

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2019**

Members Present: Chairman Wallace
Vice Chairman Kessler
Tom Pretz
Jennifer Becker
James Holderfield
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Jeff Funke
Peter Vargulich

Members Absent: Suzanne Melton

Also Present: Russell Colby, Community Development Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the October 8, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Funke and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the October 8, 2019 Plan Commission meeting. Mr. Pretz abstained.

5. General Amendment (John Karatheodore)

Ch. 17.14 "Business & Mixed Use Districts" to add Pet Care Facility as a Special Use in the CBD-1 District.

- a. Public Hearing
- b. Discussion & Recommendation

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

6. K-9 Country Club of St. Charles, 305 N. 2nd St. (John Karatheodore)

Application for Special Use

- a. Public Hearing
- b. Discussion & Recommendation

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 22, 2019
Page 2

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to continue items #5 and #6, as requested by the applicant, to the November 5th, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Becker, Wallace, Funke, Purdy, Vargulich, Pretz

Nays:

Absent: Melton

Motion carried 8-0

7. Parkside Reserves, 1337 Geneva Rd. (Grandview Capital LLC)
Application for Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to approve the application for Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision for Parkside Reserves, 1337 Geneva Rd. (Grandview Capital LLC), subject to resolution of staff comments prior to City Council action.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Becker, Wallace, Funke, Purdy, Vargulich, Pretz

Nays:

Absent: Melton

Motion carried 8-0

8. St. Charles Public Library (St. Charles Public Library District)
Application for Special Use for PUD
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

a. Public Hearing

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Ms. Purdy to close the Public Hearing.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Becker, Wallace, Funke, Purdy, Vargulich, Pretz

Nays:

Absent: Melton

Motion carried 8-0

b. Discussion & Recommendation

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 22, 2019
Page 3

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the application for Special Use for PUD and PUD Preliminary Plan for the St. Charles Public Library (St. Charles Public Library District), subject to resolution of staff comments.

Motion was made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Ms. Purdy to amend the motion by including the following conditions:

- **Further articulation of north addition north side face along Main St.**
- **Preservation of existing trees at the north end of the site as much as possible.**
- **Sidewalk along Illinois Ave. to be ADA accessible.**
- **Configuration of St. Mark’s Illinois Ave. access to be right-out only.**
- **Move the Main St. sidewalk to the south for pedestrian safety.**

Roll call vote (on motion to amend):

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Becker, Wallace, Funke, Purdy, Vargulich, Pretz

Nays:

Absent: Melton

Motion carried 8-0

Roll call vote (on main motion):

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Becker, Wallace, Funke, Purdy, Vargulich, Pretz

Nays:

Absent: Melton

Motion carried 8-0

9. Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Recommendations for West Side study area

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

10. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff- None

11. Weekly Development Report

12. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, November 5, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, November 19, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, December 3, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, November 11, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, December 9, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 22, 2019
Page 4

- 13. Public Comment-None**
- 14. Adjournment at 8:59pm**



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

Transcript of Hearing- Property located at 1337 Geneva Road

Date: October 22, 2019

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 :
Preliminary/Final Plat of :
Subdivision, Parkside :
Reserves, Grandview :
Capital LLC; Property :
Located at 1337 Geneva Road. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, October 22, 2019
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 218474A
Pages: 1 - 11
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand
14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Hearing- Property located at 1337 Geneva Road
Conducted on October 22, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSSELL COLBY, Community Development
12 Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
City of St. Charles Plan Commission will come to
order. Tim.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. Becker.

MEMBER BECKER: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Those of
you who wish to, please stand for the Pledge of
Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 4 is

1 presentation of the minutes of the October 8th,
2 2019, meeting of the Plan Commission.

3 Is there a motion to approve?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So moved and seconded.

7 All in favor?

8 (Ayes heard.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm going to abstain.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Item No. 5 is
12 general amendment, Chapter 17.14, Business and
13 Mixed Use Districts, to add pet care facility as a
14 special use in the CBD-1 District.

15 Yeah.

16 MS. JOHNSON: The applicant has requested
17 that the Commission continue this item and Item
18 No. 6 to the November 5th meeting.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And Item No. 6
20 is K-9 Country Club of St. Charles, 305 North
21 Second Street.

22 So is there a motion to continue --

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry -- to the

Transcript of Hearing- Property located at 1337 Geneva Road
Conducted on October 22, 2019

6

1 November 5th meeting.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So motion to
4 continue to November 5th. It's been seconded.

5 Tim.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

7 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 7 on
22 the agenda, Parkside Reserves, 1337 Geneva Road,
23 Grandview Capital LLC, application for
24 preliminary/final plat of subdivision.

1 Ellen.

2 MS. JOHNSON: So this property is a vacant
3 half-acre parcel near the St. Charles/Geneva
4 border on Geneva Road. In 2018, the City approved
5 a map amendment and a final plat for this property
6 allowing for development of a three-unit townhome.

7 Grandview Capital LLC, the applicant and
8 property owner, have revised their plans for the
9 property to add an additional townhome unit. The
10 revised plat of subdivision proposes four lots,
11 one for each unit, and a common area outlot; and
12 the site layout is similar to the previous
13 proposal.

14 Ken Bernhard is here and representing the
15 project, as well I believe he has a board to
16 present.

17 MR. BERNHARD: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

19 MR. BERNHARD: I'd like to put this up
20 there so you can see it. Adequate? Can everyone
21 see it from there?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. That's fine.

23 MR. BERNHARD: So we realized early on
24 that the project we were proposing wasn't as

1 saleable as we would like it. It was going to be
2 in the 900-plus range, and we wanted to do
3 something that was more cost effective and try to
4 make a saleable product that we can all enjoy.

5 So we revised our plans; and in doing so,
6 we actually shrunk our overall area of impervious
7 surface by close to 270 square feet. So we
8 created a fourth additional unit; but in doing so,
9 we have less impervious surface. The present plan
10 does meet all of the City planning height and
11 setback restrictions as well.

12 And we have had some recent City review,
13 comments which are minimal, that we are going to
14 begin to work on shortly here.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Questions?
16 No questions?

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is he okay with the
18 staff comments that are in the report? Is he
19 agreeable?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are you agreeable with
21 the staff comments?

22 MR. BERNHARD: Yes. We're working on them
23 now.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

Transcript of Hearing- Property located at 1337 Geneva Road
Conducted on October 22, 2019

9

1 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. Did
2 the fire department review this plan already? Did
3 they approve it?

4 MR. BERNHARD: I don't believe the fire
5 department has looked at it as far as I know.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: My only concern would be
7 accessing the property with a truck.

8 MR. BERNHARD: Okay. I believe our
9 driveway is actually a little larger now so we
10 should meet that but we're happy to do whatever --

11 MS. JOHNSON: The fire department did look
12 at the previous version of this plan and did not
13 have any concerns. I'm assuming that they were
14 also routed -- these plans actually have come in
15 for a building permit, and I believe that they
16 were routed these plans as well.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any questions?
18 Tim.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to make a
20 motion to recommend approval to the planning and
21 development committee for the Parkside Reserves,
22 1337 Geneva Road, Grandview Capital LLC,
23 application for preliminary/final plat of
24 subdivision, subject to resolution of all staff

Transcript of Hearing- Property located at 1337 Geneva Road
Conducted on October 22, 2019

10

1 comments prior to City Council action.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
4 seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

5 Tim.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

7 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

22 MR. BERNHARD: Perfect. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Good luck.

24 (Off the record at 7:07 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 29th day of October, 2019.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Hearing-In Re: St. Charles Public Library

Date: October 22, 2019

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: St. Charles Public :
Library, St. Charles :
Public Library District, :
Application for Special :
Use for PUD and for PUD :
Preliminary Plan. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, October 22, 2019
7:07 p.m.

Job No.: 218474B
Pages: 1 - 71
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand
14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSSELL COLBY, Community Development
12 Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item No. 8
3 is St. Charles Public Library, St. Charles Public
4 Library District, application for special use for
5 PUD and application for PUD preliminary plan.

6 This is a public hearing, and as such --
7 sorry, I'm trying to open the screen here. The
8 Plan Commission is tasked by the City Council to
9 conduct public hearings for certain applications
10 that come before it, such as this one.

11 We will gather information and evidence;
12 and once we feel that we have enough information
13 to be able to make a recommendation to the City
14 Council on the application, then we will close the
15 public hearing and take action on the item.

16 In gathering information, we'll hear first
17 from the applicant, and then Plan Commission
18 members will ask questions. If anyone else wishes
19 to offer any testimony or ask any questions, they
20 will be allowed to do so; and then, as I said, if
21 we have enough information, we will close the
22 public hearing.

23 Whoever wishes to offer any testimony or
24 ask any questions, I would ask you be sworn in.

1 Could you raise your hand.

2 (Witness sworn.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

4 And when you speak, obviously, you're
5 already at the lectern, but please state your
6 name, spell your last name, and state your address
7 for the record.

8 Before you start, is there anything from
9 staff?

10 MS. JOHNSON: No.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. You may begin.

12 MR. MCKAY: Thank you. My name is Don
13 Mckay, M-c-k-a-y. I'm a principal at Sheehan,
14 Nagle Hartray Architects here in Chicago at 130
15 East Randolph Street.

16 As we went through the conceptual part of
17 the process with the City, both with the HPC and
18 with the Plan Commission and the planning and
19 development committee, we got some very useful
20 comments. I think everyone approved of our
21 design. I'm going to make a presentation tonight
22 that focuses on the changes that we have made in
23 response to what we've heard.

24 So here's an overall aerial view of the

1 site. Again, I won't go into any of this -- many
2 of these things in detail unless there are any
3 questions about it.

4 Here's a plan that illustrates the
5 original Carnegie Library location and then the
6 two additions that have been put on to it. One of
7 our major concerns with the additions that were
8 put on was the way that it marginalized the
9 Carnegie Library, and that was a big factor in
10 terms of how we approached the design for the
11 project.

12 Here's our revised site plan, and probably
13 the most serious comment that we got from the Plan
14 Commission the last time we presented was with
15 respect to the pedestrian environment on the site.
16 So we've made some substantial changes that
17 improve the pedestrian safety and the character on
18 the site.

19 The plan that you see here really gives a
20 good illustration of the landscaping that's on the
21 site. I'm going to forward to the next side for a
22 second just to show you without all the trees
23 because I think this better illustrates the
24 pedestrian environment that we've created.

1 So a couple of things that we've done that
2 I think are significant: One is that we've closed
3 the through parking lot access in this area here
4 and extended this up as a major walkway from
5 north/south that gets you up near the front of the
6 building. We've also eliminated parking here and
7 on the other side of this drive here.

8 This we eliminated to navigate the grade
9 change that we have along this part of the site,
10 but we think it also improves the pedestrian
11 safety on the site. The other thing that we did
12 is eliminated the parking here so that we get a
13 sidewalk that comes across here without this being
14 broken up with parking here as well.

15 We also added a very strong, I think,
16 pedestrian path from Illinois Avenue directly up
17 to the site through the parking lot here. We've
18 added a sidewalk that connects the existing
19 sidewalk along 7th Avenue to this new sidewalk
20 that we have added in the center of the site that
21 will allow people to get access from 7th Avenue to
22 Illinois Avenue.

23 What's not shown on this plan, and which
24 I'll address in a few minutes, is the addition of

1 a new sidewalk that connects the termination of
2 the existing sidewalk along Illinois Avenue to the
3 intersection of 7th and Illinois. So I think that
4 this plan illustrates the way that we've tried
5 to address the pedestrian environment.

6 Going back to the landscape site plan for
7 a minute, we are respecting all of the setbacks
8 around the site. One of the staff comments
9 regarding landscaping was that we need three
10 additional shade trees along 7th Avenue. I think
11 it would make sense to put them along this portion
12 of the site down here.

13 There was also a staff comment regarding
14 the lighting levels, especially alongside 7th
15 Avenue, and the preliminary plan that our lighting
16 designer put together indicates that we get up to
17 about 3, 3 1/2 foot candles along 7th Avenue. We
18 have already talked to our lighting designer about
19 reducing that to a half a foot candle along 7th
20 Avenue. So we'll be making those changes as well.

21 There were a couple of things that we were
22 asked to consider, which we did, and decided
23 otherwise on, and I'd like to spend a minute to go
24 through those.

1 One is illustrated on the left-hand side
2 here which was whether or not to have access from
3 St. Mark's Church parking lot directly on Illinois
4 Avenue. So right now there's a current access
5 into the site right here. We were asked to
6 consider getting rid of that and just leaving one
7 access point here on Illinois Avenue.

8 The result of that in order to allow for
9 stacking and make this a safe condition coming out
10 here is that in order to get into St. Mark's
11 Church lot, we have our first kind of cross-access
12 point up here which creates a kind of rather large
13 dead-end parking lot area at the end here.

14 The other thing that it does is it takes
15 away, what works out very well right now for the
16 early childhood program that they have, with a
17 pickup and drop off that allows them to stack
18 cars, you know, and get a clean pickup and
19 drop off along the driver's side along this side
20 area of the site here and then exit directly onto
21 Illinois Avenue.

22 This currently is a right-turn only exit
23 out onto Illinois Avenue, and we would propose to
24 leave that. So because of the dead-end parking

1 condition that we end up with with this
2 configuration and because of the circulation
3 through the site for the early childhood pickup
4 and drop off, we would prefer to leave the
5 existing access point to the St. Mark's Church
6 along Illinois.

7 Another thing that we were asked to
8 consider was rotating the parking in this portion
9 of the site 90 degrees. I think that if you
10 compare this now to the plan that we've developed,
11 the plan that we've developed is actually a safer
12 configuration than what you see here. The theory
13 in this was that people get out of their car, and
14 they can walk up towards the building but not
15 everybody is crossing a large, major road here.

16 If you go back to our site plan, you can
17 see it here, that with these major sidewalks that
18 come through the site now, we think that this
19 limits the number of pedestrian crossings across
20 what's likely to be a fairly busy area just with
21 ingress and egress to the site. So it limits the
22 pedestrian crossings which we think makes it a
23 safer condition. So we'd prefer to leave the
24 setup that way for that reason.

1 The other thing that we were asked to
2 consider was adding the sidewalk that connects the
3 currently dead-end sidewalk here on Illinois
4 Street -- on Illinois Avenue on here to the corner
5 over here.

6 The drawing that you see here is a drawing
7 from our engineering drawings. We have given
8 these to our construction manager to price out, so
9 we're pricing this out as an alternate. We want
10 to see what it would cost.

11 But based on the engineering that our
12 civil engineer has done, we would need a 150-foot
13 long, 3-foot high retaining wall along this edge
14 of the sidewalk in order to maintain this sidewalk
15 as an accessible route and still take care of the
16 stormwater detention that we have in this area
17 here.

18 So we think that a 3-foot high retaining
19 wall along this edge of the sidewalk here, we can
20 design it to look nice, but we still think that
21 it's not going to be as nice as the berm that's
22 along that -- that landscape berm that's along
23 there right now.

24 We also think that because of the sidewalk

1 access that we've provided connecting this
2 intersection here of Illinois Avenue -- along 7th
3 Avenue to Illinois Avenue here, that we have taken
4 care of the concern about the pedestrian -- about
5 pedestrians along 7th Avenue being able to get to
6 this point on Illinois Avenue. So, again, we'd
7 ask your consideration to be able to leave that
8 condition as it exists out there right now.

9 Here's a close-up of the landscaped area
10 of the site plan at the building entry. I won't
11 go into this in detail. I just want to point out
12 this kind of highlights the terrace garden that
13 slopes down and provides natural light into the
14 children's area down below, but it also provides a
15 fairly nice, we think, pedestrian environment
16 leading up to the front door of the library.

17 Here's the floor plan. Nothing of
18 significance has changed here. The only thing --
19 a couple of things I want to point out here: One,
20 is I want to reinforce, again, the idea of this
21 access from the front entry that runs through the
22 Carnegie building as a way of reintegrating the
23 Carnegie Library into the daily activities of the
24 library building.

1 The other thing I want to point out is
2 this is a screen wall -- this is our service area
3 up here. This is a screen wall that we have
4 lengthened and increased the height of in response
5 to comments that we got at the Plan Commission
6 hearing.

7 The other thing we did -- there was also a
8 concern for the library vehicles that you often
9 see parked up in front of the building here.
10 We've reserved two spots kind of in the interior
11 of the site here across from where the drive-up
12 window is located that will be reserved for the
13 library to park their library vehicles.

14 Here is the lower-level plan. I think the
15 thing this best illustrates is that garden area
16 that lets natural light into the children's area
17 down below, and then this is the mezzanine level
18 that illustrates the -- if you've not been up
19 there, it's worth a visit -- the great meeting
20 room that sits on top of the Carnegie building at
21 one end of the building.

22 And then this is underneath our new roof
23 area, and I'll highlight this in a minute, but
24 this is a new teen area that we think is going to

1 be a kind of equally dynamic space. It's kind of
2 a complement to the Carnegie meeting room on the
3 other end of the building.

4 These elevations are the ones that we
5 presented at the last meeting, and I just want to
6 use this to highlight a couple of comments that
7 were made of things that need to be improved. One
8 was to make an improvement at the entry part of
9 the building here.

10 The strong idea that we had about the
11 access running through the building connecting the
12 Carnegie gets kind of lost in this elevation.
13 There was concern, that we shared, for the octagon
14 configuration that's kind of a leftover from the
15 existing library building that's there right now.

16 Then also spending a little more time
17 focusing on the north elevation along Main Street
18 and this -- this data line that's very strong that
19 kind of runs through and integrating our new
20 addition better to that data line that really kind
21 of runs through the entire building.

22 So this was a sketch that we presented at
23 the last meeting that shows the proportion study
24 that we did and how we were using the proportions

1 of the existing Carnegie Library to inform our new
2 entry piece. This was the piece that got lost in
3 our design that respects that access that runs all
4 the way through the center of the Carnegie on the
5 other side. I think it was a good suggestion that
6 we reintroduce that in to the building.

7 So here you see a rendering that shows the
8 way we've introduced that. This is looking right
9 down that access, so we've reintroduced that tall
10 window here. This looks dark, but it's just in
11 shadow up here. This is actually open all the way
12 up. Then you can see through the building here
13 the access that runs back to the Carnegie building
14 itself.

15 I'm just going to go through a couple of
16 the other exterior views to show you the way that
17 we developed the architecture.

18 Here's the entry as you walk up to it.
19 You can see that new dormer piece on the
20 right-hand side.

21 This is standing where the existing
22 octagon canopy is on the building right now
23 looking across the new courtyard and down into the
24 children's area and at the new entry piece that

1 we've got on the other side here. You can also
2 see in the foreground here a reshaped canopy
3 piece, and I'll show you more about that in a
4 second.

5 This is the lower level of the children's
6 area. In working with our landscape architect,
7 we're trying to develop a natural environment down
8 here that might include boulders that the kids
9 could sit and climb on down there as well. That's
10 going to be a great program space for the
11 children's area outside.

12 This shot, I think, shows pretty well the
13 changes that we've made to that octagon piece
14 that's on the end of the building here right now.
15 Essentially, we're squaring it off. So if you
16 look down below here, this is the octagon piece
17 that exists right now. We have to maintain that
18 at the grade level because there's actually a
19 mechanical room underneath that we have to
20 maintain.

21 What we're doing is we're taking off the
22 octagon portion of it. We're reshaping this, and
23 we're doing so while maintaining -- keeping the
24 existing structure that underlies the roof that's

1 up there right now so that we don't have to
2 rebuild all that. But I think that this form is a
3 better complement. It really doesn't compete now
4 with the entry the way the last -- the way the
5 octagon piece did in the past.

6 Here you can also start to get a sense of
7 what it's like to walk up to the building, be able
8 to see down into the courtyard and into the
9 children's area.

10 This is a view that shows the new addition
11 in the foreground. Here you can see the Carnegie
12 building in the background and start to get a
13 sense, I think, of how these two pieces will be
14 complementary pieces on the building when it's
15 developed.

16 Here's a view from the opposite side that,
17 I think, shows the same thing, the Carnegie in the
18 foreground here and the new teen area that we have
19 in the background here. This also shows the
20 elevation along Main Street, and I'll show this in
21 more detail in a minute.

22 But you can see here, I think, that it's
23 fairly simple, and that's by intention. The
24 highlights are the two end pieces of this, and we

1 want something that is a good connector between
2 the two but not really something that will compete
3 with it.

4 So here are the revised elevations. Here
5 is the entry elevation or the east elevation that
6 shows that new dormer piece that we have focused
7 on the access to the Carnegie Library. You can
8 also see on the left-hand side here the
9 reconfiguration of the octagon canopy.

10 Then down below here, this is the north
11 elevation. I apologize. We've got some
12 duplication of text here, but this is a stone band
13 that runs over the top. And then these windows
14 are all into back-of-house areas, staff areas, and
15 service areas along the building.

16 It's subtle, but we're using the brick --
17 we're patterning the brick on this side of the
18 building to pick up on the same proportions that
19 we have through the windows that I showed on that
20 study that we did of the Carnegie building
21 as well.

22 Here you can also see the way we're taking
23 that data line that runs through the building. We
24 have extended it now -- this is an existing roof

1 that's in the background. We're extending that
2 same fascia piece across here. It then drops down
3 just a little bit here in order to get us a little
4 bit of cover at the windows and then runs across
5 here. So we think that we've better integrated
6 that data line into the addition that we have here
7 as well.

8 Here you might also be able to tell that
9 we've lengthened that screen wall. This is that
10 service area along the north side of the building
11 as well.

12 And I just want to close with a couple of
13 other renderings that give you a better
14 understanding about how the inside and the outside
15 of this building work together.

16 So this is coming into the building, into
17 the new lobby where we've carved out a two-story
18 space. This is on that same access, and you can
19 see the effect that the tall window that we've
20 added on the outside of the building is actually
21 quite dynamic from inside the building as well as
22 outside.

23 This is if you turn around and look down
24 towards the Carnegie. At the end here, this will

1 all be art display and new books along this. So
2 this will be a very active hallway back here, and
3 it's shown a little dark right now, but we're
4 working on how do we really accent that
5 termination of the Carnegie at the end of this
6 access.

7 This is the way we're proposing to kind of
8 take advantage of the two-story space that's in
9 the library right now by re-imagining it as kind
10 of a seating area, introducing a new fireplace and
11 wall that becomes kind of an anchor in the space,
12 if you will, and gives it a kind of presence that
13 it lacks right now.

14 Beyond that, you can see this is a new
15 meeting room that we're adding and windows on it
16 on both sides of the meeting room that add to the
17 transparency and being able to see both into the
18 building from outside as you're coming up to the
19 entry but also out when you're inside.

20 This is a view of that area at the bottom
21 of the terrace inside the children's area. You
22 can see the transparency, again, out to that
23 garden space on the outside.

24 And then finally, this is that space atop

1 our new addition that we view as kind of a
2 complement to the space on top of the Carnegie
3 right now that would be a dedicated team in the
4 building.

5 So that's our presentation. I'm happy to
6 answer any questions that you have.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Questions?

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: I just had a question
9 on the site plan.

10 MR. MCKAY: Sure.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: I appreciate all the
12 changes you've made to the site plan but also the
13 building. The thing that I still don't agree with
14 is the access, the second access to Illinois.

15 Even though you're saying it's going to be
16 a right out, it looks like it's a full access. So
17 unless that driveway is narrowed to only fit one
18 car, it's going to be a full access. People are
19 going to turn left, and you have people coming up
20 the primary driveway, and I think there's going to
21 be a conflict.

22 So I would still encourage -- I would say
23 at the end of the drive out where you've
24 changed -- where you're dead ending as the option

1 that you were considering --

2 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- I would say you
4 would turn left or turn east and connect to the
5 primary driveway.

6 MR. MCKAY: Let me make sure I understand
7 that correctly. So this is the site plan. This
8 is that dead-end condition I was referring to.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right.

10 MR. MCKAY: So you're suggesting --

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Turn east back to --
12 turn east back to the driveway.

13 MR. MCKAY: Turn right here?

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah.

15 MR. MCKAY: Yeah. I think that doesn't
16 work very well as far as other cars that are
17 coming down here. It's too close to the corner.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would say no
19 different than what you're proposing or, in fact,
20 it has to be better because you're eliminating two
21 people coming up to the same intersection and
22 wanting to do something simultaneously and
23 figuring out who has the right-of-way.

24 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: That would be --

2 MR. MCKAY: Thank you.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- one suggestion.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, Tom.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. If
7 you go back to the north elevation.

8 MR. MCKAY: Sure.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: So looking at -- you talk
10 about the data lines and how they line up with the
11 existing structure, you know, which I agree is a
12 good idea. I like the way that you continue that
13 access through to create the illusion of the
14 entrance. I think, you know, from a visual
15 perspective, I think it works a lot better than
16 the original design.

17 My only concern is the size, and, you
18 know, I understood what you're doing with the
19 teenage room upstairs. You're trying to create
20 that vaulting, but I think the proportions are a
21 little bit skewed when you balance from right to
22 left. You can see here on this elevation where
23 this roof just -- it looks so massive, and it
24 looks so out of a character with the rest of the

1 building.

2 I wonder if there is a way to kind of
3 downplay it a little bit so it doesn't overtake
4 the entire structure, and to balance from east to
5 west would be, I think, nice if there was a way to
6 incorporate that.

7 MR. MCKAY: I understand what you're
8 saying, and I think that we've tried to be aware
9 and conscious of that as we have developed it. I
10 think one of the differences between the Carnegie
11 side and the new side is that it's a big roof, but
12 it's sloping at a fairly steep pitch.

13 So in this elevation where it looks -- it
14 has that appearance of being very tall, especially
15 relative to the Carnegie, I think the reality, and
16 I'm not sure if we've got a -- you know, the
17 reality is when you're down, you know, at grade
18 level looking at it, the way that roof recedes as
19 it goes up, it doesn't appear as tall.

20 In other words, if this were a big gable
21 where that ridgeline came all the way out, it
22 would have a very massive appearance; but I think
23 it's a matter -- we thought it was a matter of
24 perception. And so I think even from this view,

1 which is actually taken a little bit elevated,
2 this is not even, you know, at a pedestrian eye
3 level, this is actually up a little bit, and you
4 can see the way this is really the dominant
5 feature because the roof recedes there.

6 So we're after the same thing that you're
7 talking about. It's something that was
8 complementary; and we thought that given the
9 difference in geometry that we had on this
10 addition, that we were accomplishing that.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Do you have a view from the
12 north looking, I would say, south from North
13 Avenue?

14 MR. MCKAY: We do, but I am afraid that is
15 an aerial view.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah, right there.

17 MR. MCKAY: You know, which is not the --
18 this is not the view I'm trying to sell what I'm
19 talking about.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, you know, if there's
21 a way to see what it looks like from the -- you
22 have the model north already.

23 MR. MCKAY: Yep.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: It would be nice to see

1 what it's going to look like from the back and
2 seeing --

3 MR. MCKAY: Yep, yep.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: -- if what you're saying is
5 true.

6 MR. MCKAY: Yeah. Well, like I said, I
7 think the best evidence of it are probably, you
8 know, a couple of views like this.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Right.

10 MR. MCKAY: Like this one, right, where
11 you can kind of see the dominance of that gable
12 piece in the foreground. This is going to be a
13 major view, I think, because of where the parking
14 is located in the building.

15 Then I think the other one is, you know,
16 this one and the one that I showed earlier, where
17 we really think that -- I think that the addition
18 of that dormer with the roof that slopes back and
19 really getting the elevation of that kind of
20 exaggerated in a way on there. It's great inside
21 the building when you're looking out in that
22 direction, but I think it also helps to minimize
23 the presence of that large hip roof on the end of
24 the building.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: What's the material?

2 What's the roofing material?

3 MR. MCKAY: Asphalt shingles. So that was
4 another change that we made based on a comment
5 that I think you made. We were indicating
6 imitation slate shingles which are plastic, and we
7 got some samples of them, and we decided that we
8 were probably not going to like the way that
9 looked when you got -- you know, this building,
10 you're going to be able to get up fairly close and
11 see the roofing material.

12 So, you know, asphalt shingles have come a
13 long way. We're proposing to use something that
14 has a much more substantial character than the
15 kind of traditional asphalt singles that you see
16 on residential roofing. It gives us a greater
17 range in terms of color selection and things like
18 that as well.

19 We considered things like a metal roof.
20 It didn't really seem to make any sense. I think
21 if we had our druthers on this, we'd put on a
22 genuine slate roof. I think the cost is just
23 prohibitive to do that. You know, wood shingles
24 just don't hold up well. For an institutional

1 building like this, it's just not a good choice.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: On where you are taking a
4 look at adding that sidewalk along Illinois --

5 MR. MCKAY: Yep.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: -- and you have, you know,
7 the potential three-foot retaining wall. My
8 concern would be that if in the end that --
9 because right now you're taking a look at it to
10 see whether you should move forward and put that
11 in versus just the elimination and using the other
12 sidewalk.

13 MR. MCKAY: That's correct.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: My concern would be that
15 if, in fact, that sidewalk is not put in, that the
16 potential for people, pedestrians to walk along
17 the street instead of going around or just trying
18 to walk on the grass for whatever reason, that
19 something with landscaping is thought of to kind
20 of give a directional, so if somebody is
21 attempting to do that, it forces them to that
22 sidewalk to come around.

23 MR. MCKAY: Yep.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: That would be a concern

1 that I would have.

2 MR. MCKAY: So one of the ways we could
3 solve this is just put a concrete sidewalk over
4 the berm that's there right now. The problem is
5 it's not an accessible slope in order to do that.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

7 MR. MCKAY: So, you know, that would be a
8 way of addressing the pedestrian concern other
9 than making it accessible.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm just concerned that if
11 there is nothing there and it's just a little
12 berm --

13 MR. MCKAY: Yep. I mean the other
14 thing --

15 MEMBER PRETZ: -- what can be done --

16 MR. MCKAY: Right.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: -- from a landscaping
18 perspective --

19 MR. MCKAY: Well, that's --

20 MEMBER PRETZ: -- to give it direction.

21 MR. MCKAY: Yes. That's what I was going
22 to ask about is what if we treated it less like a
23 concrete sidewalk and more like a landscape path,
24 you know, whether it was crushed stone or, you

1 know, something along there to accommodate people
2 who are walking there, but clearly that's not an
3 accessible route.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Could it just be
5 signage?

6 MR. MCKAY: Is that a compromise.
7 I'm sorry?

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Could it just be
9 signage? The gravel, I think -- I mean it's an
10 okay idea but not for a public way.

11 MR. MCKAY: Yep. So you're suggesting if
12 we just put in a concrete sidewalk and put a sign
13 there indicating that it's not accessible?

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, either do that or
15 just end up not doing the sidewalk, just have
16 signs that direct people so that they know --

17 MR. MCKAY: Oh, sure, sure.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- that that is the
19 route to get over to 7th.

20 MR. MCKAY: Absolutely. Absolutely.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: You could put a sign on
22 each end that directs them to do that.

23 MR. MCKAY: Absolutely.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think that would be a

1 better solution than a gravel sidewalk or
2 something like that.

3 MR. MCKAY: Yeah.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Because it's not going
5 to be maintainable.

6 MEMBER BECKER: Well, I guess my comment
7 is related to the sidewalk that you're showing.
8 If there's a grade change and there's stairs, I
9 think that would be a challenge for people with
10 mobility issues; and I think the sidewalk along
11 Illinois, for whatever engineering challenges they
12 present, I think it's really important to have it
13 be accessible to all types of people to come to
14 the library. So I think that should be, you know,
15 a major goal.

16 The sidewalk with the stairway is great,
17 but it would prevent people with challenges
18 from -- and talk about gravel or any other thing,
19 that wouldn't be ADA accessible either.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: But the interior sidewalk
21 would be accessible; right?

22 MR. MCKAY: Yes. I think --

23 MEMBER PRETZ: You don't have a grade
24 issue there.

1 MR. MCKAY: -- there are some existing
2 steps here right now, and what I'm not sure of
3 offhand is whether the grade on this side of the
4 detention pond is such that it would make it
5 easier to put in an accessible route here without
6 these steps. If we could to that, would that
7 address your concern?

8 MEMBER BECKER: Well, specifically for
9 that place, that location --

10 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

11 MEMBER BECKER: -- as long as there's
12 access from that side of the property, yes.

13 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can you go back to the
15 northwest view.

16 MR. MCKAY: Northeast?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Either one.

18 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The view that you
20 showed here on the sidewalk, I know that right
21 there is green space between Route 64 and the
22 sidewalk. Is there an intent to -- would the
23 sidewalk be changed --

24 MR. MCKAY: No.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- or is that just a
2 product of this program?

3 MR. MCKAY: Yes, it's a product of the
4 illustration, yes.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. On your plan for
6 the trees, there are two trees that are currently
7 existing in the parkway between the sidewalk and
8 the street that have access through them.

9 Are those intended to be removed?

10 MR. MCKAY: Sorry. I want to make sure
11 I've got the -- I think that's information that
12 probably shows up more clearly on the
13 documentation that was submitted, but I'm not sure
14 I have it clearly in the presentation material I
15 have here. So are you referring to trees along
16 Main Street here?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: In a minute, yes.

18 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But I'm talking more
20 where the sidewalk hits the public sidewalk up
21 there.

22 MR. MCKAY: This area here, yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There are two trees to
24 the north of the public sidewalk between the

1 sidewalk and the street.

2 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: A 32-inch and a
4 24-inch, Siberian elms, both of them, and there's
5 another Siberian elm that looks like is on the
6 property, also a 32-inch.

7 MR. MCKAY: Okay. Offhand I can think of
8 no reason that we would have to take those trees
9 out based on the plan changes that we were making
10 here.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

12 MR. MCKAY: But I would like to confirm
13 that with our landscape architect.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Now, the other
15 issue I have, and I brought this up at the concept
16 plan review but it looks like it wasn't really
17 considered, was the addition, the addition on the
18 north along Main Street.

19 I have issues regarding the safety of
20 pressing pedestrian -- a pedestrian walkway so
21 close to Main Street. I mean, as it is right now,
22 it's narrow between the bushes and Main Street.
23 And I've seen people when they're walking in
24 groups along that sidewalk be almost on the

1 street.

2 My concern is putting that new addition
3 there, and I'm assuming that you're going to be
4 putting some landscaping between the addition and
5 the sidewalk. It's not just going to be nothing.

6 MR. MCKAY: No. I assume that there's
7 landscaping there as well, and we are not changing
8 the sidewalk along North Avenue.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. I understand. I
10 understand.

11 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I understand, but what
13 I am saying is that there is a structure there,
14 and then there's landscaping that is right next to
15 the sidewalk. The only space that people are
16 going to have is the sidewalk basically from the
17 south edge of the sidewalk to Main Street to walk.

18 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm just questioning
20 how pedestrian friendly that is. Especially, if
21 you have landscaping that may very well grow as
22 landscaping tends to do to further push pedestrian
23 traffic towards Main Street.

24 MR. MCKAY: So I think this is a matter of

1 making the right judgment on it. So right now if
2 we look at this plan, the setback is 5 feet back
3 from the property line. That's where our building
4 is located. I assume that the property line is
5 along the edge of the sidewalk. That would be
6 where it would typically be located, along the
7 edge of the sidewalk.

8 Assuming that to be the case, that means
9 we've got 5 feet of landscape to work with along
10 the north side of the building, and I'm sure that
11 we can come up with some planting materials there
12 that would be a nice landscape buffer without
13 having to worry about them encroaching on the
14 sidewalk there.

15 And it's going to require a certain amount
16 of maintenance, I mean, as will the rest of the
17 site. I think that, you know, one of the things
18 the library does a very good job of, I think, is
19 maintain their landscaping on the site.

20 So, you know, we've already pulled the
21 north wall of that addition back in order to
22 respect the 5-foot setback that's there right now,
23 and we have found a way to make that work in the
24 floor plan inside. It's really tight to pull that

1 back any further.

2 So I'm not sure that we're making the
3 existing condition any worse than it is. Our goal
4 would be to make it better, but to do so by
5 leaving the sidewalk where it's at right now.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I'm just going to
7 make a suggestion. I mean, it seems that the
8 library, as proposed, is basically going to have
9 effectively three fronts. You know, there's a
10 front on Fifth Avenue where the front of the
11 Carnegie is, of the library, the front on Main
12 Street by necessity, and then there's the new
13 front facing to the east.

14 In making all of these changes, why
15 wouldn't thought be given to taking the service
16 entrance and moving it to the only place that
17 could be considered the back of the library, which
18 is where you're going to be parking trucks anyway.

19 MR. MCKAY: See, we view this as a
20 four-sided building. We don't think there is a
21 back of the building here. The fact is --

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: By putting the service
23 entrance right next to the main entrance?

24 MR. MCKAY: It's not right next to the

1 main entrance, and I think we're taking a lot
2 of -- we're making a lot of effort to conceal it
3 there to make sure that it's out of sight.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But at the same time,
5 you're removing how many trees that are
6 currently --

7 MR. MCKAY: I think five -- I think five
8 trees along Main Street here. That's a function
9 not of the service drive. That's a function of
10 the addition that we're putting on along the north
11 side.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I count 13 trees at
13 least on this plan --

14 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- that are X'd out.

16 MR. MCKAY: I know that there are five
17 mature trees along the site there. I'm not sure
18 about the other ones that you're referring to.

19 But to address your question about the
20 back side of the building, we really don't see
21 this as a back side of the building. I'm sure
22 that St. Mark's, which considers this entry here
23 to be more or less their front door most of the
24 time, I'm sure they don't consider this to be the

1 back side of the building here as well.

2 Our decision to locate the two library
3 vehicles in this island back here was that we
4 thought it was fairly well concealed from
5 everything else. It's kind of buried in the site.
6 There are two existing trees there right now, and,
7 you know, some new landscaping that we're putting
8 in there right now as well. We thought that was a
9 pretty good compromise to try to get them out of
10 public view, if you will.

11 But, you know, the reality is so much of
12 our parking is down here. This view coming up to
13 the building or even, you know, moving through the
14 parking lot, I think this view of the building,
15 there's not a whole lot we can do with it because
16 it's all existing.

17 We are trying to improve the character by
18 changing the octagon piece here and doing
19 something all along this site here, not just the
20 entry piece itself with the plaza and the garden
21 piece that we're introducing here. We're trying
22 to do something that attracts your attention here
23 instead of the '60s and '80s building facades that
24 are there right now. But it's hard to imagine

1 this as a service area for the building.

2 I think we thought that by putting our
3 entry on this side of the addition that unless
4 you're walking along -- unless you're coming to
5 the library by walking along Main Street here and
6 crossing this sidewalk to come in, it's the only
7 time that you're really going to cross that
8 service drive. We thought we did a pretty good
9 job of kind of keeping it out of view and out of
10 the way of typical pedestrian access in and out of
11 the building.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I guess -- I mean
13 I'm not an architect, I don't pretend to be, but
14 one of the other things that I see when I look at
15 the library, and I think this was even a portion
16 of the concept plan, is that -- when was the
17 addition done, in the '60s?

18 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's one of the most
20 dated looking portions of the library. If the
21 library had their druthers and could get rid of
22 something, that would probably be the portion they
23 would get rid of.

24 MR. MCKAY: It might be in their future.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But now I see the new
2 addition going on, and it's a similar style. It's
3 one story with a flat roof that's sticking out the
4 other side of the library, and I think that it's
5 mirroring the least attractive portion of the
6 library. I guess I don't really understand that.
7 As I said, I'm not an architect, so please feel
8 free to explain.

9 MR. MCKAY: Let me help you out. So I
10 think that your -- the significant thing, I think,
11 that you're ignoring in your analysis is the
12 dynamic character of what we're putting on the
13 building here as a complement to what happens on
14 the Carnegie on the other side.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I'm talking more
16 the view from Fifth Avenue and 64 towards the
17 library. I'm not talking about the back. The
18 side towards the parking lot, I think, what you've
19 done there I really like. I'm talking about the
20 view from 64 to Fifth Avenue and specifically that
21 addition towards Main Street.

22 MR. MCKAY: I guess I'm not sure I'm
23 following what you're suggesting. Are you
24 suggesting that we modify this side of the

1 building?

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, no, not all. Go to
3 the northwest view of the building and you can --
4 maybe I can better explain what I'm talking about.

5 What I see -- yeah, right here.

6 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And what I see here is
8 a wing of the building that sticks out in front of
9 the Carnegie Library, obviously, which was built
10 many, many years ago. Then I see a new addition
11 that's going up towards Main Street, to me, just
12 the layman observer, the same thing being
13 continued on the other side of that original
14 Carnegie Library. And I guess my question would
15 be what is the necessity of doing it that way, or
16 what is the thought of doing it that way?

17 MR. MCKAY: So the thought -- it is
18 intentional. I mean, you're right to read it that
19 way. It is intentional. We do think that it will
20 be done better than the '60s and the '80s
21 additions. We think that proportioning the
22 windows, the brick patterning, the stone coping
23 with the inscribed lettering of St. Charles
24 Library is going to give it a much more elegant

1 character than what you have on the '60s and '80s
2 additions on the other side of the building.

3 But it is intentional that we're trying to
4 downplay that relative to the Carnegie on the one
5 side and the new addition that we're putting on
6 the other side of the building.

7 So we're trying to strike a balance there
8 between doing something that is -- that looks
9 good. It's got to look good. It's going to be
10 very noticeable when you're driving along North
11 Avenue, but we also don't want it to detract from
12 what we see as the two feature pieces on the
13 building, and especially where it's directly
14 adjacent to the Carnegie.

15 I mean, if I were to give credit to the
16 '60s and '80s buildings, you know, aesthetically
17 in some way, it would be that they did nothing to
18 really detract from the power of the Carnegie
19 building there. You know, they are clearly
20 background buildings. We are trying to strike
21 something of a balance.

22 You know, we've added on to buildings on
23 the National Register of Historic Places where you
24 have to follow the secretary of the interior's

1 guidelines; and when you're dealing with an
2 historic building, they're very clear about, you
3 know, trying to make sure that whatever you add on
4 to that historic building doesn't compete with or
5 look like it was, you know, designed as part of
6 the original building as well.

7 So I think that's the balance we're trying
8 to strike. I think if there's a concern for lack
9 of detail on that north elevation or something, I
10 think that, you know, we could look at ways of,
11 you know, ornamenting the brick a little bit more
12 or creating something, you know, a little more
13 visually interesting along the north side there.

14 I don't know. I feel like I'm rambling a
15 little bit here. I'm not sure if I'm addressing
16 the concern that you have.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You're getting
18 there.

19 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You're getting
21 there. That's how I'm feeling.

22 I've had a concern since our last meeting
23 about that elevation, and this view that we see
24 here is -- I mean, it's striking, and it's

1 attractive, but that's not a view that anybody
2 will ever, ever see.

3 MR. MCKAY: No.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Nor will they see
5 the view from -- the west view, looking
6 northwest -- southwest at the building. Nobody
7 will see that.

8 MR. MCKAY: That's right.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What people are
10 going to see as they're driving down Main Street
11 is a cell block right up against the street. You
12 won't even -- you show an elevation of -- you show
13 that north elevation.

14 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You've got the
16 windows, you know, across the top and the windows
17 in the addition. Nobody will ever, ever see that
18 because they will be on Main Street, and there's
19 really no place you could go on Main Street to get
20 a good view of that. You'll never see that view
21 from anywhere.

22 MR. MCKAY: Right.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So I guess what
24 we're -- where I'm going with it is that I believe

1 what you just described by articulating that
2 surface better because when I'm sitting in my car,
3 which we often do right there heading east, you're
4 sitting at the light at 7th, and you're going to
5 look at a building that's less than 15 feet away
6 from you.

7 So a better articulation on that elevation
8 and also keep as much of the landscaping there as
9 you possibly can because that's going to soften
10 it. All we're going to see is a wall, a brick
11 wall with some windows in it, and it looks kind of
12 like a cell block. So I guess that's where I was
13 headed with what Todd is trying to say. We're
14 never going to see anything like that.

15 I also want to say I love everything else.
16 I mean, I think this is a great. I know what
17 you're done by bringing that view all the way
18 through to the Carnegie. That's fabulous. I like
19 what you've done in this new iteration where you
20 have the big entrance on the east elevation that
21 actually looks all the way through.

22 I like how you've shared with St. Mark's
23 the parking. I like the changes you've made in
24 the parking lot to stop, you know, free flow of

1 pedestrians walking anywhere they want. That's
2 the one thing, that if you could do something with
3 that elevation, that would be great.

4 MR. MCKAY: Well, I think we can. I think
5 that we can articulate the brickwork in this panel
6 to give it a kind of character that clearly
7 distinguishes it from the '60s and the '80s
8 building. So we've done that before. I have
9 great confidence that we can do that.

10 What I want to make sure of is that we're
11 not trying to make this elevation kind of the
12 equal of the two end additions that we have here
13 right now.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Understood.
15 Understood.

16 MR. MCKAY: Okay.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because you're not
18 going to see them when you're sitting next to them
19 anyway.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And just to tally my
21 concerns, I mean, I was -- my two biggest concerns
22 are, just as Tim said, having that structure so
23 close to 64 and not only the, you know, perception
24 concerns when people are driving by but also

1 safety concerns; and the other thing is losing all
2 of those trees. I know that it's necessary if
3 you're going to put an addition there, but I'd be
4 curious to know if the library board actually knew
5 that they were losing so many trees by doing this.

6 MR. MCKAY: Yes. The library board feels
7 the same way that you feel about it, the same way
8 that we feel about it, the same way our landscape
9 architect feels about it; and I think we're hoping
10 that the other improvements that we're making to
11 the site, not just in terms of the architecture,
12 but also in terms of the landscaping features, the
13 entry feature, and the sunken garden that gives
14 access to the children, we're hoping that those
15 improvements are enough to compensate for the, you
16 know, losses like this.

17 You know, we're proposing two relatively
18 small building additions, and one of the things
19 that we considered was we knew we couldn't meet
20 the program requirements without a portion of it
21 being two stories. So we considered the section
22 along North Avenue -- along Main Street to be the
23 two-story area. We thought by keeping it one
24 story, that we were not -- we were actually making

1 it a better environment along Main Street as
2 opposed to having a two-story wall there.

3 So I think what we didn't anticipate is
4 the comparison of that to the '60s and '80s
5 building. We don't want to do that in any way.
6 You know, we want to be complementary and kind of
7 honor the architecture of the Carnegie building.
8 We have no such desire when it comes to the other
9 two buildings. We want to distinguish ourselves
10 from that.

11 So we thought that -- that's a perception
12 of this that, frankly, we didn't see before
13 tonight. I understand your concerns, and I do
14 think that it's a relatively easy fix to make to
15 give some articulation to that facade that it
16 lacks right now, that I think will address the
17 concerns that have been raised here tonight.

18 And from our point of view, it will go
19 further to distinguish this -- you know, any
20 perception that this looks like the '60s and '80s
21 building, frankly, we want to move away from that.
22 So I think, you know, that would be a good step
23 from our point of view.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that's a

1 great idea, and I think if you just keep in mind
2 where you're actually going to view that addition
3 from; and when you're there, you have that valley
4 of 64 between the building on the corner. It's
5 not very big.

6 MR. MCKAY: No, it's not.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any questions?

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a question.

10 Following Todd's questions regarding the
11 tree removal --

12 MR. MCKAY: Yes.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: -- on your plan showing
14 removing two parkway trees.

15 MR. MCKAY: Parkway trees along --

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Along Main Street.

17 MR. MCKAY: Okay. Yeah. I think those
18 are the two that Todd pointed out before.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right.

20 MR. MCKAY: That doesn't -- offhand that
21 doesn't make sense to me. I would have to double
22 check that, but offhand, I can see nothing that
23 we're doing in the improvements that we're
24 proposing that would require the removal of those

1 two trees. So we will take a look at that.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. And then also,
3 Todd, in the landscape plan, they are planting
4 that entire 5-foot area out with shrubs and also
5 it looks like five upright oak trees. So they're
6 not very big at the beginning but, ultimately,
7 they will create a different kind of feel and look
8 to that facade that, you know, you have voiced
9 some concern over.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
11 questions? Comments?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
14 from any member of the public?

15 Yes, ma'am, come on up.

16 MS. HALL-BABIS: It's probably a little
17 trite.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I know you weren't
19 sworn in because he was the only one to raise his
20 hand.

21 MS. HALL-BABIS: All I want to say is --

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wait.

23 (Witness sworn.)

24 MS. HALL-BABIS: Yes, that's why I'm

1 standing here. Anything else?

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And your name, please.

3 MS. HALL-BABIS: Kathy Hall-Babis

4 H-a-l-l -- B-a-b-i-s. I live at 245 Unionwood

5 Lane, West Chicago. I'm here because I'm the

6 administrator to Trinity Vineyard Christian

7 Fellowship, which is just across the street.

8 Anyway, the reason I'm standing here is

9 because you pronounce it Carnaygie (phonetic).

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

11 MS. HALL-BABIS: I just thought I'd set

12 the record straight.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. Any other

14 comments or questions?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything additional,

17 Ellen or Russ or anyone?

18 MS. JOHNSON: No.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Actually, we

20 will need to make a motion to close the public

21 hearing.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I move to close

23 the public hearing.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Moved and
2 seconded. Any discussion on that motion?

3 Tim, roll call.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

5 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 8b is
20 discussion and recommendation.

21 Is there discussion or a motion?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So we've had a lot

1 of discussion about potential, you know, concerns
2 that we have. How would we voice those in a
3 motion? As a recommendation? As directing us
4 to -- Ellen, go ahead.

5 MS. JOHNSON: It's up to the Plan
6 Commission. You could include those in your
7 motion as comments or consideration, or you could
8 include them as conditions of approval.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What considerations
10 would people be wanting to include?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well --

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm assuming it will be
13 a motion to recommend approval, but what
14 conditions would you --

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I don't know
16 if it would be conditions or comments. That's why
17 I'm discussing them.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because we've
20 talked extensively about the landscape. You know,
21 we're looking at a plan that shows trees being
22 removed; but yet there's, you know, some question
23 as to whether or not they really need to be. So
24 that's something that needs to be addressed. I

1 want to make sure that if they don't need to be
2 removed, they're not removed.

3 We've talked about, you know, articulating
4 the north elevation, and the applicant is
5 agreeable to doing that, and that should be so
6 noted, so.

7 MEMBER PRETZ: You had the sidewalk along
8 Illinois.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We have the
10 sidewalk and the sidewalk along Illinois. So all
11 of these things are important to our
12 recommendation, and I'm asking the Plan
13 Commission -- well, here's what I want to do.

14 I'd like to make a motion to recommend
15 approval to the planning and development committee
16 that the St. Charles public library, St. Charles
17 Public Library District, application for special
18 use for PUD and application for PUD preliminary
19 plan, and I would welcome an amendment to that
20 motion to include those items that were just
21 enumerated.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the motion is to
23 recommend approval. Is there a second?

24 MEMBER PRETZ: I second that subject --

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Subject to.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Staff comments.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Subject to resolution
4 of --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Resolution of all
6 staff comments.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is there a
8 second to that motion?

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. It's been moved
11 and seconded. So any discussion, or as was
12 suggested, amendments to the motion to add
13 commentary? Yes.

14 MEMBER BECKER: I move to amend the
15 original motion to include conditions for approval
16 related to further articulation of the northern
17 single-story building face, and preservation of
18 the existing trees along Main Street at all costs,
19 installation of a sidewalk on the Illinois Street
20 face or satisfactorily resolving the grade issue
21 of the existing sidewalk and stair configuration.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Illinois Avenue.

23 MEMBER BECKER: The Illinois Avenue second
24 access for St. Mark's. No?

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry. The
2 conditions that I have are the articulation on the
3 north one-story addition, preservation of the
4 existing trees along Route 64, installation of
5 sidewalk along Illinois Avenue on the southeast
6 portion of the property near the detention area.
7 Okay. And then --

8 MEMBER BECKER: And then --

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's your motion. Go
10 ahead.

11 MEMBER BECKER: I'm trying to figure it
12 out. And then configuration of the St. Mark's
13 access to be right-in -- right-out only.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'll second that.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So the motion
17 that is on the table right now is a motion to
18 amend. Is there any discussion on that motion?

19 MEMBER FUNKE: Can I just add something,
20 maybe that north sidewalk to get it away from
21 North Avenue. I think they do have a couple feet
22 of room from what I see on the site plan. We can
23 move it south a little bit.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Say that again. I'm

1 sorry.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: You had that concern about
3 the sidewalk being too close to North Avenue. I
4 think there is some room. They can actually move
5 it down. So they do have -- if you look at the
6 site plan that they propose, they do have a couple
7 feet that they can actually move it south towards
8 the building and still maintain that landscape
9 buffer.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is the sidewalk --
11 the sidewalk now is not on Main Street. It's not
12 right on the curb line.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: No.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: It's like a foot away from
15 the curb line.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: It's very close.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So the motion to
18 amend, who seconded it?

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I did.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you wish to add that
21 to your motion?

22 MEMBER BECKER: Consideration of moving
23 the sidewalk in the public right-of-way to the
24 south, if room permits.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. You agree?

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: I mean just for Jeff's
5 motion, it looks like there's a couple of feet
6 between the walk and the actual right-of-way line.
7 So the current location of the public walk is not
8 against the right-of-way line, so there is some
9 space now. That's where it's offsite and all
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: There is actually space
13 without impacting the 5-foot landscape area
14 between -- that's required based upon the setback.
15 The setback is from the right-of-way line not from
16 the sidewalk.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, sir.

18 MR. MCKAY: I'm not sure if this is
19 appropriate. I have one comment regarding what
20 I've heard, and that's regarding this portion
21 along -- the site along North Avenue. So the
22 motion I heard was to save the trees along North
23 Avenue at all costs, which would mean --

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As possible.

1 MR. MCKAY: Okay. All right. So I just
2 want to be clear about that, and then I'm afraid
3 that we might be getting some contradictory
4 direction. Reducing the landscaped area by moving
5 the sidewalk south and still trying to keep the
6 trees there and maintaining.

7 So I think, you know, that's fine. We'll
8 do the best -- you know, we'll do the best we can.
9 You know, my understanding is if we can get the
10 amount of landscape that you would like to see
11 along that north side and at the same time be able
12 to move the sidewalk a couple of feet south.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Without removing
14 the trees.

15 MR. MCKAY: So this is the part I want to
16 be clear on. Because if we keep the -- I think
17 they're elm trees along this, we're not going to
18 be able to put the addition on the north side of
19 the building.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No, no, no. I
21 understand.

22 MR. MCKAY: Yeah. Keep the two trees in
23 the parkway that are not in front of the --

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any of those

1 trees, if possible.

2 MR. MCKAY: We agree entirely. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So the
4 motion to amend is what's currently on the table,
5 and it would be to include the following
6 conditions for approval. That would be
7 articulation of the north one-story addition,
8 preservation of the existing trees as much as
9 possible, installation of the sidewalk or
10 correcting this part of that -- what was it?

11 MEMBER BECKER: Accommodating the sidewalk
12 as shown to meet -- to be accessible.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Should I say
14 installation of sidewalk correcting the grade to
15 accommodate ADA accessibility requirements?

16 MEMBER BECKER: That would be excellent.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And then
18 configure St. Mark's exit to be right out only,
19 that's on Illinois Avenue, and position the
20 sidewalk along Route 64, I put, as possible for
21 pedestrian safety. Does that make sense?

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. So
24 that's what the motion is. Yeah. Go ahead.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Regarding this
2 motion and going back to the applicant's comments,
3 you know, we have to be a little careful here
4 because we are giving some conflicting -- so
5 what's the priority? Keeping the trees or moving
6 the sidewalk? Because if moving the sidewalk is
7 going to --

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: In the area that we're
9 talking about moving the sidewalk adjacent to the
10 new addition, it has no impact on the trees we're
11 talking about.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But the connection
13 made --

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm sorry.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The connection
16 made where the sidewalk -- where the sidewalk
17 proposed back into -- I mean, you can move the
18 sidewalk. So are you just going to extend the
19 sidewalk on the northeast -- that northeast
20 corner? Are you just going to extend it?

21 You're going to move the whole sidewalk to
22 the south. So are you going to extend that, or
23 are you going to extend --

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think we're talking

1 more along --

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- where this --

4 MEMBER FUNKE: Tim, if you look at page 40
5 in your packet, you can see there is room in
6 between the landscaping that they're creating.
7 The addition is approximately 3, 4 feet that they
8 can actually move south towards that new
9 landscaping they're creating.

10 In that area of the new addition, you have
11 to get rid of the trees because of the foundation
12 or what have you. So we're saying in that area
13 where it's so close to Main Street, North Avenue,
14 is it possible to bring that down further south,
15 if possible, without getting rid of --

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So yes, I think it
17 would be extending the existing line further
18 south.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So those four
20 trees have to come out, but those trees aren't the
21 trees that are there now.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Those are not --
24 and if you look at the plan that shows all the

1 trees that are there now, there are more than
2 that. There are trees to the south of that or to
3 the west of that addition that --

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Go to page 30.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 30?

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: 38.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: They're indicating all
9 the trees that are being removed. So the trees
10 that we have this concern, with these Elm trees,
11 are a little bit further to the east of the
12 addition. That's what we're talking about.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The two trees to
14 the west of the addition, how are those going to
15 impact these two trees when we start moving the
16 sidewalk?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right here. I
19 mean, are you just going to make a jog here and go
20 back, or are you going to move the sidewalk?

21 So my concern is that you may put other
22 trees in harm's way by moving the sidewalk. So is
23 the priority saving trees or moving the sidewalk?
24 That's my only concern about the motion, and I

1 think we should make that clear to the applicant.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, sir.

3 MR. MCKAY: I'm sorry. One more comment.
4 I'm just looking at the landscape architect's plan
5 regarding those two Elm trees with the access
6 through that are in the parkway out there right
7 now.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Those are to the
9 east of the addition.

10 MR. MCKAY: That's right. And their
11 condition is noted as poor. So we had an arborist
12 take a look at the trees that are out there right
13 now. I'm sure what's why she is -- she will not
14 take down a healthy tree. I'm sure that's why she
15 is recommending to take them down.

16 So this might be a question for the City.
17 You know, if they're in poor condition, would you
18 prefer that we leave them there?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And then my
20 question would be the two trees that are to the
21 east -- west of the addition, how are they going
22 to be impacted by any excavation and moving? I
23 mean, they may not be impacted but --

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I think what he's

1 talking about is No. 9, which is the 19-inch sugar
2 maple, and No. 8 which is a 1-inch-by-3 crab
3 apple.

4 MR. MCKAY: No. I'm talking about Nos.
5 20, 21, and 22.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, no, I understand
7 that.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm talking about
9 8 and 9, which are on the west side of the
10 addition along the sidewalk.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: He's saying that if the
12 sidewalk was moved to the south --

13 MR. MCKAY: I see.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- in addition to the
15 trees that we're already losing, would we be
16 endangering those trees as well by suggesting that
17 the sidewalk be repositioned?

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Those trees are south of
19 the property line. So we're not going to be
20 moving sidewalks off the property, so they should
21 be fine.

22 MR. MCKAY: That is about where the
23 addition occurs that we're proposing. So I think
24 we can make a transition in the sidewalk there to

1 shift it a little south once we get past those
2 trees.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But I just want to
4 make it clear in our motion that we want those
5 trees.

6 MR. MCKAY: Yes. We have no intention of
7 taking those trees out.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is everyone
9 clear what the motion to amend is? Okay. Any
10 further discussion on the motion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tim.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This is the motion
14 to amend.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This is the motion to
16 amend, yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

18 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So that
9 makes the main motion a motion to recommend
10 approval with those conditions, which I will not
11 state again, but there are one, two, three, four,
12 five conditions regarding articulation,
13 preservation of trees, sidewalk along Illinois,
14 configuration of St. Mark's drive, and the
15 sidewalk along Main Street.

16 Any discussion?

17 MEMBER BECKER: I just have one thing I
18 was thinking about in regards to the motion.
19 St. Mark's is not an applicant. So are we placing
20 conditions on them that would have to be vetted by
21 the applicant?

22 MR. MCKAY: St. Mark's is here.

23 MEMBER BECKER: Okay. I guess I just
24 don't want to confuse the issue and belabor it

1 unless that has been vetted already. So thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, does anyone from
4 St. Mark's have any concern about what's being
5 proposed? If you could, just so we can be on the
6 record, I'd appreciate it.

7 MR. TONIOLO: My name is John, last name
8 Toniolo, T-o-n-i-o-l-o. I am chairman of
9 St. Mark's, president.

10 As Don has laid out, we have discussed it
11 many times amongst us, and this plan and what
12 we've seen today is acceptable to us, so.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any further
14 discussion?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tim.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

18 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That motion
9 passes unanimously, and good luck, ladies and
10 gentlemen.

11 (Off the record at 8:19 p.m.)

12

13

14

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 29th day of October, 2019.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely 

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Hearing- Comprehensive Plan for West Side Study Area

Date: October 22, 2019

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: Comprehensive Plan :
Update for Downtown, :
Recommendations for West :
Side Study Area. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, October 22, 2019
8:19 p.m.

Job No.: 218474C
Pages: 1 - 38
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand
14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSSELL COLBY, Community Development
12 Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And next is the
3 comprehensive plan update for the downtown west
4 side study area. Russell.

5 MR. COLBY: All right. So this is a
6 follow-up to the discussion we had a few meetings
7 back on the downtown comprehensive plan update for
8 the west side. At the conclusion of the
9 discussion, I think we were talking about
10 potential street extensions, particularly in this
11 large block area that's bound by State Street,
12 Route 31, and 4th Street.

13 There was some discussion about
14 potentially a north extension of 3rd Street, an
15 east/west route that might cut through the middle
16 of that block. There was also some discussion
17 about what might be going on along the north end
18 of that block and how that connects to other
19 potential future development to the west.

20 And there was some indication that the
21 Plan Commission wanted to look at why there was
22 this study area for this discussion taking into
23 account what is the west, including the Lexington
24 Club or former Applied Composites redevelopment

1 site.

2 So there's exhibits that are included in
3 the packet that show the study area boundary that
4 we're currently working with and how that sits
5 relative to the Lexington Club site. So I'm just
6 going to flip through these. These are a couple
7 different perspectives of how things are laid out
8 in that area.

9 This is a view that's looking to the west.
10 We've identified the site boundary of Lexington
11 Club. This is Mark Street that runs right along a
12 portion of the site, and then Mark Street
13 continues up to 4th Street, and there's a narrow
14 section here. This does more or less align with
15 what's, essentially, a private paved parking lot
16 and the alleyways that exist behind these
17 buildings that back up to the railroad
18 right-of-way.

19 And here is another view that shows a
20 wider area of the two sites also identified. As
21 part of the Lexington Club project approval, the
22 number of streets that currently terminate into
23 the site will be interconnected on the site in
24 some manner. So it's expected that however the

1 site is developed, it's likely that Mark Street
2 will continue to the west and connect to both 7th
3 Street and 9th Street in some form.

4 This exhibit shows what is happening with
5 the parcels along Mark Street. First, you can see
6 the right-of-way that exists there currently is
7 fairly narrow. A typical right-of-way in the
8 older neighborhoods in St. Charles is 60 feet. So
9 there's a 50-foot right-of-way here between 6th
10 and 5th. Then in between 5th and 4th, there's a
11 very narrow 30-foot right-of-way.

12 You know, there's property that's owned by
13 the railroad and also private property both to the
14 east and west. So there is potentially some type
15 of corridor there that could be established, but
16 there doesn't currently exist public right-of-way
17 to do that. Then also they're somewhat limited
18 just based on the existing topography along the
19 railroad right-of-way and some electric utility
20 poles that run along that corridor.

21 So the intent tonight is just to provide
22 this additional information, recognizing the Plan
23 Commission had discussed this a couple meetings
24 back, and I wanted to ask, you know, what

1 additional information the Plan Commission might
2 want to look at in terms of concluding the west
3 side study area comprehensive plan review.

4 Our hope was to bring the west side plan
5 to the planning and development committee in
6 November, which means we would have the meeting
7 coming up where we could discuss this again, but
8 I'd be looking for some direction about what other
9 information you want to conclude the discussion of
10 the plan recommendations that were presented at
11 the last meeting.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I know that we had some
13 discussion about the potential for a parking
14 deck -- sorry. I'm trying to find where --

15 MR. COLBY: I can skip ahead.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. The HVS Economic
17 Impact Study Figure 7.9, classification of parcels
18 in the study area. I don't know if you have that.

19 MR. COLBY: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, there you go.

21 MR. COLBY: This exhibit?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. It shows there
23 reserve for multilevel parking on that portion.

24 MR. COLBY: Yeah. That's, essentially,

1 over the VFW parking lot that's there, which is
2 half the block.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What is the feasibility
4 of doing that?

5 MR. COLBY: In terms of the number of
6 spaces that could be accommodated or --

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. I guess there
8 was also an issue with grade changes and whether
9 multilevel would require a ramp or if there would
10 be separate entrances.

11 MR. COLBY: Yes. There's potential to do
12 a two-level deck there without ramps, and
13 potentially, a three-level. There's not a lot of
14 grade change. It depends on whether you wanted to
15 try and take the lower level lower than street
16 level; but certainly, you could do a two-level
17 split without needing a system of ramps other than
18 shorter ramps entering and exiting the deck.

19 I know there was some discussion about
20 parking supply and looking at the amount of
21 parking that would be required, but I think the
22 question is we want to look at a larger area than
23 just what's shown here and what footprint we want
24 to consider.

1 It sounds like from the last discussion,
2 there was some interest in what's going on on at
3 least this block that's directly to the west of
4 the site.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I agree. You
6 know, I mean, what is the feasibility of extending
7 3rd Street to that, and, you know, creating a
8 right-of-way? I mean, we're going through that
9 guy's K-9 place. What is the feasibility of doing
10 that because that particular block is just kind of
11 nothing. Didn't 31 come off of 5th Street? There
12 was a viaduct under 5th Street?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes, yes. Originally, 5th
14 Street connected right there.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So that was a big
16 area that, you know, was connected to the river,
17 but now it's cut off from the river by 31. So
18 bisecting that, especially, if there is a proposed
19 parking garage right there on the southeast corner
20 of that block, you would have to do something to
21 bisect that. Is that feasible? Do you have to
22 buy a house to do that? Probably.

23 MR. COLBY: So this exhibit shows sort of
24 what exists there today. It's got the floodplain

1 area shown here in blue, so that it would require
2 removal of this house which is located right at
3 the end of north 3rd Street. This was identified
4 by the Historic Commission as potentially a house
5 that has some character, not necessarily any
6 historical significance that we're aware of.
7 These two houses are considered to be more
8 important within this area, but this house would
9 have to be removed or demolished.

10 And when you get into this area, you would
11 be crossing the floodplain and the State Street
12 Creek, so that would take some engineering to
13 figure out how that would work, if that would be,
14 essentially, just bridged.

15 But also there is a potential that if this
16 area was redeveloped, this could be an extension
17 of the floodplain area for flood storage, so that
18 could create a conflict if there was a street
19 there. So if the street were to go through, you
20 wouldn't necessarily have the opportunity for
21 floodplain storage there. But then once you cross
22 the other side of the creek, you are ending up in
23 that parking lot area that's near where the K-9
24 facility that's being proposed is located.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Isn't that an
2 easement there too?

3 MR. COLBY: So there are cross-access
4 easements that serve each of these buildings. If
5 there were to be some kind of street established
6 through here, it might be possible that, you know,
7 there may need to be publicly dedicated streets
8 that may require some of these buildings to be
9 eliminated or some of these properties to be
10 reconfigured because if we're talking about a
11 future redevelopment of some of these properties,
12 it may change the type of buildings that are
13 there.

14 So it doesn't necessarily make sense as it
15 exists today to just extend 3rd Street up to this
16 cross access. You'd have to do something to
17 continue it in some other direction to make sense.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, has there been
20 any consideration -- as far as the existing
21 floodplain goes, my understanding is if the active
22 river project were to happen, that that would have
23 a positive impact on the floodplain.

24 MR. COLBY: Correct.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. There we go.

2 MR. COLBY: Yeah. So this exhibit shows
3 theoretically the footprint that would be reduced
4 from the purple to the blue.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And then has there been
6 any further consideration or any talk at all at
7 any time about actually opening and deepening the
8 State Street Creek corridor to reduce flooding?

9 MR. COLBY: Well, there hasn't been
10 previously, but we've talked about that with this
11 exhibit that, you know, once -- if the active
12 river project is created, that there is an
13 opportunity to provide -- in addition to the
14 reduced flood level that would just result from
15 the river being lower in this area, to provide
16 additional storage area that could be created as
17 part of the design of the project. So there's
18 that opportunity.

19 And then potentially if there is an
20 interest in creating more, there's areas along the
21 creek that would be more conducive to doing that
22 that are closer to the river. It hasn't been
23 discussed, though, as a project that the City
24 would undertake.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm wondering -- I
2 don't know. I just remember a project that
3 occurred when I was in college actually that was
4 in Champaign or actually it's in Urbana, the
5 Boneyard Creek. It used to go through a pipe
6 similar to this. It was very similar to this, and
7 there were flooding problems all the time.

8 I don't know the engineering that was
9 involved, but it's beautiful now. They opened it
10 up and really made it something that looks really
11 nice, and it's very effective in reducing
12 flooding. I'm just curious if we're talking
13 conceptually, which we are, if that might be
14 something to consider to be included.

15 MR. COLBY: Yeah. I'm familiar with that
16 project, the Boneyard project; and I know when
17 they opened up the creek, they also created a
18 large storage -- detention storage areas that are
19 connected to it to take some of the volume away so
20 the creek itself wasn't flooded, that there were
21 areas of storage.

22 There's potential for something like that
23 to be done here. You know, this is sort of the
24 lower end of the State Street Creek drainage area,

1 and there are existing drainage problems further
2 to the west that are actually --

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Along Main Street?

4 MR. COLBY: Even further as eventually the
5 creek drainage area goes and crosses Main Street
6 sort of in the vicinity of the Old Valley Shopping
7 Center where the police station is located; and so
8 the City, as part of the police station
9 redevelopment, actually installed a significant
10 amount of regional stormwater detention in that
11 area to assist with drainage issues that exist
12 there that are tributary to this area.

13 So there has been some focus on reducing
14 potential flooding from occurring. It more so
15 happens to the west where it's flatter. When you
16 get into this area, you're very close to the river
17 and influenced by the water level of the river.
18 So your ability to create a lot of storage that
19 would impact the flooding of the creek is limited.
20 Because you're so close to the river, the river is
21 going to impact it.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. Any
23 other discussion?

24 And actually, the other thing that I was

1 going to ask is about the parking lot that is
2 across from Carroll Tower. If we're making a
3 floodplain surface or structured parking on our
4 own space or removed mixed use --

5 MR. COLBY: And I think that was the issue
6 that Tom Anderson had raised at the previous
7 meeting was that the City has not been specific as
8 to the ultimate use of that site in the future,
9 and his concern is planning for the property he
10 owns adjacent to it and whether or not the
11 property will continue to have visibility and
12 exposure to Route 31.

13 So if the Plan Commission has any opinions
14 on whether we should be more definitive in the
15 planning documents, we could be. We've sort of
16 left it open recognizing that whether it's
17 floodplain or not really dictates the potential.
18 That doesn't necessarily mean that there has to be
19 something developed there even if it's removed
20 from the floodplain.

21 MEMBER BECKER: I think it's important to
22 keep the plan vague. The more specific you get,
23 the more you cut off potential scenarios that
24 might work for the City. To modify our plan to

1 fit one property owner where his comments were
2 very well thought out, and I appreciate his point
3 of view, but, I mean, general and vague, I think,
4 is the best way to go.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think also -- I mean
6 if I was a developer looking at the comprehensive
7 plan, I'd want to see that there was some thought
8 given to this entire kind of corridor being
9 available for a mixed-use type of development.

10 My thought would be as far as the
11 connections go -- I mean my thought would be that
12 the comprehensive plan doesn't lock us in to
13 making connections, just potential connections,
14 extending 3rd Street north effectively a block and
15 having a potential future connection from east to
16 west connecting 4th Street with 2nd Street.

17 I don't know. What are other
18 commissioners' feelings about including something
19 like that in the comprehensive plan?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I wouldn't want to
21 do that. I would leave it vague. I'm just
22 curious about -- my questions were only about the
23 feasibility of doing something like that; but if
24 you look at this as a development as opposed to a

1 construction site, the potential here is possibly
2 there's a lot of things you could do.

3 The way this plan is laid out showing
4 being able to move floodplain and make use of
5 other property to do certain things that wouldn't
6 necessarily be able to be done now, I mean, this
7 is a big development. This is not just a site
8 plan, so.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What about adding
10 different possibilities, you know, the same way
11 that we did with -- help me, Russ. What was
12 another part of the comprehensive plan where we
13 had multiple different scenarios?

14 MR. COLBY: A couple of the key focus
15 areas for the mall sites.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, yeah.

17 MR. COLBY: Both the old St. Charles Mall
18 and the Charlestowne Mall there were different --
19 I think three different options for each that were
20 proposed that would be acceptable, different
21 scenarios and different land uses.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think the good thing
23 about that is to show -- without being really
24 vague as in not showing that changes are possible,

1 it's showing that we're open, you know, to the
2 active development of this area.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I guess I can't
4 really put my finger on how -- what you would say.
5 How would you describe it then? I mean, if we
6 view this as a major development as opposed to a
7 particular site plan, I think some of the things
8 that, Russ, you've described as far as, you know,
9 the floodplain and being able to -- if we did this
10 here, than we could move, you know, the affected
11 floodplain. You've come up with ideas of opening
12 up the creek as, you know, storage.

13 I think that's what a developer brings to
14 the table. That's what the development team
15 brings to the table. If we leave this an open
16 palette, they're going to be able to do that.

17 But I understand what you're saying about
18 describing it in some way.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: I think what you should
20 show, I mean, the opportunities, putting parking
21 in one lot and showing mixed uses in another. I
22 think there needs to be some sort of continuity to
23 create this, what I called it before, main street,
24 then we should show what maximum height that you

1 are allowed to build, the idea of, you know, not
2 just having a parking garage, but we need parking
3 obviously for the development, and they need to
4 adhere to ratios.

5 You know, cover that parking with some
6 sort of architectural elements so it does create
7 that continuity, whether it's retail, whether it's
8 a Texas wrap, whether it's, you know, residential
9 that's wrapping on the upper floors.

10 So, you know, one idea would be to do,
11 like, a massing study, you know, showing where
12 would we like retail to go, where would we like
13 the pedestrian sidewalks, the continuity towards
14 the river from, you know, Lincoln Park towards the
15 river, and show these opportunities. Show, you
16 know, how tall is the building going to be.

17 If we want it to be residential, you know,
18 obviously, we don't want any industrial in this
19 area and manufacturing. So it's businesses, and
20 it's residential, and we want to create density.
21 So with the density, you're going to -- you know,
22 it's going to activate the other areas.

23 So if we can create that, you know, as one
24 phase, you know, on this -- what street is

1 that? -- Cedar Street.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Cedar Street.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: That may be, you know, a
4 starting point; and then if we create Cedar
5 Street, that idea, the big idea, it's going to
6 activate towards the north end of that, and then
7 the north is going to fill in on its own and to
8 the west.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But we have to
10 come up with a way to make that description
11 without giving the specifics of -- I mean, this is
12 the comprehensive plan, and that's exactly the
13 division, I believe, that we want to describe in
14 the comprehensive plan, that this is a bigger
15 development as opposed to, you know, that block or
16 even just the connections we've discussed.

17 Those are things that can happen. I think
18 it's a cross between how Jeff just described it
19 and what Jennifer was trying to say but keeping it
20 somewhat vague. I don't know what that language
21 is. I don't know that language.

22 MR. COLBY: Well, one option would be to
23 incorporate some building footprints and some
24 massing, as Jeff has indicated, just to kind of

1 give a concept of the scale of the buildings that
2 could go there to sort of use that as an example
3 of the type of development that we would envision
4 for any of the areas that are mixed use. We look
5 at a couple of blocks and kind of lay that out and
6 see if that communicates enough of a vision.

7 We also have photos that we use in the
8 image surveys that we could incorporate as
9 references as well.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, what's the
11 maximum height allowed in the current zoning right
12 now?

13 MR. COLBY: 50 feet in the CBD-1 zoning,
14 which most of this is.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: So, I mean, is that --
16 I don't see that as a restriction to any sorts of
17 multi-story mixed-use development. I mean, unless
18 we were talking about down zoning it to --

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Basically, what is it,
20 four stories?

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: How tall is Carroll
22 Tower?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. It's indicated on there
24 65 feet.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: PUD, it could
2 be --

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: 65 feet. And then
4 how tall is Hotel Baker?

5 MR. COLBY: Yeah. It's similar. It's a
6 little bit taller. Those buildings have
7 relatively -- Carroll Towers has relatively
8 shorter ceiling heights because of the use and
9 when it was constructed.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Is that the maximum
11 height that any structure can be?

12 MR. COLBY: Well, it's based on the zoning
13 district. So it's 50 feet in CBD-1. We do have
14 PUDs where a taller building height has been
15 approved, like with First Street.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. If, I
17 mean, I guess I want to be careful that you don't
18 limit it either being joint massing. I mean, if
19 some developer came and had a development that we
20 really liked and then applied for a PUD and went
21 for six- and eight-story buildings, we can do
22 that too.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I was kind of writing
24 down some of the language.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Hey, Russ, a question
2 on the street and talking about those kind of land
3 uses. So is this the kind of general land use
4 exhibit that you want to include in the amendment?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. And, I mean,
7 to me I see this as, let's say, the two blue sites
8 that seem to be determined. If we have current
9 zoning that allows 50-foot development, you now
10 have straight zoning, not a PUD or anything, just
11 straight zoning. You can put a restriction of
12 them being potentially in a floodplain. And
13 having an active river project, not having an
14 active river project, and all of that, you can
15 still park on the first floor.

16 Maybe you'd have some part of the building
17 would come down to the first floor to address that
18 entry and elevators and things, but overall those
19 two land parcels would be fairly open if you had
20 parking on the first floor, and then office,
21 residential, et cetera above.

22 It would be hard to put retail on those
23 sites if it had a floodplain because of the
24 compensatory storage that you have to do. So that

1 would be a whole different set of engineering and
2 issues to resolve to develop either of those
3 blocks.

4 But certainly there can be parking and
5 have multi stories above under the current zoning,
6 and then, obviously, whatever we feel comfortable
7 with as far as a PUD, if they could come for a PUD
8 because of the use or the way they wanted to do it.

9 So I wouldn't say that was overly
10 restrictive. I don't see it as something that
11 limits anybody terribly.

12 I think if we were talking about, a little
13 bit of what Jeff was talking about as far as the
14 character and the relationship of the buildings
15 and the street, I think that the important thing,
16 you know, if you're looking at connecting from
17 Main Street and 31 going north, and you want to
18 have additional retail and uses, I think that the
19 whole feeling of pedestrian is really important;
20 and right now given where the right-of-way line is
21 and where the curb is, there's really not much to
22 do to improve that.

23 And so, if anything, I think we should
24 talk about the requirement of siting the buildings

1 back from Main Street, not necessarily 10 or
2 15 feet, but at least 5 feet, hopefully 10, so
3 that you can improve the pedestrian way as you go
4 to Cedar and go from Cedar to State and State up
5 to the railroad trestle.

6 I think that would be an important thing
7 to include because it talks about improving the
8 pedestrian experience. You know, when you work on
9 streetscape projects, it's how do we improve the
10 level of service to pedestrians, the level of
11 service to bikers, putting in bike lanes.

12 When you're talking about level of service
13 for pedestrians, it's with a sidewalk and things
14 that separate them from traffic that make them
15 feel comfortable. And so having a wider space to
16 do that since you can have streetscape elements
17 between the curb and where the sidewalk starts and
18 then having a wide enough sidewalk so that it felt
19 more comfortable. People could comfortably walk
20 about, you know, two by two, you know, that kind
21 of thing.

22 But I think that would be a good thing to
23 add because it tweaks and it creates an
24 expectation on the developer that you do have that

1 setback, that they are not to build to the
2 right-of-way line and leave the sidewalk and the
3 parkway where it is, that they improve that.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That could be one
5 condition.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: So I think that would
7 be a good thing to add. I think that making sure
8 that some things -- some exhibits that you had up
9 in previous meetings, I think I missed a meeting,
10 so sorry, but you talked about adding a traffic
11 signal at State because, number one, it creates a
12 safe pedestrian place to cross. Main Street and
13 31 is extremely difficult because of where the
14 buildings are. There just isn't much sidewalk to
15 work with.

16 So having a safe place to cross, that
17 would help Carroll Towers versus being a block
18 north. They're not going to get it at Cedar; but
19 if you could do that at State, it would be at the
20 end of their parking lot. Assume that they don't
21 want to participate in any other thing else, that
22 they just want to keep their parking; and then if
23 there's public parking to the west of them and a
24 garage or other surface lots, then they would be

1 able to use those and have a very safe way to
2 cross, which is one of the things they ask for,
3 but it would also give people a safe way to cross
4 from any parking that we do west of the river,
5 assuming we do something with the active river
6 project.

7 So us pursuing as a community that traffic
8 light or safe pedestrian crossing, like we see
9 flashing lights that pedestrians are present, and
10 you're supposed to stop at a minimum. If you can
11 get IDOT to agree to a traffic signal, all the
12 better. That's a whole another ball of wax and
13 level of effort to deal with IDOT to get a
14 signalized intersection.

15 But if we can at least do that, I think
16 that would accomplish a lot. But I think those
17 would be good things that would help that
18 corridor; and then, obviously, whatever you want
19 to talk about as far as how that streetscape would
20 come west. You know, does it come west to 4th and
21 stop? You know, is that the extent of it as you
22 move to the west from these redevelopments because
23 you're heading into more residential
24 neighborhoods, and, you know, a more built-up

1 streetscape isn't what you need.

2 I think those would be -- even if it's
3 just in a narrative form, that graphic in a
4 narrative form would help set that table for if
5 they use -- if someone comes in and wants to do a
6 mixed use on the block surrounded by 3rd, State,
7 4th, and Cedar, you're going to have to look at
8 that whole thing. It's already -- at least the
9 perimeter on what they to do, and the market and
10 their desires can help shape what they do on the
11 property. But I think those would be helpful.

12 MR. COLBY: Yeah. And one thing I'll
13 suggest, I know we have it in our existing
14 downtown plan, a section that talks about
15 frontages and describes sort of the character of
16 the streetscape and the building fronts and how
17 they interact with the street and different types
18 of frontage characters on each block.

19 So I think getting at what Peter is saying
20 is we could sort of define the frontage of each of
21 the block faces to identify the character of the
22 pedestrian area and building fronts as they're
23 interacting with the street, recognizing that what
24 might happen internally within the block, you

1 know, that would be based on whatever the project
2 is. But the more important part is how that
3 development interacts with the street.

4 We can sort of break that up into
5 segments, and I could prepare that information,
6 which would maybe take it a step further in
7 identifying specific stretches where we would want
8 to see a certain type of character on the street.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Should there be some sort
10 of design? You know, I agree with Peter, what he
11 said. You know, to take that a step further,
12 shouldn't there be some sort of design standards
13 that actually analyze this, you know, the widths
14 of the sidewalks?

15 On First Street I think we were lacking
16 that idea of that cafe, the outdoor cafes. The
17 sidewalks are not wide enough. So I think we have
18 a great opportunity here to create wider sidewalks
19 that, you know, promote the outdoor cafe,
20 pedestrian walking.

21 You know, that idea of maybe it becomes a
22 taller building, so a developer does set it back
23 off the property line 10 feet. I think that gives
24 them an opportunity to go one more story or

1 something because they're always worried about how
2 much, you know, the buildable area is on a piece
3 of land.

4 But, you know, design standards I think
5 are important and connectivity and, you know, to
6 create that block. You know, that idea I think is
7 going to help the developments and help future
8 developments.

9 MR. COLBY: I think that's a good point.
10 I'm not sure necessarily we'll have design
11 standards created as a part of this. When it
12 comes to parameters for that, and I think some
13 specific widths that we want to maintain for
14 certain types of features, that type of
15 information that is defined on the plan is helpful
16 when we're communicating with potential developers
17 and the expectations for the space.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think my
19 understanding is with the parkway area, which is
20 the curb to the building face or right-of-way
21 line, the exact layout, and how wide we want that
22 to be to facilitate, I don't know, pedestrian
23 things, but things like cafes that help with the
24 alignment of any street in different ways beyond

1 the streetscape because you start to, you know,
2 get people to sit down and do something and then
3 watching and interacting with people, and there's
4 no streetscape that does it. It's the people that
5 are able to do that.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I was just trying to
7 think of some phrases that could be incorporated.
8 What you're talking about -- I've heard pedestrian
9 friendly parkways with street-level activity.

10 Creating -- you know, having the area
11 create density, drawing properties from the north
12 into downtown through interconnections, utilizing
13 mixed use, creative mixed use.

14 And the other thing is maybe drawing
15 residential properties from the west through
16 creative transitions. I mean, I don't know what
17 that looks like. You've got single-family homes
18 going to mixed use, and, you know, I mean, I'm not
19 a developer. I think maybe that would give
20 developers an idea of what we're envisioning.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: And I think parking is also
22 important, how we treat a parking garage.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I wrote that too.
24 Sorry.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: And future developments
2 that have -- you know, the City of Chicago does a
3 nice job where they have landscape requirements
4 that actually, you know, decorate the parking. So
5 it's not just a parking lot with a fence. You
6 know, they actually require the owners to, you
7 know, create some sort of buffer, so you're
8 screening the parking.

9 So when you're walking on the sidewalk, a
10 pedestrian sidewalk, you have landscaping, and you
11 have that buffer between the sidewalk and the
12 automobile, which I think is important for future
13 developments, that, you know, if you have an open
14 lot, you know, to create that potential for
15 future -- you know, you're decorating it, or
16 you're maintaining that pedestrian feel.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Well, it's also --
18 I mean, you're preaching to the choir here.
19 Because the St. Charles Business Alliance, we
20 wanted to create some kind of cohesiveness
21 throughout the entire downtown in terms of signage
22 and sidewalks. Like some of those raised beds on
23 1st Street disallow the cafe setting and all that.

24 So, I mean, I know you said they don't

1 really have designs, but I think it's something
2 that we may need to consider. As you guys have
3 said, it's things that we have talked about being
4 part of the downtown feel and vibe that we would
5 love to see be created.

6 So I just have one question. On the open
7 space on the screen that's up there, where it's an
8 open space along the creek corridor, does that
9 mean removing of a building is possible? Like
10 that option is there?

11 MR. COLBY: Potentially because that
12 building is -- I'm referring to this one. This
13 building is basically constructed over the creek.
14 So if there's going to be an effort to make an
15 open space there, it would make sense for that
16 building to be removed. But it can also be
17 limited to a portion behind the building.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. I just
19 wondered about that. But, yeah, getting back to
20 the design standards, I do think it's something
21 that we have to consider, but also keeping
22 everything very vague because we never know what
23 creativity people are going to come and present to
24 us, you know, in terms of from a development

1 viewpoint. We never know what they're going to
2 come in and present to us, so I think we have to
3 be open. You know, I mean, there's different
4 things being presented right now that we don't
5 even know about, that we have to be able to allow
6 for.

7 MEMBER BECKER: And similarly, I'm
8 thinking about all these comments, what are our
9 thoughts about innovative adaptive reuses as
10 opposed to wholesale, you know, demolition; and I
11 think maybe there could be some thinking about
12 that. What if we have a baker's space or
13 coworking or that kind of thing.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: We do have a
15 baker's space, and we have coworking, which people
16 don't even know about. But, yeah, we do have
17 that, and it has been retro working with the
18 buildings.

19 And this is just a side note, my sister
20 lives in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, and that has been
21 completely revamped. It's a very, very old
22 community that they have retrofitted and changed
23 streetscapes and the way that -- directions and
24 everything.

1 You might want to take a look at
2 Wauwatosa, Wisconsin and see what they've done
3 with their downtown. It's really amazing and very
4 pedestrian friendly. They've taken, like, a whole
5 area and just created a whole pedestrian area, and
6 it's really quite amazing what they've done.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wauwatosa.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It's really, really
9 interesting what they've done.

10 MR. COLBY: Well, and I think one element
11 of this plan could be a recommendation that the
12 City develops this type of guideline document, you
13 know, and go through the process of actually
14 laying out on physical space that exists there and
15 really identify the opportunities with a little
16 more specificity, so that when a developer does
17 come forward, we have that document.

18 But I think for us to get into the process
19 of developing that, we first need the direction of
20 the plan to say this is something we need to
21 develop. Then that's something we can give to the
22 City Council to support, and then we have a basis
23 to budget for it and plan for it as a future
24 project for the City to undertake.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But that's not
2 part of this comprehensive plan.

3 MR. COLBY: I think we can talk about some
4 of the things we've been talking about,
5 identifying the types of street frontages and the
6 character of the sidewalk and the public
7 right-of-way. We can talk about it in general
8 terms and widths and areas where we want to see
9 certain things verse others.

10 We can't go to the level of actually
11 designing and putting together a design standard
12 document. This is something we'd want to do
13 separately.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
15 else?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Does that help?

19 MR. COLBY: Yeah. I think I have enough
20 direction to bring something back for the
21 Commission at the next meeting.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

23 Any additional business from Plan
24 Commission members or staff?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Seeing the
3 weekly development report, meeting announcements.
4 Is there any potential for changing any of the
5 future meetings?

6 MR. COLBY: I don't believe so.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any public
8 comment?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
11 motion to adjourn?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes, so moved.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll second.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Moved and
16 seconded. All in favor.

17 (Ayes heard.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The City of St. Charles
21 Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

22 (Off the record at 8:59 p.m.)

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 29th day of October, 2019.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely 

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois