff
22 report, you'll see that we have a -- we're
23 proposing a four-lot subdivision. And you can
24 kind of see where Buildings C and D will have car

1 lots 1 and 2, Building B is lot 3, and Building A
2 is lot 4.

3 We also submitted some concept elevations.
4 We have two prototypes. This one right here is
5 Building A. Building A, we're proposing at 40
6 feet. And with 40 feet, you can see we're having
7 a -- the potential for a two-story office. And
8 that's the main difference between Building A and
9 the other three buildings.

10 The buildings will have precast panels
11 with reveals, clerestory windows, some spandrel
12 glass, and the elevation here. These are some of
13 things that we're proposing for Building A. And
14 then Buildings B, C, and D are going to be
15 shorter, 32 feet to 36 feet. And the main
16 difference here is we don't really have a
17 second-story option. I don't think we'll need
18 that for this -- for this type of building.

19 Some other things that we submitted to
20 staff was our signage program. And we'll work
21 with staff. There were some comments about how
22 many signs we can have per lot, and we will comply
23 with that with the M-2 Zoning, but we have three
24 types of signage. We have our proposed park

1 monument signage that will basically just have the
2 Pheasant Run Industrial Park. And we have two
3 locations for that, one on Kautz and one at
4 Pheasant Run at our northern property line border.
5 Then we have our tenant monument signs. Then,
6 lastly, our directional monument signs.

7 And with that, I'd like to open it up to
8 any questions regarding our submittal. Like I
9 said, we have our design team here to answer any
10 specific questions you might have.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Anybody?

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah. Hi. I just got a
13 couple questions. I actually like the new layout.
14 I like what you did with, you know, the scale of
15 the buildings, Buildings B and C being at a lower
16 scale and then increasing as they go further east,
17 which is kind of nice from the planning
18 standpoint.

19 I like what you did with the detention
20 ponds, splitting those up and kind of, you know,
21 giving each building their own landscape element
22 and detention area. It's -- and they're -- it's
23 really like a courtyard, I see. See all the
24 trucks are on the interior of the building, so

1 you're not going to be seeing the trucks, which is
2 nice. And having the cars on the exterior on the
3 visual side of, you know, the streets and, you
4 know, from the south and the north.

5 My question is truck traffic. How do the
6 trucks enter and leave the property for each
7 building?

8 MR. POSSIN: Okay. So Buildings A and B,
9 the primary access points would be 64 and Keil
10 Road. And then we have two roads on additional
11 parcel 3 that we noted -- we're in talks with the
12 DAA and submitted a letter from the DAA that will
13 buy the acreage we need to put -- to build the
14 roads. That also will be the easement we need to
15 Keil Road. They will allow that.

16 So we have auto and truck access on Keil
17 and 64 to get to Building A. And it can also go
18 to Building B with that access point. Then we
19 also have our access point at Pheasant Run Drive
20 and 64, autos and trucks, primarily for Buildings
21 A and B. And then we have our access points for
22 Buildings D and C mainly off of Kautz.

23 And if you have any specific traffic
24 questions, we have our traffic engineer here as

1 well, and he can answer them for you.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. I guess the question
3 was, you know, just thinking from mixing trucks
4 and cars and, you know, how -- how does that
5 circulate around this site. And I can see on the
6 east side at Building A, where, you know --
7 correct me if I'm wrong. Are the trucks and the
8 cars using the same road to get in, access to the
9 property?

10 MR. POSSIN: Yeah. So we envision,
11 ultimately, inbound trucks would come in on the
12 northern access off Keil and outbound trucks would
13 leave from the southern access point. And the
14 inbound -- the northern access point for
15 Building A will be autos and cars and most likely
16 just trucks on the southern access point.

17 The DAA is not going to allow any truck
18 traffic to make a right turn onto the southern
19 access point on Tower. That's for emergency
20 access only. So that's how the primary access
21 would go for Building A.

22 And then you'll see there's also -- and,
23 again, it's hard to see on this exhibit here. But
24 there is an internal roadway that connects to

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

14

1 Pheasant Run Drive that will then -- you can then
2 take Pheasant Run Drive south to Building B.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Oh, so, Building B, the
4 trucks would be utilizing that 30-foot wide
5 street; is that correct?

6 MR. POSSIN: Yes.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay. So you would be
8 mixing cars and trucks, then, right, for those
9 buildings there?

10 MR. POSSIN: Yes.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

12 MEMBER BECKER: So follow-up question to
13 this line of discussion. When the truck traffic
14 is queueing up on Pheasant Run Drive, will there
15 be any mechanism for the auto dealers to the east
16 to have uninterrupted access to turn out, or will
17 the traffic have to wait for truck traffic to
18 clear before they turn on Pheasant Run to exit
19 onto North Avenue? Will it be stop controlled or
20 anything?

21 MR. POSSIN: Well, that is signaled right
22 there. Kautz is signaled, and so is Pheasant Run
23 Drive. So we'll have the signal there that will
24 have stop signs at all the other extensions.

1 So to answer your question -- I mean, and
2 I can get Javier up here, he has the counts -- but
3 we don't think that that will -- the truck traffic
4 won't -- there won't be enough truck traffic to --
5 it should be able -- it's adequate -- current
6 ingress and egress intersections is adequate to
7 handle the truck traffic for this development. We
8 don't think that will be a problem.

9 MEMBER BECKER: So, question for staff on
10 that line. Have there been discussions with the
11 -- we reviewed the auto dealers earlier this year.
12 Is there discussions or there are -- will there be
13 access easements or something that would allow for
14 the comingling of those different types of traffic
15 that will give adequate access, east and west,
16 south of the signalized intersection at Pheasant
17 Run?

18 MR. COLBY: So I'm not aware if there's
19 been discussions on this topic with the McGrath
20 dealership that's under construction. But I know
21 they are aware of this project and are aware of
22 the shared access easement that runs along the
23 edge of their property to the benefit of this
24 industrial park proposal. So they're aware of the

1 land use.

2 And the specific question about whether
3 there will be any stop control or intersection
4 control at that access point into the McGrath
5 property is something that we have not explored.
6 And I'm not sure if the applicant can comment or
7 their traffic engineer.

8 MR. POSSIN: Javier, do you have anything
9 to add?

10 MR. MILLAN: Good evening. My name is
11 Javier Millan. I'm a principal with KLOA.

12 Regarding the internal intersection,
13 that's something that we looked at. We have not
14 looked at (indiscernible) --

15 THE REPORTER: Can you speak into the
16 microphone?

17 MR. MILLAN: Sorry. (Continuing) whether
18 it's one-way stop controlled or two-way stop
19 controlled, something worth taking a look at.

20 With regards to the access garage for
21 Pheasant Run Drive onto North Avenue, the Pheasant
22 Run Drive will actually be -- the left turn lane
23 and the right turn lanes will be extended, so
24 they're going to be much longer to accommodate

1 that additional traffic.

2 And the analyses have shown that it
3 clears. While I will acknowledge it takes a long
4 time because the signal is a long cycle to get a
5 green for North Avenue, traffic will be able to
6 clear and it will be able to be accommodated,
7 given that grouping that I mentioned of extending
8 that as part of the auto dealership.

9 MEMBER BECKER: I understand. And I was
10 thinking of long trucks queueing up on the
11 southbound -- well, the northbound leg to wait for
12 the signal.

13 If people are turning in from 64 and they
14 have to wait to get in, say, to the auto dealers
15 or whatever ultimate land uses are on the other
16 side, if they can't traverse that because the
17 queueing of the semis are so big, that's just
18 something I would think that we should consider.

19 MR. MILLAN: The analyses have shown that
20 the queues will not extend up to that internal
21 intersection. Like I said, those turn lanes will
22 be extended to accommodate that additional
23 traffic.

24 MEMBER BECKER: Understood. Thank you.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

18

1 MEMBER WIESE: Hi. I wanted to follow up
2 just to clarify something that you said. Did you
3 say you were in negotiations to potentially have
4 an access on that parcel 3?

5 MR. POSSIN: The additional parcel 3, yes.
6 We submitted to staff a letter from the DAA. That
7 piece is in West Chicago. It's not in
8 St. Charles. And we are in the process of buying
9 the acreage needed for the detention and the
10 roadways connecting to Keil Road.

11 MEMBER WIESE: Because I'm looking at the
12 letter, and I'm just trying to make sure if I'm
13 understanding this correctly, that it says you are
14 in negotiations but that access will not be
15 allowed to Keil or to Kautz Road through that
16 property.

17 MR. POSSIN: The southern access point --

18 MEMBER WIESE: I'm sorry?

19 MR. POSSIN: -- the southern access point
20 that goes to Keil road, the DAA will not allow
21 traffic to make a right turn.

22 MEMBER WIESE: Got it.

23 MR. POSSIN: So it will be left only and
24 then the northern access point will be a full

1 intersection. We don't have a roadway for that
2 yet, but we'll call that Pheasant Run without ID
3 and Keil Road.

4 MEMBER WIESE: Okay. Thank you for
5 clarifying.

6 MEMBER MELTON: Are you only purchasing
7 that parcel for the detention pond on that
8 roadway, or do you have other plans?

9 MR. POSSIN: We're only buying the roadway
10 for the detention pond. That's correct.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So your current
12 detention ponds don't meet the requirements? You
13 need that?

14 MR. POSSIN: Yes, we do. And if we have
15 specific detention questions, I can have Brett
16 Duffy from SPACECO answer them.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. It was just a
18 generalized volume issue. Because you're showing
19 a lot of detention areas in the property. But it
20 sounds like you need more than what you currently
21 are showing.

22 MR. POSSIN: Well, the detention shown on
23 additional parcel 3 is a detention solely for the
24 proposed roadways.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

20

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: For the two
2 roadways --

3 MR. POSSIN: Just for the two roadways.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- that cross that
5 parcel?

6 MR. POSSIN: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I got it. So you
8 don't need any part of parcel 3 unless -- unless
9 you get those agreements to have the roadways
10 cross?

11 MR. POSSIN: That's correct.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Got it.

13 MEMBER MELTON: Is the plan for that
14 really long detention pond in front of C and B,
15 that's one single detention pond, and I guess my
16 question is -- I think staff might have had a
17 comment as well -- is who would maintain and be
18 the owner of that?

19 MR. POSSIN: So the detention ponds is
20 going to be the association, and we submitted some
21 covenants and CCRs. And all the detention ponds
22 will be common area and will be maintained by the
23 association.

24 MEMBER MELTON: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other thoughts,
2 questions?

3 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yeah. Around landscape, I
4 have a question. You know, I saw on your report
5 that you have a GIS map of all the existing trees
6 on the site. Are you planning to save or
7 repurpose a lot of those trees in any ways? I'm
8 just curious where, you know, feasible, are they
9 removed and reused around buildings or how is that
10 going to work? I see you've put a large amount of
11 time to inventory all the trees.

12 MR. POSSIN: Yes. Well, we submitted an
13 exhibit. Russ might be able to help me pull it
14 up. But the only trees that we can save and
15 repurpose are the ones on Tower Road that are just
16 south of the detention.

17 And that exhibit shows, basically, the
18 trees that are in that area all the way from Kautz
19 to Pheasant Run Drive, those are trees that can be
20 saved. There are some dead trees in there that
21 will have to be removed. But that area, we're
22 going to try to save as many of the trees as we
23 can. All the other trees on site will have to be
24 cleared.

1 MEMBER EWOLDT: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So is that true also
3 for the trees on the south side of Basin E1, which
4 is south of Building A?

5 MR. POSSIN: South of Building A, yes.
6 Because of grading plan, the majority of those
7 trees will not make it and will have to be cut
8 down.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. It was just a
10 little confusing on the exhibit from ENCAP with
11 respect to that. Because they kind of -- you kind
12 of just show it all the way across the entire
13 south property line the trees would be preserved,
14 but the grading doesn't seem to reflect that for
15 Basin E. It seems like you're grading all the way
16 up to the property line to accomplish the
17 detention.

18 MR. POSSIN: Yeah. I don't have the
19 basins labeled on here. But, again, the area
20 where we can save trees would be from Kautz to
21 Pheasant Run Drive just south of the detention
22 basin. That area is where we can save the trees,
23 and all the other trees on site have to be
24 cleared.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Overall, I like the
2 plan. I noticed that you had -- you're using
3 permeable pavers for all of your auto parking
4 areas. That's what it looked like on the
5 engineering plan. Is -- I mean, it seems like
6 it's typically assumed to be a more costly
7 solution. Was there any particular reason why, or
8 is that part of the stormwater management system?

9 MR. POSSIN: Yes. That's part of our
10 overall stormwater management system and
11 requirements. So we need those pavers in order to
12 meet the Kane County standards. And if you have
13 any more specific questions, Brett Duffy from
14 SPACECO could answer that.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That was just more of
16 a curiosity. I like it. I applaud it.

17 MR. POSSIN: It's going to look great.
18 But, yes, we need it as part of our overall
19 detention requirements.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Kind of assumed so.

21 When you were here last, you kind of
22 commented about the amount of parking and parking
23 ratios. Statistically, it seems like, based on
24 the staff report, you're still not quite there and

1 there's some issues or topics related to land
2 banking and that kind of thing.

3 Is there any particular reason -- and
4 maybe staff can help with this answer also -- that
5 you're not trying to lower that? I mean, I think
6 of numerous projects throughout the Chicagoland
7 suburban areas over the last three to five years
8 that don't have that parking requirement of one
9 per thousand square feet. It's lower, closer to
10 .6 or .7. Is there any reason you're not doing
11 that? Certainly, that could help with your
12 stormwater.

13 MR. POSSIN: Of course. Well, one of the
14 things -- and maybe Russ can comment on this as
15 well -- but we have to comply with the M-2 Zoning,
16 and the M-2 Zoning requires one per one thousand
17 square feet.

18 And so we wanted to show -- in Building A,
19 yes, we realize that that is short. And on our
20 next submittal, we will correct that in various
21 ways. We can make the building a little smaller
22 and we can add areas where we could add more
23 parking. We could take away some of the trailer
24 positions. We will comply.

1 But you -- we wanted you to see that we
2 will meet the requirements. And then when it
3 comes time to actually build one of the buildings,
4 we may land bank -- we can bank up to 25 percent
5 of the parking. And if that makes sense at the
6 time, we will do that.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Well, and I
8 guess I understand that. But from a marketing
9 standpoint, do you need all this? Do you need one
10 per thousand or even .75, you know, per thousand?
11 Even if you land bank it and don't build it, don't
12 you have to side your detention for it, because
13 you'd have to assume you'll ultimately have to
14 build it, either triggered by your decision or by
15 the City's request.

16 So is there a reason you wouldn't want to
17 pursue .6 or .7?

18 MR. POSSIN: Well, we would if that was an
19 option. Russ, would that be an option for us to
20 pursue?

21 MR. COLBY: So when this project was
22 presented as a concept plan, there was an option
23 for it to be presented as a planning and
24 development, in which case, the parking ratio

1 could have been set specific to the PUD.

2 Because it's being presented just as a
3 rezoning and a subdivision, it's required to
4 comply with the code requirement of one per
5 thousand. But there is a building request to land
6 banking to reduce it down to .75, but that has to
7 be based on specific information for an individual
8 building and the user in the building.

9 So that process exists under the code, but
10 that's as far as the parking requirement can be
11 reduced under the M-2 code requirements.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Under the M-2. Okay.

13 So I guess we'll still go back to you,
14 then. Why wouldn't you pursue a PUD to reduce the
15 parking required, assuming we all came to an
16 agreement on that? And then, hence, reduce the
17 amount of parking you ever have to build, again,
18 unless you have a tenant that -- you know, that
19 specifically needs a much higher parking count?

20 MR. POSSIN: Well, occasionally, we run
21 into tenants that will require that much -- they
22 may need that much parking. So we're not opposed
23 to building the parking.

24 The other reason -- and we thought it was

1 reasonable with the M-2 Zoning, like Russ just
2 stated, that we could reduce it at the time we
3 submit a building plan to build one of the
4 buildings. But if we know the tenant will not
5 require that much parking, then we would build to
6 the .75 ratio that you just mentioned. We would
7 do that.

8 But for right now, for the zoning and plan
9 amendment, we wanted to show and we needed to meet
10 the zoning standards of one per thousand. And we
11 do think .75 is realistic for us if we need it.
12 And we would build to that standard once we have a
13 tenant.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
15 Okay. I just prefer you not to have to pay more
16 than you need to. I understand you need to meet
17 your market, no doubt, regardless of what parking
18 counts are. I mean, sometimes we have residential
19 parking counts that are less than what the market
20 requires so people build to market and not
21 necessarily to what was asked for. So that was
22 more just inquires along there.

23 So if the -- you commented about a path
24 that kind of goes along the south basin, Basin W1

1 and E1. But it -- when I was looking at the cross
2 sections, it's elevated above a retaining wall.
3 And -- and then there's a green space -- a linear
4 green space next to the driveway. Is it your
5 intent to have trees planted along that driveway
6 that parallels those -- those ponds?

7 There's a green space next to the
8 sidewalk, and then there's a green space, if you
9 will, next to the parking that will allow, let's
10 say, eight or ten feet or something in that rough
11 dimension. So you didn't present a whole lot of
12 answers in what you show in those exhibits, other
13 than it says turf, but I'm just wondering if
14 there's more to that.

15 MR. POSSIN: Brett, would we have room for
16 landscaping in that area?

17 MR. DUFFY: We have to investigate that
18 and see. There may be some shrubs or something.
19 I don't know if we can put any trees in there or
20 not. I am not sure. It might be a little tight.

21 MR. POSSIN: I don't think we had planned
22 for trees in that area. And on the plans we
23 submitted that the landscape plan would be
24 submitted when we build the building. If we don't

1 have enough room, I think the plan is just to go
2 with the turf in those areas.

3 We're going to have -- I mean, there's
4 also grasses and the retaining wall there. I
5 think it will look quite nice. And then you also
6 -- remember, you also have a lot of trees along
7 Tower Road that were saved to look at as well. So
8 I think it will turn out -- it will look quite
9 nice.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I guess it's a --
11 from a pedestrian scale standpoint, when you're
12 walking next to a, I don't know, 24-, 28-foot wide
13 driveway, right, and you have truck traffic
14 potentially coming in off of Kautz or vice versa,
15 using it to exit, which the auto dealers use that
16 too, but there's really no canopy over that walk
17 along there.

18 So while there is a nice view, from a
19 pedestrian experience standpoint, I can't say it's
20 a very positive one from that standpoint. Because
21 you basically have a curb and no -- nothing from a
22 sense of protection or a sense of scale as you
23 walk along there.

24 Now, how many people would use that, I

1 don't know. But you have a lot of parking that
2 presumably is going to be used. And so I guess I
3 would ask that those areas, you know, be looked at
4 from a standpoint of being able to plant trees
5 along there. I mean, not like the City of Chicago
6 with 25 foot on center.

7 But even if you met our -- the spirit of
8 our street ordinance, which is 50 foot on center,
9 or something like that, 50 or 60 feet, I mean, I
10 think that would be nice from a pedestrian
11 experience standpoint. And you make those
12 driveways feel more like roadways, the way they do
13 if you were going out to -- if you're coming in
14 off of the signalized intersection at Pheasant Run
15 and you're coming in on the east side of that
16 street.

17 McGrath Honda is planting trees all the
18 way down north to south to make it feel like a
19 street, even though it's a private road, really.
20 But you're not continuing that, and I guess I have
21 a question as to why you wouldn't do that.

22 MR. POSSIN: Well, one of the main --
23 well, first off, the area you're talking about
24 with the pedestrian area, on future submittals, we

1 will look at that and get together with the design
2 team and our landscape team and see what will
3 work. We will definitely look into that for
4 future submittals.

5 And in response to your question about
6 Pheasant Run Drive going south, we have the
7 easement that was -- we only have so much room
8 that was given to us from the -- from our northern
9 border to 64 to match that. And that's one of the
10 reasons why you don't see that here. But that's
11 another thing. And it's also a private driveway.
12 It's not a public driveway. But that's something
13 else we could explore as well is some trees on
14 Pheasant Run Drive going south to Tower.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I mean, I think that,
16 for better or for worse, if you will, I mean, from
17 my perspective, I think for better. But, you
18 know, McGrath has kind of set the tone that they
19 want that to feel like a public street, if you
20 will, just like you would anywhere in St. Charles
21 when you drive through.

22 And so I would just -- I think it would be
23 nice if that could continue south, you know, all
24 the way down to the basins at the other end. You

1 can make it feel like a street. And then at least
2 parking areas have trees on both sides of that
3 east to west road. That, again, makes it feel
4 like a street.

5 I guess the only technical question beyond
6 space I have is that on the south side of that
7 street next to the retaining wall, you have your
8 gas main running in the area between the sidewalk
9 and the curb. And on the north side of that
10 driveway, you have a water main. Do the utilities
11 allow tree planting over top of those?

12 MR. COLBY: No, not directly over the
13 utility line.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So, no. The answer
15 is no. Okay.

16 MR. POSSIN: That's one of the
17 encumbrances of the site is the gas lines. The
18 gas line you referred to, yes, that is another
19 encumbrance that we have on the site that we have
20 been working with.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Not the existing one.
22 The proposed one. You have a proposed gas main
23 that runs almost the entire length of that
24 east/west roadway south of Buildings B, C, and A.

1 And it's -- and it's shown to be in the turf area
2 between the sidewalk and the curb.

3 MR. Duffy: On the south side -- Brett
4 Duffy with SPACECO. 9575 West Higgins Road in
5 Rosemont.

6 Yeah. There's -- there's about ten feet
7 of green space between the back of the curb and
8 the sidewalk. We have to have a location for the
9 gas tanks, so we put it on the south side,
10 opposite the water main.

11 The gas we could probably put two feet off
12 the back of the curb. We might be able to squeeze
13 some trees in there. We'll take a look at that.
14 We'll have about eight feet left to plant some
15 trees, maybe do something small in there to
16 accommodate some trees. There is some room there.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

18 MR. DUFFY: Also, Pheasant Run Drive will
19 have some room on either side of the street to --
20 to provide some trees going south from McGrath in
21 there.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

23 MR. DUFFY: The area north of McGrath is
24 going to be extremely tight when the full

1 improvements are made. They stopped with just a
2 driveway coming to the south. That's going be
3 widened. What they proposed to do is going to be
4 significantly widened. There's going to be very
5 limited room from the back of the curb to the
6 easement, maybe five feet. So coming south,
7 looking at the property, there will be some trees
8 on each side of the passage.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And my comment was
10 more for the driveway that is on your property,
11 not -- not from there up to North Avenue.

12 MR. DUFFY: Right. So through there, we
13 might be able to throw some trees in there along
14 the road. We'll have to be careful with the gas
15 pipelines. And so -- part of that, though -- it
16 sits right on top of the water easement. You see
17 the water easement there?

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

19 MR. DUFFY: It's pretty wide through
20 there, so we -- we have to work with them. I
21 mean, we've got some plans for them to review
22 right now.

23 So if we can put some trees on their
24 easement, we can work that out with them. There's

1 some other areas to the north where it's outside
2 of the easement, I think we can put some trees in
3 there and make it work.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right. And that
5 would be great. I appreciate that.

6 A question also regarding the -- the
7 walls. Are those going to be quarter walls or
8 precast or --

9 MR. DUFFY: They'll likely be a block
10 retaining wall, a landscape wall. I don't expect
11 them to be concrete.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. That's a lot
13 of lineal feet.

14 MR. DUFFY: Yes, it is.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Understanding that
16 these are, you know, the challenges of building
17 big boxes. You know, a lot of lineal feet of
18 wall.

19 And a little bit of a challenge because
20 you're going to end up with water flowing against
21 the back of the wall with the railing and
22 everything there just because of, you know,
23 likely, the sidewalk will be -- it doesn't look
24 like the sidewalk is going to be higher than the

1 curb. It looks like the sidewalk will be below
2 the curb.

3 MR. DUFFY: There's going to multiple
4 access drains on site. So we're not anticipating
5 a lot of water spilling over that wall. A lot of
6 it's going to the back curb. That curb's back 10
7 feet or so, 10 or 15 feet. So I don't expect it
8 to be (indiscernible) going across.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
10 And then just more out of a curiosity question.
11 Is there any reason that you have the four-inch
12 under drain for all the ponds on one side?

13 MR. DUFFY: That's going to be -- we have
14 to drain -- our BMP -- as part of -- as part of
15 the detention basins, we have to provide best
16 management practices with water control. So in
17 order to drain those ponds, you have to put some
18 other drains in the pond to drain the pond. So we
19 really only need them on one side.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So is the --
21 you're actually going to have a foot of water in
22 the ponds, planted --

23 MR. DUFFY: Depends on the time. If it
24 rains, it will fill up the first foot. The plan

1 is to then -- over a certain period of time,
2 you'll have some evaporation, and you're going to
3 have some of that to drain -- infiltrate into the
4 soil. And what doesn't infiltrate into the soil
5 will evaporate. So that will likely be only
6 standing water in there for 72 hours. But then we
7 plant natives and flowers for the bottom.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I noticed in
9 the -- the landscaping plans that you have that
10 there's emerging plants, you know, plants for the
11 bottoms, and then a series of grasses and native
12 things, you know, rolling up the sides. And the
13 overall character of that, I like a lot. I think
14 that's great. I think the biggest question I have
15 is why no trees around any of the detention ponds?

16 MR. DUFFY: Well, on the north side, you
17 have retaining walls. So we're not going to be
18 able to put any trees on that side. I'm not sure
19 about the south side.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: But there's one, two,
21 three, four, five ponds on the north side.

22 MR. DUFFY: Along the north property? I'd
23 have to defer you.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is there some reason

1 that we wouldn't plant any kind of trees? I mean,
2 I understand it's all native grasses. But native
3 grasses and trees aren't exclusive to each other.

4 MR. POSSIN: Right. And, again, that
5 landscape plan would be submitted once we build
6 lot 2, for example, Building B -- excuse me --
7 lot 3, in my example, would be Building B. When
8 we submit a plan to build Building B, because we
9 have the detention on that lot, we would submit
10 the landscape plan at that time.

11 If we can work with staff now, since we're
12 exploring trees along Pheasant Run Drive and also
13 along the detention basin along Tower, we can look
14 at that now and put some trees around the
15 detention basins, assuming we can look at a future
16 submittal.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Well, I would
18 -- you know, I certainly would want you to look at
19 that. And from a -- if you will, a benchmark, I
20 would ask that -- could you take a measurement of
21 the high waterline of the area and look to plant,
22 let's say, one tree per thousand square feet? And
23 it could be a shade tree or an intermediate tree
24 of an appropriate species that relates to the

1 detention ponds. And if that could be something
2 that could be done, I think that would be great.

3 I had some specific questions about the --
4 the landscape plan, but I also have a question
5 regarding the pond in the far northwest corner.
6 So I think it's Pond W5.

7 MR. POSSIN: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And is there a way to
9 move that pond eastward towards the parking lot?
10 There's a lot of space between high waterline and
11 the back of the curb. And by doing that, then a
12 -- a berm could be built along Kautz Road, similar
13 to what you're doing between the entrances and
14 coming up along there.

15 That piece from the entry -- the main
16 entry to the north, there's no berm there.
17 There's plantings, but no berm. And if it's a
18 matter of just moving the pond to the east -- but
19 there's a water main there. But it seems like
20 there's enough room to move the water main closer
21 to the parking lot without putting it under the
22 parking lot.

23 MR. POSSIN: Okay. I agree with that.

24 MR. DUFFY: We can move that pond to the

1 east a little bit more and open up some space to
2 do some more screening along there over on the
3 side. That berm, it seems like gradient level.
4 The street is higher than the site at that point,
5 so it's got to grade it into the site. So if we
6 can get a berm in there, we might be able to get
7 something, you know, two, three, four feet tall.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. It looked like
9 between the high waterline and the parking lot --

10 MR. DUFFY: There's a lot of room there.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- the spot you're
12 at, it looks like there's a two-foot differential.

13 MR. DUFFY: Yes. That's correct.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So it seems like it
15 would just offset 10 or 12 feet and you'd still be
16 able to make that transition and still have space
17 between the pond -- high waterline of the pond
18 and the Kautz Road right of way.

19 MR. DUFFY: Yeah. That would open up some
20 space along there and we could do some additional
21 landscapes along there for sure. We can do that.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If we can look at
23 doing that, that would be great.

24 I think one of staff's comments was to add

1 a sidewalk along Kautz Road.

2 MR. POSSIN: Yes. There is one there,
3 and they want us to move it further to the west.
4 And we'll do that in future submittals.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So it would be a
6 sidewalk, if you will, within the right of way,
7 then, for Kautz; is that correct?

8 MR. POSSIN: Correct.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So -- and then I'd
10 also request that you do crosswalks across Kautz
11 Road at both of the entrance points, the one that
12 lines up with Illinois and the one that aligns
13 with the Target entry, because there's crosswalks
14 when you get to Kautz and Main Street.

15 Realizing that that's IDOT, there are
16 crosswalks in place, the sidewalks cross, there's
17 depressed curbs and all that stuff. I think it
18 would be nice if people from this project, if you
19 were out for your walk and wanted to go over to
20 Portillo's, which seems to be a very popular
21 place, that you actually could walk there and have
22 a crosswalk that would take you across Kautz Road.

23 MR. POSSIN: This exhibit came in late,
24 but this shows the pedestrian areas a little bit

1 better than that last plan. And, yes, we can look
2 into the crosswalks.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. I mean,
4 understanding that, you know, you're not
5 signaling anything because there's no additional
6 stop points, that you're making some adjustments
7 to create left turn lanes between the pavement and
8 what's there. But I think the current pavement
9 areas already have crosswalks. I think the reason
10 that there aren't is because Pheasant Run was a
11 golf course.

12 MR. POSSIN: You're correct.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is the -- is there
14 any reason that part of the submittal -- I can't
15 remember what's all supposed to be on our
16 checklist. But there was no planting plans
17 submitted related to any of the buildings. Let's
18 say you were going to start with Building D,
19 saying, okay, we're not going to give you a plan
20 for every building, because that may -- things may
21 adjust a little bit as you guys move forward, you
22 know, despite what you're showing in your concept.
23 But there's no landscaping plan that shows
24 that you're going to execute our landscape

1 requirements other than there appears to be
2 sufficient space.

3 MR. POSSIN: Well, I think Russ can talk
4 to this. But in talking with staff, once we
5 submit a permit submittal for a building, we'll
6 have detailed landscape plans for that building.
7 And that's -- and we will comply with the M-2
8 Zoning standards for landscaping.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

10 MR. POSSIN: So I don't have -- we don't
11 have a landscape plan for all four buildings at
12 this time, because we're -- we're not -- we don't
13 have a submittal for any of the actual buildings
14 yet.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
16 For the -- along Kautz Road, there's a berm shown
17 on the very southern part. Is it possible to
18 extend that down towards the detention pond? That
19 just covers part of that distance. But is it
20 possible to extend it south towards the property
21 line?

22 MR. POSSIN: Brett?

23 MR. DUFFY: Yeah. It's just -- yeah. We
24 can extend it further south. Yes.

1 MR. POSSIN: Yes. It looks like we can
2 extend the berm further south. I just wanted to
3 make sure it was our detention.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I'm not asking
5 you to impact or adjust your detentions.

6 MR. POSSIN: There's some room down there.
7 We can extend it.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It wasn't about
9 changing the detention size. I understand you've
10 spent a lot of time on your calculations. It
11 sounds like it's a pretty involved thing, given
12 that you're also doing permeable pavers.

13 MR. POSSIN: Yes. We need to do permeable
14 pavers as well. So, yes.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So, I appreciate
16 that. When I'm looking at the -- I think it's
17 Sheet L1 on the landscaping, at the top right
18 corner, there's some requirements related to
19 street trees and then these buffer zone
20 calculations. And as I'm comparing that to the
21 sheet, it looks like the street trees are shown
22 within your property and are counted towards the
23 buffer zone requirements when I -- when I add
24 these up.

1 MR. POSSIN: I'm going to bring up Randy
2 Metz from Metz & Company to address this.

3 MR. METZ: Randy Metz, M-E-T-Z, with Metz
4 & Company.

5 In answer to your question, yes. There
6 are a combination of trees planted in the buffer
7 areas. I guess it was kind of my confusion, when
8 I was kind of looking through the ordinances, if
9 you needed trees in the parkways or if they could
10 be outside of the parkway along the -- within the
11 property.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I don't know for
13 sure. I would have to defer to staff. But I
14 would assume if they are a street tree, they would
15 have to be within the parkway.

16 MR. METZ: If it's a requirement, we will
17 put it in the parkway. Also, based on staff
18 comments, the landscape buffer that we've shown is
19 not required, so some modifications probably will
20 be made to the landscape plan, which, in the
21 process, we'll include parkway trees in the
22 parkway of this road, if that's what I recall.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
24 That's fine.

1 MR. METZ: You know, looking at Google
2 Images, I didn't see any other parkway trees in
3 the immediate area. So I assume that they would
4 plant along the property just off the right of
5 way.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I don't know. Russ
7 or Ellen, do you know if we have -- if there's a
8 street tree requirement? Are they required to be
9 within the right of way, if possible?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes. There is for a
11 subdivision, the planting of a certain distance
12 apart. I think the question would be whether
13 there's room within the right of way here to plant
14 those trees. If there is, that requirement would
15 apply.

16 And then on the property, there's a
17 requirement for public street frontage landscaping
18 that would apply along the frontage on Kautz Road.
19 There's was a reference to a landscape buffer
20 yard; that requirement does not apply here because
21 there's not residential uses across the street,
22 but there's a public street frontage area that has
23 some landscape.

24 So it's possible that some of these trees

1 -- something could be located into the right of
2 way as street trees and maybe some of the others
3 could be spread out further with the slightly
4 reduced requirement for frontage landscaping.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Does that make
6 sense?

7 MR. METZ: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
9 And then just as a -- as a general comment, the --
10 just based on what was submitted, there was a lot
11 of evergreens, which, you know, I'm totally fine
12 with intermixed with the deciduous trees. And I
13 would just say, in general, that the spacing looks
14 really tight. Some of it may be the area you have
15 to work in --

16 MR. METZ: It was based on the area that I
17 had worked in. I was under the impression that we
18 had to provide a certain capacity for the
19 screening if it wasn't with a solid wall through
20 the plant material.

21 So by planting the -- the evergreen trees
22 kind of in a triangular pattern, as closely as I
23 possibly could, I think I tried to maintain a
24 15-foot separation between trees, which would --

1 if they were a spruce tree, that's typically what
2 I -- I try to space out. If they were pine trees,
3 I'd probably do 20-foot spacing. But, again, that
4 was trying to -- trying to provide an advanced
5 screen.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. So it sounds
7 like, based on what staff is commenting on, is
8 that there's a requirement there, it's just not
9 exactly the one that you were following initially.

10 MR. METZ: Correct. So in the future
11 plans, you will probably -- future plans, there
12 will be probably a few less trees in that area.
13 And based on comments being made by this
14 Commission, there will be some additional trees
15 added throughout the site in the common areas.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. And I guess
17 one -- one specific thing. When the buildings
18 come forward -- because this is more, if you will,
19 building landscaping -- in this area between
20 Buildings C and D, which are the ones closest to
21 Kautz, I mean, from the site plan standpoint, I
22 like the fact that when you come in the driveway,
23 you have a turn so you're not looking directly at
24 a building. But it also turns you into looking

1 down the loading dock area.

2 And I would just ask that at those corners
3 of those two buildings -- that you kind of close
4 down that area with groupings of evergreen trees
5 so that as you come in, you're not seeing the full
6 expanse of the loading docks. Understanding that
7 the driveway needs to come through and you need to
8 be able to get through there and have side lanes
9 when trucks pull up if they're leaving in that
10 direction.

11 But people coming in, especially on Kautz
12 Road, and kind of getting the full look east to
13 west or from west to east down the -- the combined
14 loading docks for Buildings C and D would be less
15 than desirable from that standpoint. So if you
16 close that down visually with evergreens, I think
17 that would be a nice thing that could be done.
18 Again, when you're doing the landscaping for the
19 buildings.

20 MR. METZ: The address the building -- the
21 parking lots in the building landscape.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. And the --
23 from the -- from the standpoint of the POA, have
24 you guys maintained projects like you're

1 proposing?

2 I mean, there's an extensive amount of
3 native plant material from a herbaceous standpoint
4 on the ground plant, you know, which is not even
5 close to the same thing as mowing and maintaining
6 common areas of, let's say, Kentucky bluegrass.
7 So have you guys done that kind of maintenance?
8 Because this is a pretty extensive property.

9 MR. POSSIN: Yes. Greco/deRosa has
10 maintained property like this throughout multiple
11 industrial developments in the midwest. And we
12 will hire the appropriate people, like Randy and
13 other firms. The association will hire those
14 firms to main the areas.

15 Randy had -- through your maintenance
16 plan, I believe has plans set for this native
17 species plantings that we intend to follow as
18 well. Yes. And the CCRs will all lay all that
19 out. And I think they did even submit a draft of
20 CCRs as well. So, yes, we'll be able to handle
21 that.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. It's just a
23 different thing to maintain. And unless you, as a
24 property owner, have done it before, it can be a

1 little arduous, potentially. I mean, you see it
2 with residential DOAs, that they're given
3 something that they have no idea how to
4 appropriately manage and, over time, it degrades,
5 not in the three years of maintenance, but in
6 maybe five or in ten years.

7 And I applaud, you know, what you're doing
8 here, part of it probably caused by the DuPage
9 Airport Authority with respect to their whole bird
10 thing that they have an issue with. But
11 independent of that, it's still -- it's a little
12 more complicated. So if you've done it and you're
13 committed to it, I applaud that, because I think
14 that will look great.

15 MR. POSSIN: Yes. We are and we will.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Great. All right. I
17 don't know if anybody from the public is here to
18 speak on this project. I don't have any --
19 questions from anybody else?

20 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah. I just had a couple
21 more comments. Now that I brought the sidewalk
22 plan up, I don't know if there's a way to kind of
23 make that more -- more organic. I mean, it seems
24 like it's very rigid, how it's connecting the

1 front entrances. And I think you're missing a
2 couple of entrances on the north of Building A.
3 There should be some sidewalks connected to some
4 of the parking in that area. If there's a way to
5 incorporate that --

6 MR. POSSIN: We'll have to look at it to
7 see what we could add.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: I mean, how many employees
9 do you anticipate for all these -- when all these
10 buildings are filled up?

11 MR. POSSIN: Unfortunately, we don't have
12 a good answer for that, because we don't have any
13 end users at this time. So I don't have -- I
14 can't give you an answer for that other than, you
15 know, we anticipate that there will be offices in
16 all these buildings.

17 And, unfortunately, you know, being
18 surrounded by the airport, there isn't really a
19 place for them to go, because we're surrounded by
20 the airport to the east and to the south. And
21 then, eventually, there will be, hopefully, some
22 retail to the north and then that will be a place
23 they could go. And then, obviously, as we've
24 already discussed, crosswalks going through. So

1 we're looking for, yes, areas for pedestrians to
2 go on the sides and just getting a nice walk at
3 lunchtime and taking in the native plants.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: All right. And looking at
5 that sidewalk, it just seems very rigid. It would
6 be nice to incorporate within the detention and
7 the landscape and make -- create walking paths
8 that connect the areas.

9 Like if you were walking from Building A
10 to Portillo's, like Mr. Vargulich said, I think it
11 would be -- you know, it's just a straight line,
12 right, so to make that more organic I think would
13 be, you know, more conducive to the -- take
14 advantage of the landscape.

15 And then in looking at -- you know, I
16 think the elevations look nice. My only problem
17 is that thinking about the employees after the
18 fact of creating -- giving them outdoor spaces and
19 if there's ways to create landscape areas around
20 the buildings, maybe from a planning standpoint,
21 would be nice where -- especially in the front you
22 see -- you know, it's a nice entrance, but it
23 seems like you have, you know, the cars pulled
24 right up to that entrance.

1 It seems like it would be -- it would be
2 better off suited if you had more -- you know,
3 more of a grander entrance, I think, you know,
4 that is kind of conducive with the architecture.
5 I think the architecture is nice. You know, when
6 you pull up your cars to that area, to that
7 entrance, it kind of blocks that. So to make
8 those -- to emphasize that I think would be a nice
9 thing to give outdoor spaces for employees.

10 MR. POSSIN: Yes. We can look at that.
11 Oftentimes, that happens when we actually get an
12 end user who are filling out the space. And then,
13 you know, we can look at things -- assuming we
14 have enough parking, we can take a look at using
15 the parking space in a way to create those areas
16 or pull a dock position, what have you. And that
17 type of detail usually comes once we have an end
18 user. And, yes, we can look at that.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: I agree. Just some
20 comments. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just a quick question
22 on the signage. Will you be able to -- I didn't
23 notice on the signage package that you had in the
24 submittal. Will you have any signage that will be

1 on North Avenue?

2 MR. POSSIN: As of right now, no.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. Okay.

4 Understanding it's off-site, I didn't know if you
5 had any ability to work with McGrath on that or if
6 you approached them about somehow working that
7 out. And I don't even know if that complies with
8 our signage ordinances, to be totally honest.

9 MR. POSSIN: Well, we'd have to work with
10 staff on that. But the short answer is, no, we
11 don't -- we -- as of right now, we don't have any
12 signage rights on North Avenue.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: On North Avenue.
14 Okay. Understanding you have signage on Kautz,
15 but I didn't know if you had any that you could
16 put up there. Because that's going to be a pretty
17 popular entry for people coming in, coming from
18 west to east, that come into the park, especially
19 for the central to -- you know, for Buildings A
20 and B, for sure.

21 MR. POSSIN: The only signage potential
22 right now that we might have on North Avenue would
23 be working out an agreement with the DAA and maybe
24 if we can get a sign on Keil Road, Keil and North.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Got it. Sure.

2 MR. POSSIN: So that would be an
3 opportunity we're pursuing. But as of right now,
4 we put the signs in the most prominent areas that
5 we could.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That you could.
7 Okay. Thank you. All right. So we're going to
8 open -- unless we have more --

9 MEMBER EWOLDT: I have one question, and
10 then I'll be done. It's just about how are you
11 looking to handle the trash? You know, I'm
12 looking at the overall plan. I see a lot of
13 parking spaces. I see a lot of big buildings.
14 You know, if it's industrial commercial offices,
15 whatever, where are you looking to put trash
16 receptacles, dumpsters, stuff like that? Because,
17 I mean, obviously, there's going to have to be a
18 large volume, so that would reduce your parking
19 spaces that you're showing. So I'm just kind of
20 curious how that would function in your plan.

21 MR. POSSIN: Well, again, that would
22 pertain once we get an end user. But, generally
23 speaking, dumpsters will go in -- the user will
24 put, usually, some kind of trash in the dock

1 position. And then how we'll maintain it -- the
2 tenants will be responsible for trash on site.

3 But then, also, as part of the association
4 and our landscape crews, you know, when they go
5 maintain or mow the areas, they'll be picking up
6 debris as they see it. So we'll have a
7 two-pronged approach with that. We'll have the
8 tenants, the end users that are in the building,
9 and then also the association to maintain the
10 trash and debris on the site.

11 MEMBER EWOLDT: So you're saying the trash
12 receptacles will be stored inside, on the loading
13 dock areas, or outside? I'm just curious.

14 MR. POSSIN: Generally -- it depends.
15 But, oftentimes, they are outside. So you might
16 take a dock position away and have a dumpster
17 there.

18 MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Thank you
20 so much.

21 MR. POSSIN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any comments from the
23 public that would like to speak?

24 MS. MROCH: I'm sorry. I'm just a

1 resident. I'm Sue Mroch, and I live on Illinois
2 Street --

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry. You have
4 to come up to the podium, please.

5 MS. MROCH: I'm a resident of St. Charles,
6 and I live on Illinois Street. My name is Sue
7 Mroch, M-R-O-C-H. Can I ask -- are any of you --

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Can you please --

9 MS. MROCH: Do any of you live in
10 St. Charles? Do any of them live in St. Charles?

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No idea.

12 MS. MROCH: That's my question, one of
13 them. Anybody live in St. Charles?

14 MR. POSSIN: I live in St. Charles.

15 MS. MROCH: You live in St. Charles.

16 Okay. So based on -- based on the trees that we
17 have at Pheasant Run, it's hard to believe that we
18 only have a few that can be moved.

19 So I'm wondering if an environmentalist
20 has been -- third party, of course -- has been
21 hired to decide what -- or arborist or whatever
22 you call them -- to decide what trees can be
23 maintained or moved.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. I'll let Jeff

1 answer that. But there was a -- as part of the
2 submittal that was online and part of their plans,
3 there was an inventory that was created by a
4 third-party consultant, ENCAP, and they located
5 the trees on the site as well as created a list of
6 all the trees. And so that's available -- or was
7 available.

8 MS. MROCH: So who has that -- who has
9 that list?

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It was on the
11 website.

12 MS. MROCH: It's on the website?

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. It's
14 downloadable from the -- from the City's website.
15 Go to the Plan Commission tab, and it's under
16 their submittal.

17 MS. MROCH: Okay. And then they talk
18 about the parkway trees. You know, the parkway
19 trees you get when you first own your home and you
20 get this with it, right? I think to -- like you
21 were saying, to be consistent with McGrath, I
22 don't know how tall McGrath is looking at for
23 trees, do you?

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I don't remember for

1 sure off the top of my head. But I think they
2 were planting our standard size trees, which I
3 think are two-and-a-half or three-inch caliber,
4 which is what you see --

5 MS. MROCH: The parkways.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- all over. I mean,
7 that's pretty common for many municipalities, not
8 just St. Charles.

9 MS. MROCH: Correct. And I know it's also
10 not for Lombard, because Lombard has a beautiful
11 -- you know, I know that's where Mr. Metz's
12 business is, so, you know -- well, I think you're
13 right. I think the landscape is a big key here
14 and the trees and the wildlife. Has anybody
15 talked about how they're going to cull or kill the
16 wildlife?

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I don't think anybody
18 has asked that question. I'm not aware that we're
19 killing wildlife.

20 MS. MROCH: Oh, they're not?

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: What wildlife,
22 specifically, are you talking about?

23 MS. MROCH: Have you seen the wildlife at
24 Pheasant Run? You know, have you looked? Is

1 anybody looking at this or no? You don't have any
2 -- Fox Valley Wildlife Center coming to look and
3 decide what is going to be destroyed?

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I would, I guess, at
5 one level, defer to staff. I don't think we have
6 a requirement.

7 MS. MROCH: But a suggestion? You know,
8 would there be a recommendation?

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We can consider that.

10 MS. MROCH: I mean, it's just, you know,
11 an idea. I mean, it's hard to lose Pheasant Run.
12 Not as it is. It's hard to lose the golf course,
13 of course, but --

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, golf as a game
15 is --

16 MS. MROCH: It's our gateway. It's our
17 gateway into St. Charles, and we're going to have
18 this. And the less I see of this, the better off.
19 But -- yeah. So I think the trees and maybe if
20 you can make a recommendation that maybe a
21 wildlife center, Fox Valley Wildlife Center, could
22 come out and review. No harm.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We can consider that,
24 yes.

1 MS. MROCH: Consider it. Okay. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Anyone else from the
4 public as far as our public comment period?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No. All right. So I
7 guess it's back to us Commissioners. Do you want
8 comments or testimony from the petitioner and
9 their consultant team? Do we have any additional
10 thoughts or comments?

11 MS. MROCH: And then one other thing, can
12 we have a handout next time? We're looking at
13 this, you guys are looking there.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry. I can't
15 hear you. Can you come up or maybe move your mask
16 down a little bit?

17 MS. MROCH: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

19 MS. MROCH: The next time, can we have
20 handouts like you guys are looking at on your
21 screens? Somebody's drawing, I'm writing, and you
22 are looking at this --

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

24 MS. MROCH: -- please.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

63

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Yes.

2 MS. MROCH: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other additional
4 thoughts or comments?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So, at
7 this point, do we feel we have enough information
8 to close the public hearing and make a motion to
9 do so?

10 MEMBER BECKER: So moved.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. A motion to
12 close the public hearing. A second?

13 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And a second. Any
15 discussion?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So, roll
18 call.

19 Colleen Wiese.

20 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Suzanne Melton.

24 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park
Conducted on October 19, 2021

64

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zachary Ewoldt.

2 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

4 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

6 We will close the public hearing.

7 So, next steps. Staff, any additional
8 comments?

9 MR. COLBY: I'm just adding that there's
10 some open staff review comments so that any
11 recommendation should be conditional on resolution
12 of staff comments.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Understood.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll make a motion for
15 approval with staff comments for the rezoning from
16 BR, regional business, to M2, limited
17 manufacturing, four-lot subdivision, 1,172,718
18 square feet of industrial space for the four
19 buildings.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Any further
21 discussion? How did I get this wrong, Russ? We
22 have to second first and then we can amend the
23 motion?

24 MR. COLBY: Was there a second made?

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No.

2 MR. COLBY: You can -- whoever was making
3 the motion can amend the motion.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right. So
5 let me get a second.

6 MEMBER WIESE: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So any
8 discussion?

9 MEMBER BECKER: Is the motion just for the
10 map amendment, or is it for the map amendment and
11 plat of subdivision?

12 MEMBER FUNKE: It's for the re --

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff?

14 MEMBER FUNKE: -- it's for the map
15 amendment. It's rezoning from the BR, regional
16 business, to M2, limited manufacturing.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Can we do them
18 separately, Russ? Or can we combine them?

19 MR. COLBY: That could be done separately
20 or combined. It's up to the Commission.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, I'll make the motion
22 for the rezoning and -- from BR, regional
23 business, to M2, limited manufacturing, and the
24 plat of subdivision.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. So we
2 have an amended motion. Do we have a second of
3 the amended motion?

4 MEMBER MELTON: I'll second that.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I guess I would like
6 to -- I'd rather do this all at one time. But I
7 would amend the motion to include not only the
8 staff comments that have been already presented to
9 the applicant but also to incorporate our comments
10 with respect to the landscape plan, looking at
11 adding trees around the ponds, which I don't
12 believe are, again, in the staff comments, and
13 making the driveways feel more like streets rather
14 than just driveways, by adding new trees.
15 Understanding there's things to look at with
16 respect to placement of utilities, gas and water,
17 but moving to include that also in this.

18 Is there a second on that?

19 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll second that.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other discussion?

21 MEMBER BECKER: I do. Yes. For a point
22 of clarification from staff. If this is a map
23 amendment with other requirements in the
24 ordinance, would you attach additional

1 considerations?

2 MR. COLBY: So with the plat of
3 subdivision, there's a requirement that landscape
4 plans be provided for any public streets or
5 detention basins for the subdivision
6 infrastructure. So to the extent that there's a
7 request to install additional landscaping around
8 the detention basins, which I think has been
9 suggested, that would be appropriate.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff, anything else
11 to add?

12 MEMBER FUNKE: No.

13 MEMBER BECKER: I just want to make sure
14 that we were clear on what we were voting on that
15 was ordinance compliant.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Fair enough. Sounds
17 like we are. All right.

18 So, roll call.

19 Colleen Wiese.

20 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Suzanne Melton.

24 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

2 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

4 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes.

6 All right. We're done. Thank you very
7 much.

8 MR. COLBY: Was that a vote on the motion
9 to amend or approve?

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry. Did I
11 miss the procedure?

12 MR. COLBY: Was the motion to amend made
13 separately from the original motion to approve?

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

15 MR. COLBY: So then that vote would have
16 been on the motion to amend. So then you now need
17 to vote on the motion to approve.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Procedures,
19 procedures. Thank you, Russ. Thank you.

20 Okay. So now that we've agreed on our
21 amended approval, now we can have roll call on
22 this.

23 So, Colleen Wiese.

24 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Industrial Park

Conducted on October 19, 2021

69

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Suzanne Melton.

4 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

6 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

8 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes.

10 Now, procedurally, we are done, gentlemen.

11 Thank you.

12 (Off the record at 8:16 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

2

3 I, Courtney Petros, Registered
4 Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter and Notary Public, the officer before
6 whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby
7 certify that the foregoing transcript is a true
8 and correct record of the testimony given; that
9 said testimony was taken by me and thereafter
10 reduced to typewriting under my direction; that
11 reading and signing was not requested; and that I
12 am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed
13 by any of the parties to this case and have no
14 interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto signed
16 this 23rd day of October, 2021.

17 My commission expires May 6th, 2023.

18

19



20

COURTNEY PETROS, RPR, CSR

21

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE

22

STATE OF ILLINOIS

23

24



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

Transcript of Sterling Bank

Date: October 19, 2021

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

- - - - - x

In Re: Application :
for PUD Preliminary :
Plan for First Street :
Redevelopment PUD; :
Sterling Bank, 10 :
Illinois Street. :

- - - - - x

HEARING

St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, October 19, 2021
8:18 p.m.

Job No.: 336738
Pages: 1 - 29
Reported By: Courtney Petros, RPR, CSR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3

4 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

5 2 East Main Street

6 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

7 630.377.4400

8

9

10

11

12 Before Courtney Petros, a Certified Shorthand
13 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a
14 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

PRESENT:

- PETER VARGULICH, Chair
- ZACHARY EWOLDT, Member
- SUE MELTON, Member
- COLLEEN WIESE, Member
- JEFFREY FUNKE, Member
- JENNIFER BECKER, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSS COLBY, Community Development Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner
- RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner
- MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

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

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So Item 6, First
3 Street Redevelopment PUD, Sterling Bank, 20 [sic]
4 Illinois Street. Application for PUD preliminary
5 plan. Success. All right.

6 So will staff or the applicant be
7 providing the summary for this?

8 MS. HITZEMANN: Dan Marshall is here. He
9 runs the project.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sounds great.

11 MR. MARSHALL: Hi. Dan Marshall.
12 Marshall Architects. 812 East Main, St. Charles,
13 Illinois.

14 This proposal was to change the PUD from
15 the fifth -- the third, fourth, and fifth floor of
16 this building to -- instead of just commercial to
17 be residential or commercial.

18 The owners have an interested purchaser in
19 the fifth floor and -- as residential. So that's
20 the way -- they'd like to change the PUD to
21 accommodate that. And part of that process is to
22 put a roof deck for the purchaser right over that
23 fifth floor unit. You can take the whole
24 remaining fifth floor of that, above the Sterling

1 Bank portion.

2 This building is split into the southern
3 third Sterling Bank owns and the northern
4 two-thirds is owned by a condominium association,
5 residential condos, and then there's commercial on
6 the first floor. And so the -- those floors have
7 been empty, three, four, and five. They're having
8 trouble, obviously, renting them for offices with
9 the market these days for offices, it seems.

10 And so they have a buyer for this fifth
11 floor, and it goes with the rest of the units
12 pretty well. And so we're hoping to be able to
13 accommodate that. We have a pretty positive
14 review from the HBC in terms of it being good for
15 the area for having more people living there.

16 Right now, it's just a fifth floor, and it
17 seems like a pretty good chance of turning that
18 into residential. But they would like to have the
19 ability -- the flexibility to put the third and
20 fourth floor as well.

21 The roof deck includes a penthouse, which
22 is kind of like a greenhouse, a lot of glass,
23 glass skylights on the top, and then on the roof
24 deck, and a pergola with a retractable shade.

1 They want a pergola with a retractable shade.

2 There's already a common roof deck for the
3 condominiums over there that make it up to the
4 common stairway. This would be separate and just
5 be their own stairway coming out of their unit to
6 this private roof deck.

7 Any questions with that?

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If you had units on
9 the third and fourth floor, would there be one
10 unit per floor, as on the fifth, or is it the
11 intent to have more than one unit on those two
12 floors?

13 MR. MARSHALL: That's a good question. We
14 hadn't really discussed that. I guess because the
15 fifth floor is going all to one, I imagine that
16 that's all one per floor. But I don't think that
17 has been written in their PUD application for --
18 for how many units they can put in there, so
19 that's -- I guess that's open to what their buyer
20 would want at that point. It could be split up.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And is there
22 appropriate parking to be able to -- to -- you
23 know -- right, isn't there parking underneath the
24 building?

1 MR. MARSHALL: There's parking under the
2 building, but it's all taken except for the two
3 spots that they're selling to the guy on the fifth
4 floor. So that's all residential parking down the
5 there, except for these two spots that Sterling
6 Bank has owned.

7 So the third and fourth floor would not
8 have dedicated parking to it right now and never
9 has. Third, fourth, and fifth has not had
10 dedicated parking, right now, as offices.

11 So, right now, as offices, the parking
12 would be quite a bit more than residential.
13 Because how many -- I think it would be four per
14 thousand, so you have about 20 spaces required for
15 each floor right now. We would be going down to
16 -- even if there was, say, two units on the floor,
17 that would be four per floor, so you would have
18 eight to ten. So it would be half the existing
19 parking if you were to allow a change to
20 residential.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So for the office
22 space, if they were leasing that office, is there
23 parking in the garage for this or no?

24 MR. MARSHALL: No.

1 MR. COLBY: Yeah. The -- the parking
2 that's in the basement level of this building, as
3 Dan said, is assigned to the residential units
4 that are on the upper floors.

5 And then there's a parking deck that's
6 behind the building that is a public, city-owned
7 deck that has time-limited parking. And that's
8 available for use by the commercial tenants or any
9 other users of properties in the First Street
10 area.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay.

12 MR. MARSHALL: It was all kind of
13 developed as part of the main PUD.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So then if somebody
15 would -- if you had buyers to do a condo on the
16 third or fourth floor, whether that's one or two
17 units per floor, they would have no assigned
18 parking?

19 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Does that --
21 does that work?

22 MR. COLBY: So the -- the property is
23 located in the downtown special service area.
24 That does not require additional on-site parking

1 for these uses. So their -- their option would be
2 to park in the larger parking deck, which permits
3 24-hour overnight parking. So there's parking
4 available, but not, as Dan said, dedicated
5 parking. So -- but based on code, you know, you
6 could have residential units there without
7 dedicated parking.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay. So if
9 you bought something on the fourth floor, you
10 would have to park across the street because you
11 can't park on the deck adjacent for 24 hours?

12 MR. COLBY: Correct. Currently, based on
13 the time restriction of that parking deck.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay. All
15 right. I'm just trying to understand how the
16 parking would work. Because I would think,
17 typically, most people would, you know -- I'm
18 guessing that if you want to buy a condo on the
19 third floor of this building or the fourth floor,
20 you already have somebody for the fifth floor --

21 MR. MARSHALL: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- you would hope
23 that you'd have assigned spots?

24 MR. MARSHALL: Yes. I think if you're

1 buying it, you would hope that.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, that makes for
3 some interesting marketing. Fair enough.

4 MR. MARSHALL: It is set up for
5 commercial, third and fourth floor. And I think
6 that's the main push still, and not -- you know, I
7 think it's just while we're here changing the
8 zoning, I think the thought was, let's give them
9 some flexibility -- let's give them some
10 flexibility to do the third and fourth floor as
11 well and encouragement that if they wanted to,
12 they could. But I think the main push is the
13 fifth floor right now.

14 MS. BECKER: I'm not sure that would add
15 flexibility on these other floors, what we were
16 talking about several months ago with the ground
17 level and the remainder of the -- of the area on
18 that -- on the street.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And just to clarify
20 or confirm, you said that the proposed changes to
21 the roof are -- are tied specifically to the
22 potential buyer for the fifth floor?

23 MR. MARSHALL: Correct. Yes. That would
24 be a private deck right underneath stairs right

1 out of their unit.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That's what it looked
3 like. I just wanted to confirm.

4 MR. BECKER: Are you sure we won't need a
5 heliport up there with the size of this unit?

6 MR. MARSHALL: How would they survive
7 without one?

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

9 MR. MARSHALL: We're not looking at that.
10 It's actually not a very big roof deck or anything
11 else. It's just -- they would like a place to get
12 up there. They also have a beautiful balcony on
13 the south end of the unit that overlooks -- it's
14 just a phenomenal view from there. It's really
15 nice. Great sun. Great light all around. It's a
16 really nice view.

17 MR. FUNKE: I've got a couple questions.
18 The rooftop that you're adding to that penthouse,
19 is that within the height requirements?

20 MR. MARSHALL: Within the height
21 requirements? Yeah. It's actually -- it's the
22 same height as the existing flat roof of the
23 penthouse to the north right now. The peak of
24 this one will appear a little smaller to that and

1 it's centered in the -- pretty much in the roof.
2 So I don't think you'll see it much from below
3 like you can see the existing penthouses, one of
4 which is pretty close to the west side, and you
5 see that a little bit, but it's kind of blank.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: And the second floor is the
7 bank, right?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: And then the third, fourth,
10 and fifth would be residential?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Third, fourth, and fifth
12 would have the potential to be residential or
13 office. You know, like we're saying, the
14 marketing of that without parking spaces is going
15 to be tough. But --

16 MEMBER FUNKE: How do you separate the
17 elevators from -- I mean, I see that one elevator
18 goes right into the unit, so how does that
19 separate into commercial?

20 MR. MARSHALL: Well, they would have a
21 keycard to go up into the building. So there's a
22 -- this end has its own private elevator right in
23 the S there for Sterling, and that would -- they
24 would come in that lobby and they would go up.

1 They would go in the common area lobby where that
2 door is shown with the arch.

3 Although, there's a back door out there
4 that has a common lock, so it could be. There's
5 -- they have access to two elevators, which the
6 residential condos on the north end don't. They
7 can only get into that one elevator.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: And then the restroom, the
9 bathrooms that you have located -- I mean, you
10 have all the stacks at --

11 MR. MARSHALL: I'm sorry. What was that?

12 MEMBER FUNKE: The stacks, do they have to
13 be redone to accommodate for residential? Because
14 I know commercial and residential is typically
15 difficult to accommodate plumbing when you're
16 mixing them both.

17 MR. MARSHALL: We haven't approached that
18 yet. But I don't think there will be a problem
19 with it. I'm not anticipating that. We have an
20 engineer working on it. We have very good
21 plumbing inspector, Steve Herra, if you know him.
22 And we will look into that, that's for sure.

23 But, yeah, it's pretty well-sized for --
24 you know, as an office use, it was going to be

1 pretty dense if it wasn't -- if there's an office.
2 There could be quite a few people up there. So
3 it's a good size for commercial, which would
4 create a lot of parking too.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: And are the existing
6 windows -- in the commercial office, you have them
7 fixed. Are they operable?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. We have them
9 operable except for the big curved bay. Those are
10 all fixed. Other than that, they would be
11 operable. I designed the building and I'm always
12 a fan of opening windows. They are set up at
13 three feet high so that -- so the railing, you
14 can't fall out of it.

15 MEMBER WIESE: So a follow-up question
16 about the flexibility to the third and fourth
17 flooring. The proposal is to have either/or,
18 residential or commercial, not residential and
19 commercial on those floors, or you're requesting
20 flexibility to do both?

21 MR. MARSHALL: I think they're requesting
22 flexibility. I'm sorry Tom Russe couldn't be here
23 from Sterling Bank, but I think the idea is to
24 have the flexibility. We haven't really talked

1 about mixing them per floor, but I guess you
2 could. I think then you get into the access of
3 how that hallway works with some commercial people
4 coming and going. So that could be a little
5 tricky. I'm sure we could handle it with doors
6 and lobbies and hallways and stuff. It's not
7 uncommon in office-type buildings.

8 I don't picture it that, to tell you the
9 truth. I don't picture half. I really just
10 pictured one unit per floor, but I think you could
11 make an argument for splitting it. At one time,
12 we were looking at doing three units on the fifth
13 floor to see if that was more marketable as
14 smaller units, but somebody came along and wanted
15 the whole thing.

16 But I suppose you could try to do multiple
17 units per floor and then those units could be
18 something to work with. We're looking to make it
19 a successful building in any kind of flexible
20 range.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If you did two units
22 per floor, would you use both elevators, the
23 common one, if you will, that's kind of the rear
24 entry for the fifth floor, as well as the one that

1 comes in at the southeast corner?

2 MR. MARSHALL: I think they would have to
3 negotiate that with the broader association to
4 allow for that, because I -- I'm not positive of
5 this, but I don't think the association's set up
6 for them to be using anything other than that
7 emergency back exit. But I'm not positive about
8 that. I'll find out about that.

9 But what we were looking at a while ago
10 was a hallway that kind of connected the two exits
11 and then the apartments coming off of that hallway
12 when we were looking at multiple units. So there
13 wasn't just using that one -- it wasn't split in
14 half where this guy on the north half had to use
15 that common area hallway and the guy on the south
16 had to use another one. There was a connection.
17 But it's a good question too.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I mean, it would seem
19 to make more sense for this -- if you're going to
20 have residences here, the northern part of the
21 original northern condo group, that they would
22 almost have their own elevator and use the one on
23 the southeast corner, but then that kind of
24 creates some challenges for how to use those

1 curved balconies and, you know, who gets that one.

2 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. Who gets that one.

3 Right.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That would be kind of
5 tough to potentially split in the layout.

6 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. I think the idea is
7 to -- is to -- as -- I know that there's talk of
8 really going for offices on third and fourth
9 floor. That seems to be the more viable option
10 and just get this fifth floor residential unit,
11 but they want flexibility in doing that.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is the -- is the
13 current allowed uses office?

14 MR. MARSHALL: Correct. That's how the
15 original PUD is written is just office.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is just office.

17 MS. HITZEMANN: So the original PUD was
18 for the bank, and the bank was going to occupy
19 about five floors. And then they amended it in
20 2017 to have the possibility to have offices on
21 the third, fourth, and fifth floor.

22 So now they're going again to have the
23 flexibility for office or residential on the third
24 and fourth floor and keep the fifth floor

1 residential.

2 MEMBER BECKER: So my question for me
3 about the -- about the fifth floor -- and I'm not
4 sure that this is relevant -- but in light of our
5 discussion a few years ago about VRBOs and
6 rentals, is this -- is this going to be the
7 owner's residence? There's no plans to have it be
8 a VRBO kind of situation where there's people
9 coming and going all the time?

10 MR. MARSHALL: As far as I know, it's the
11 owner's residence. They've already been working
12 with an interior designer. And it seems
13 everything that I've heard and have been involved
14 in -- and I'm not the owner -- but it seems to be
15 very personal --

16 MEMBER BECKER: Thank you.

17 MR. MARSHALL: -- for them.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

19 MEMBER EWOLDT: I just have a concern
20 about that parking. The third and fourth floor,
21 if it was residential, you know, obviously, an
22 office daytime staff is Monday through Friday,
23 using the garages or the parking behind the
24 building is a different time frame. But if you're

1 a resident on a weekend or weeknight, you're going
2 to be fighting for parking.

3 So, I mean, at a certain point, if you
4 have to go to the 24-hour garage as a resident, in
5 theory, for the third and fourth floor, you might
6 not get a spot. So what are they going to do in
7 that -- you know, instance? You know, with not
8 having a dedicated parking for those floors for
9 residential use, I just see that as a big barrier
10 for how our downtown is set up and how it
11 operates, especially on Friday through Sunday.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff, any comments?

13 MEMBER FUNKE: That's all I have.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: You're good. Thank
15 you very much.

16 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So do we have a
18 motion on this topic? Does anybody feel strongly,
19 yes or no, about this request?

20 MEMBER FUNKE: This is a preliminary
21 hearing, right?

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah.

23 Rachel, is it -- is it your understanding
24 with respect to the application that they're going

1 to have two parking spaces for this fifth floor
2 residence? Is that part of the application or is
3 that not solidified from the City standpoint?

4 MS. HITZEMANN: I don't think it was -- I
5 don't believe it was specified within the
6 application. But, I mean, Dan would know better
7 than I would if they have had those spaces or not.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

9 MS. HITZEMANN: But, no, to answer your
10 question, I don't believe it was specified in the
11 application.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It was not specified.
13 Dan testified that it was, that they were going to
14 dedicate two spaces with the sale. But I just
15 wanted to see if it was part of the application.
16 Okay. All right. Yes, no? Yes?

17 MEMBER WIESE: Well, I -- are we making a
18 motion? Is that the next step?

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We have an
20 application in front of us requesting a
21 preliminary amendment to this PUD -- amendment to
22 the PUD. So are we going to recommend yes? Do we
23 have any stipulations related to that, or do we
24 not agree with this?

1 MEMBER FUNKE: Make a motion to close the
2 discussion.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, this isn't a
4 public hearing, right? This is not a public
5 hearing, so we don't need to close the discussion.
6 There's no public hearing to close. Not this
7 time.

8 MEMBER WIESE: Well, I would make a motion
9 to approve the application for the First Street
10 Redevelopment PUD, Sterling Bank, 10 Illinois
11 Street, application for revised PUD; is that what
12 I'm --

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. That's -- that's fine,
14 that description.

15 MEMBER WIESE: Okay.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll second.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Second. So I would
18 -- I would suggest an amendment to -- to your --
19 to the motion.

20 MEMBER WIESE: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. And I would
22 suggest that it's contingent upon addressing,
23 number one, any staff comments that are
24 outstanding.

1 And, secondly, that since we have a plan
2 that's part of the application for the fifth
3 floor, that it's confirmed with our staff that
4 there is specific parking places for that unit
5 within the building, that they have to confirm
6 that with a lease agreement or sales agreement or
7 something that would confirm that at least those
8 -- that unit has parking dedicated for it.

9 MEMBER WIESE: I mean, is that required if
10 the owner wanted to buy it without parking?

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Can we do that?

12 MR. COLBY: It's not required by code that
13 there be parking dedicated or assigned to the
14 unit. So if that's something that the Plan
15 Commission would like added as a condition, then
16 that could be specified.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes. I'm suggesting
18 that as an amendment, as a condition to the
19 approval --

20 MEMBER WIESE: And you're just --

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- I don't know how
22 we feel about that.

23 MEMBER WIESE: -- you're just requesting
24 that for the fifth floor?

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: For the fifth floor.
2 Because they don't know if they're even going to
3 be able to market the third and fourth floor for
4 residences. And, clearly, what has prompted them
5 to come forward is this fifth floor. Because they
6 already have approval for office space on all
7 three of those floors.

8 They're asking to tweak that, that they
9 can include residential on any of the three
10 floors. And, obviously, they have someone quite
11 interested. They hired Dan and an interior
12 designer, assuming that this is all going to pan
13 out, of course, that they will do it. So I'm just
14 saying, given that, I think it's appropriate as a
15 condition. We don't all have to agree on that,
16 but that's my suggestion.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: Russ, are there
18 requirements for the existing commercial office to
19 have parking?

20 MR. COLBY: No. It's -- the parking
21 that's provided, you know, in all of the public
22 parking decks and parking lots within the First
23 Street Development and within all of downtown
24 that's within the Special Service Area 1A is meant

1 to be shared, multiuse parking, particularly for
2 the businesses where it's timed parking for
3 daytime use.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: I guess my question is, if
5 we -- if we amend it to include those two parking
6 spaces for that unit, what happens on the third
7 and fourth floor, then, if that goes for
8 residential? They should require parking for
9 those floors also. I mean, if you're doing it for
10 the fifth, wouldn't you need to be consistent for
11 the third and fourth?

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Fair point. Fair
13 point. That's why we're talking.

14 MEMBER WIESE: Yeah. I'm -- I'm not
15 certain we need to require it. Because at the
16 same time, if there's an owner that wishes to
17 purchase it without it, that's -- I mean, someone
18 came and they wanted to purchase the third floor
19 and they didn't care, or the fifth floor and they
20 didn't care -- I mean, I'm assuming they would,
21 but it sounds like they have it taken care of, so
22 I'm not sure that I want to formally force it.

23 MEMBER MELTON: It doesn't even seem like
24 it's an option to do all of the floors, right?

1 MR. MARSHALL: Can I make a comment about
2 that?

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Certainly, Dan.

4 MR. MARSHALL: I think it would be nice to
5 have the flexibility, say, if the guy on the fifth
6 floor decided he wanted to sell one of his spaces
7 to the guy on the fourth floor or something like
8 that, to not have that requirement just for the
9 fifth floor, because there's just not that much
10 parking available and it could be valuable. So
11 that would be nice to have a flexibility.

12 MEMBER BECKER: I think it's a market
13 condition. And if you all, as the developers,
14 control it, I think it's too much for us to impose
15 that over and above what is part of the PUD.
16 That's my thought.

17 MEMBER MELTON: I agree with you.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: It's actually less spaces
19 for the residential when you have an additional
20 office.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. As far as the
22 parking need, yes, but there's no designation for
23 where those spaces are. I mean, that's clear in
24 the staff report.

1 All right. Well, I withdraw. I withdraw
2 my amendment. And then we'll just vote on the
3 approval, right, as originally stated? So roll
4 call will be --

5 MEMBER FUNKE: We're amending the
6 approval, right, with the staff comments; is that
7 correct?

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes. I'm sorry.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: So we have to go to the
10 amendment first.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

12 MR. COLBY: So was that motion made to
13 amend?

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes. So we have to
15 take roll call on the amended motion to include --

16 MR. COLBY: Is there a second?

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Do we have a second?

18 MEMBER MELTON: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So we have a second,
20 Russ.

21 MR. COLBY: Yeah. So now vote on the
22 motion to approve --

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Now we can vote on
24 the amended motion, not requiring any parking,

1 just that all staff comments are addressed. Roll
2 call.

3 Colleen Wiese.

4 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Suzanne Melton.

8 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

10 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

12 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Me, yes.

14 I think we're done. Thanks, Mr. Marshall.

15 MR. COLBY: We have to vote on the main --
16 the main motion to approve.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Oh, my gosh. It's
18 too much procedure, Russ. It's all so confusing.
19 Sorry.

20 All right. So one more time on the main
21 motion. We've amended it, the main motion. Now
22 we're ready. Hang on, Dan. You've got to wait
23 for the big vote. All right.

24 Colleen Wiese.

Transcript of Sterling Bank
Conducted on October 19, 2021

28

1 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Suzanne Melton.

5 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

7 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jennifer Becker.

9 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Me, yes.

11 (Off the record at 8:45 p.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

2

3 I, Courtney Petros, Registered
4 Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter and Notary Public, the officer before
6 whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby
7 certify that the foregoing transcript is a true
8 and correct record of the testimony given; that
9 said testimony was taken by me and thereafter
10 reduced to typewriting under my direction; that
11 reading and signing was not requested; and that I
12 am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed
13 by any of the parties to this case and have no
14 interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto signed
16 this 23rd day of October, 2021.

17 My commission expires May 6th, 2023.

18

19



20

COURTNEY PETROS, RPR, CSR

21

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE

22

STATE OF ILLINOIS

23

24