

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2016**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chairman Tim Kessler
Tom Pretz
Michelle Spruth
Tom Schuetz
James Holderfield
Brian Doyle

Members Absent: Dan Frio
Laura Macklin-Purdy

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

1. Call to order

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the December 6, 2016 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2016 Plan Commission meeting.

**4. Prairie Winds of St. Charles (Bricher Commons PUD) (Prairie Winds, LLC)
Application for Concept Plan review**

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos - Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

5. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

6. Weekly Development Report

7. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 3, 2017 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room- Will be cancelled

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, December 20, 2016

Page 2

Tuesday, January 10, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, January 9, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

8. Public Comment

9. Adjournment at 8:50 p.m.



PLANET DEPOS®

We make it >> *happen.*™

Transcript of Hearing - Application for Concept Plan Review

Date: December 20, 2016

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

Internet: www.planetdepos.com

Worldwide Court Reporting | Interpretation | Trial Services

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 Concept :
Plan Review, Prairie Winds :
of St. Charles, Bricher :
Commons PUD. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, December 20, 2016
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 97805
Pages: 1 - 101
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
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PRESENT:

TODD WALLACE, Chairman

TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

BRIAN DOYLE, Member

JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

TOM PRETZ, Member

TOM SCHUETZ, Member

MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic
Development Director

CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering Manager

Transcript of Hearing - Application for Concept Plan Review
Conducted on December 20, 2016

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. This meeting
3 of the St. Charles Plan Commission is called to
4 order.

5 Tim, roll call.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: Holderfield.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

8 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

12 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: Spruth.

15 MEMBER SPRUTH: Here.

16 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

18 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, here.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 3, presentation of
20 the minutes of the December 6th, 2016, meeting of
21 the Plan Commission.

22 Is there a motion to approve?

23 MEMBER KESSLER: So moved.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
2 seconded.

3 All in favor.

4 (Ayes heard.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It passes unanimously.

8 Item 4 on our agenda, Prairie Winds of
9 St. Charles, Bricher Commons PUD, Prairie Winds,
10 LLC, application for concept plan review.

11 And typically, in this situation -- well,
12 let me just let everyone know this is an application
13 for a concept plan. No application has been filed
14 with the City or action.

15 A concept plan review is a chance for the
16 developer to come before the Plan Commission and
17 present what may be included in an application at
18 some point in the future, at which point the Plan
19 Commission will offer feedback.

20 It's also an opportunity for members of the
21 public to ask questions and make comments on a
22 potential application.

23 Any questions regarding procedure?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So what we'll do
2 is we will ask the applicant to make a presentation;
3 and after the presentation, Plan Commission members,
4 members of the audience may ask questions or make
5 comments.

6 And after all of that has been done, I will
7 poll the Plan Commission to let the developer know
8 the aspects of the project that are favorable and
9 unfavorable. So you have an opportunity to take
10 those into account prior to submitting a final
11 application. Good? All right.

12 I would just ask that you speak at the
13 lectern and state your full name, spell your last
14 name, and also state your address for the record.

15 All right. Go ahead.

16 MR. KOLB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
17 Commissioners. My name is Andrew Kolb, K-o-l-b, as
18 in boy. I'm an attorney at the law firm of Vanek,
19 Larson & Kolb in St. Charles just across the river,
20 Main and 31.

21 With me is Kelly Bartelson from my firm.
22 I'm also privileged to be joined by Joe Whiteside
23 and Jeff Ratzler, both of whom are vice presidents of
24 Executive Capital and specifically deals with the

1 specific LLC in this case, Prairie Winds, LLC,
2 Prairie Winds of St. Charles.

3 We're very excited and honored to be a part
4 of what we hope to be a great project for the
5 community. What we're proposing is a big style
6 apartment complex, and we'll get into that in
7 further detail.

8 Some background, the property where the
9 proposed project is to be located is approximately
10 20 acres of vacant land located at the intersection
11 of Bricher Road and Randall Road in St. Charles.
12 The subject property is the southern portion of what
13 is commonly referred to as the Bricher Commons
14 parcel.

15 This specific piece of property was the
16 subject of a 1999 and subsequent 2000 annexation
17 agreement and early PUD. The PUD was later amended
18 in 2006 by another applicant who ended up not
19 developing the property.

20 The original PUD did not propose residential
21 for this site, but the 2006 amendment did have a
22 component for residential use. We believe the use
23 is commensurate with residential and certainly the
24 density as well.

1 In accordance with the Ordinance 1999-Z-11,
2 the subject property was zoned B-3, Service Business
3 District, with a PUD.

4 In 2006, a petition by DGT, LLC, to amend
5 the 1999 ordinance to include residential as well as
6 commercial uses was granted. Thereafter, DGT, LLC,
7 never developed the property in accordance with its
8 long-term plans.

9 The game plan, if we were to develop our
10 project, would be to rezone the property. We would
11 have to rezone the property to a higher RM-3
12 residential density zoning classification.

13 And because the current 2006 amendment
14 expires fairly soon, because there are some changes
15 with respect to the overall development that was
16 never put in place in '06, in working with Russ, we
17 had determined that the best route would be to ask
18 for a brand new PUD overlay on top of the existing
19 zoning change, so a rezoning and a PUD overlay,
20 preliminary and final PUD approval, followed by
21 preliminary and final subdivision approval as well.

22 So that's kind of the long-term game plan.
23 Before we took a project of this size forward, we
24 thought a concept plan obviously would be the

1 appropriate place to start so we could get a sense
2 of what you all thought about the project moving
3 forward, given the significant soft costs involved
4 with engineering and time and money that go into
5 tying up a piece of property like this and getting
6 it entitled and getting all of the engineering
7 finished and negotiating intergovernmental
8 agreements and determining whether obligations under
9 annexation agreements have been fulfilled and
10 dealing with the stormwater and the County and all
11 of the -- it's a unique site. It's kind of on the
12 border of two municipalities.

13 So we've got a lot to do, and it's critical
14 we, at least, get some understanding of what you all
15 think of this. So we thank you for your time in
16 coming out tonight. We really appreciate it. We're
17 very excited about the project.

18 You might know our client. They have a
19 history in St. Charles. He developed the
20 St. Charles XSport Health and fitness here. They've
21 been a member of the community. They're local.
22 They office out in Big Rock, Illinois, nearby.

23 They have a good standing -- track record
24 for developing projects like this. As Jeff will

1 tell you in a few moments, a virtually identical
2 project was just finished in Rochester, Minnesota,
3 with what I would consider a startling lease-up rate
4 in that community.

5 They have the financial capital to build it
6 all. I don't think this is the type of applicant
7 you're worried that will build one phase and then
8 run out of capital perhaps, you know, those types of
9 issues. Their track record is remarkable, and he'll
10 outline that for you.

11 I think they're good for the community. We
12 intentionally held off on filing for a concept plan
13 review until Shodeen came through. We think -- I'll
14 be a little careful with wording, but we think our
15 project contrasts nicely against that project as far
16 as the amenities and what the design and layout is
17 and what the overall concept would be for this
18 community.

19 I can tell you, having been here awhile and
20 being in the community myself, that having read a
21 number of market feasibility studies regarding
22 residential, that there is, simply put, something
23 like a 99.3 percent market absorption rate for
24 apartments in St. Charles and the Fox Valley as a

1 whole.

2 There are not a lot of apartments to rent in
3 this community. It's definitely single-family home
4 or -- well, that's about it that's here now. There
5 hasn't been a lot of residential development in
6 St. Charles. We can touch on why it need be, but
7 there's a number of issues there.

8 We're excited to bring what we think is
9 something that will satisfy demand. I certainly
10 even think the Shodeen development together with
11 ours, and you still have a big demand for apartment
12 homes in St. Charles.

13 So I think with that being said, the project
14 is in line with the overall comp plan for the
15 community. I think it proposes residential of that
16 density in that area. I think it's appropriate.
17 It's a nice corridor transition to nearby retail. I
18 think it makes sense from the standpoint of its
19 location.

20 I think you'll find the project to be the
21 highest quality you could ever want in the
22 community. I think people who come to rent, you
23 know, have to fit a certain criteria to be admitted
24 as a renter, and I think that it's going to be a

1 nice mix of people.

2 So with that, I think I'll turn it over to
3 Jeff Ratzer who will walk you through the project.
4 Both Jeff and Joe are vice presidents of Executive
5 Capital and are running this project. So he'll walk
6 you through the specifics; but at the end, I'll kind
7 of summarize.

8 Thanks again for your time. We appreciate it.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

10 MR. RATZER: Jeffrey Ratzer. I represent
11 the company that's going to develop this property.
12 I have been with the company for 27 years. We are a
13 family-owned business that was founded in 1970 --
14 thank you -- founded in 1970, and we are based in
15 Big Rock, Illinois. It's about 20 minutes southwest
16 of here.

17 We have three primary businesses. We own
18 and manage our own apartment communities. We don't
19 manage other peoples, just ours. We own hotels, and
20 we own health clubs, as Andrew mentioned. Our
21 XSport business is one of our most popular here in
22 St. Charles. We have 11,000 active members there.

23 As Andrew also mentioned, we just finished a
24 multifamily property in Rochester, Minnesota, about

1 four minutes from the Mayo Clinic. They're very
2 similar to St. Charles in the sense that they had no
3 new construction for over 20 years in that
4 community, very much a pent-up demand.

5 We put a shovel in the ground in March of
6 2015. It's 224 units. Our first move-in occurred
7 on October 1st, 2015; and we subsequently leased up
8 the entire property in a 7 1/2-month period. It
9 currently sits at 100 percent occupied.

10 Some of the photos that you'll see up there,
11 but are in your packet as well, will be on the
12 screen are actually direct from that property, and
13 they will be similar to what we want to finish in
14 the St. Charles property.

15 Our architectural firm is a nationally
16 recognized firm called Humphreys & Partners. They
17 build about a hundred apartment communities a year,
18 design, develop start to finish. They build from
19 garden style, which is sort of what I'm building, to
20 skyscrapers.

21 They have created the design for this
22 project that's called a "big house design." As
23 you'll see from the pictures, the idea behind the
24 big house design is to make them multifamily

1 dwelling units that look from the exterior as homes,
2 residential, or town houses. And they've got a
3 unique way of doing it which I'll show you with the
4 presentation.

5 A little overview of the property. We're
6 planning 250 apartments. They're average square
7 foot will be 1,250 square feet, which if you're
8 familiar with some of the competition in town, that
9 would be about 20 percent larger than most of the
10 apartments in the area.

11 We're going to target one-, two-, and
12 three-bedroom apartments, but the majority of the
13 apartments will be two and three bedrooms targeting
14 families or in some cases starting out people with
15 families that want a second bedroom to raise a
16 child, but our hope is to make an impact on the
17 school district. A lot of times when you go into a
18 town, that's not a good thing. I understand that in
19 your community it actually would be a good thing,
20 and we'd be happy to help support that.

21 Basic construction is concrete slab, frame,
22 two-story, so frame siding. Exterior features would
23 be Hardie plank, brick, and stone with a mix of
24 Dryvit.

1 Each apartment will have a one- or two-car
2 attached garage, heated.

3 Inside the units, as you'll see in some of
4 the pictures, we're gearing towards condo quality or
5 residential. We're doing energy efficient stainless
6 steel appliances, granite or quartz countertops,
7 washer, dryer, front-load washer, dryer, USB ports,
8 brush nickle hardware, nice light fixtures, and nice
9 wood-look flooring throughout the kitchen and dining
10 area.

11 The amenity package will include an
12 8,000-square-foot clubhouse that will house a
13 fitness center, an indoor pool, business center,
14 Internet cafe, our leasing offices, and some type of
15 a game room, whether it be billiards, darts, a
16 combination thereof.

17 We plan on having parking ratios about 1.9
18 to 2.0 to 1. So the parking will not be an issue.

19 We have met with staff. We have had several
20 meetings with other St. Charlesians, if that's a
21 word, and everybody seems to frown on gates. Gates
22 were frowned upon. So we took that little nudge,
23 and we do not have gates in this presentation
24 tonight.

1 Finally, as Andrew touched upon, we do this
2 for a living, and we intend to break ground in
3 April. At the very least, a grading permit in
4 April. We expect to be finished in 15 months, and
5 we do not expect to take time outs for phasing or
6 financing or anything else.

7 We have already spoken to the lender who did
8 the Rochester deal. That lender is a Chicago bank
9 named Republic Bank based in Oak Brook. They
10 desperately want to do it again. They were very
11 happy with our progress, our quality, and our
12 lease-up.

13 If there's any questions, I can answer them
14 now, or I can show pictures. How do I do it?
15 Pictures? Okay.

16 So this is the site, just to make sure
17 you're all familiar with where it's at. We face
18 Bricher Road. Bricher Road is entitled to two curb
19 cuts. You'll see that on our site plan, but we're
20 going to enter from Bricher Road and exit onto
21 Bricher Road from two different roadways.

22 So we back up to the Lowe's. We also have
23 access into the Meijer's and Lowe's through an
24 easement -- I don't know if this has anything, but

1 sorry. There's an easement right here to where we
2 put a road. Our residents can go straight into
3 Meijer's.

4 Question? No. Sorry. Okay. So that's
5 that page.

6 All right. So here's the site plan. We
7 have 25 buildings. Each building is going to have
8 10 units. Each building is going to have the same
9 type of unit within the footprint. Each building is
10 going to be about the same size. Typically, the
11 three bedrooms are on the end as are the one
12 bedrooms, and then in the middle are the two-bedroom
13 floor plans.

14 Each one bedroom is going to have one bath,
15 each two bedroom is going to have two baths, and
16 each three bedroom is going to have two baths. The
17 three bedrooms will have two-car garages. The one
18 bedrooms will have a one-car garage, and the two
19 bedrooms will have either a one- or two-car
20 depending on the floor plan the resident chooses.

21 So the plan here is -- and this was another
22 piece of advice we followed from staff is tying
23 together our entrance and exit with Camden Street, I
24 think it's called, Camden. The Lincoln Point

1 housing development is right across the street.

2 So you're going to enter here, go either
3 here or here and park to get into our leasing,
4 clubhouse, which will have the amenities that I
5 mentioned.

6 I'm trying to think. This one would be the
7 exit back onto Bricher with about 3 acres -- we have
8 a civil engineer pinning that down, but it's
9 approximately 3 acres of detention. We're going to
10 make that a water feature, and we're going to hold
11 water throughout the season or as best we could. If
12 it was yesterday, it wouldn't be water. It would be
13 a nice ice skating rink, but other than that, that's
14 our plan for the water.

15 Up here is a playground. Right here is a
16 dog park. Right here is a barbecue area. Also
17 around the pool, there are several amenities which
18 I'll show you guys pictures of that we plan. One
19 would be an outdoor kitchen. Another would be a
20 fire pit, as well as what is in the building.

21 Next, I'll have some samples of what we
22 intend to build.

23 This is just the amenities sheet that I kind
24 of walked through with you guys already.

1 So this is the big house design. Basically,
2 what you have here is the front shot of one of the
3 proposed -- they're basically the same. So let's
4 just say it's something just like this.

5 You basically -- every unit is two stories.
6 Right here is a two-car garage. The gentleman who
7 or lady who rents this apartment or family, I should
8 say, because it's probably the three bedroom, remote
9 control get into your garage. In the back of the
10 garage is a door. The door leads to a staircase.
11 The indoor staircase goes up to your apartment. So
12 there's no exterior walk in here. You don't have to
13 go outside in the frigid weather or the hot weather.
14 You go straight into your apartment.

15 The same applies to a one bedroom but on a
16 different floor. The one bedroom, the person goes
17 into that same door, a different door, but the same
18 door on the back of the garage, and it opens up
19 typically into a mudroom which is in the beginning
20 of their entryway into the first-floor apartment.
21 So either unit has interior access through the
22 garage.

23 It also, if I can flip to this one, has an
24 exterior entrance. So you have right here a front

1 door for this individual's unit. So there's two
2 ways to get in. The front door -- your guests come
3 through the front door. If you're coming home,
4 you go into this garage and go into your apartment.

5 I want to point one thing out. It will be
6 in the amenities later, but the fireplaces are for
7 show. Every unit is going to have an electric
8 fireplace. It gives warmth, and it's very
9 attractive, but there is not going to be any true
10 wood burning fireplaces.

11 This is the other picture I wanted to show
12 you. This is a side view. So you ask how you can
13 have this building and have everybody have garages
14 and not have it look like just a big parking garage.

15 And the way they've had this designed, and
16 it's their unique design, is there's garages on
17 three different sides of this building. Okay. And
18 no matter what angle you look at, other than the one
19 that's just a straight on, no garage, you have the
20 direct access. So this is actually the side
21 building.

22 If I can go back for a second, this plan is
23 similar to what we're going to do in the sense that
24 you have your stone-brick look for aesthetics. You

1 have Hardie plank, which is cement siding for your
2 siding, which avoids wood rot and lasts basically a
3 lifetime. Cement siding doesn't go bad.

4 And then up here you have Dryvit. So we're
5 going to combine these exterior features on our
6 buildings with the color schemes being slightly
7 different. They'll all be earth tones, but they're
8 not going to be identical. We like the concept of
9 having it look like a town house development, but we
10 also like to have a little uniqueness in each of the
11 buildings.

12 So that's not -- I'd like to shut the lights
13 really, it shows better, but this is our kitchen.
14 So basically what we have here is granite
15 countertops. We may go quartz, but it's going to be
16 one or the other. We have subway tile in the back.
17 These brown cabinets are affectionately known up in
18 Rochester as the espresso package, which is fancy
19 for brown.

20 The appliances are state of the art. These
21 were Whirlpool, I believe. Whirlpool appliances,
22 refrigerator, freezer, double door, with ice maker,
23 built-in microwaves, stainless steel glass-top
24 stove, stainless steel dishwasher.

1 The flooring is the -- I think it's --
2 called LVT. It's vinyl plank flooring, and it's a
3 wood look.

4 The light fixtures, that I mentioned, are
5 all very modern; and if you saw it, you can't really
6 see the handles here, any of the doorknobs, this is
7 all brushed nickle.

8 What's not in this picture, and I apologize
9 for the camera width; but right here where I'm
10 pointing is the laundry room, which does have the
11 washer and dryer included near the new fashioned
12 front-loading washers and dryers.

13 The next one. The other one has no fancy
14 name, just the white package, and it's the same
15 design, but for people who like a little bit maybe
16 more modern, more pop look as opposed to the brown
17 more traditional look, same finishes, same
18 everything.

19 This is the fireplace I mentioned. This
20 will be in every living room or sitting area,
21 depending on the floor plan. There will be one in
22 each unit. There's a control right about here
23 somewhere on it that you can increase the flame
24 which increases the heat. It's electric, so there's

1 no gas involved.

2 This we hope to be very similar to the
3 clubhouse we're going to build. This is going to
4 be, as I mentioned, approximately 8,000 square feet.
5 It will basically be two -- one story; but because
6 of the ceiling height and the architecture, we're
7 going to do something as like a loft to get a little
8 extra space overlooking the main area. That's
9 probably where that game room or whatever I was
10 mentioning will end up.

11 This is the indoor pool from Rochester,
12 currently getting a lot of use, according to my
13 manager. Right here, again, out of the picture is a
14 hot tub, and we will have that here as well.

15 This is the cardio equipment within the
16 lifestyle center or the health club. Each of our
17 health clubs around the country in the apartment
18 complexes, not at the actual health clubs, we hire
19 and basically barter for a personal trainer. They
20 live onsite, and they train our residents for either
21 free or for abnormally low rates. It makes the
22 fitness aspect of the gym really vibrant, especially
23 after work.

24 This obviously is not all of it. This is

1 just the cardio space. Behind this wall is locker
2 rooms, a shower, and rest rooms, and off screen to
3 the right is where all of the weights, dumbbells,
4 free weights, all the machinery to work out with is
5 in this room.

6 This room here is about 3,000 feet, and I'd
7 like to make St. Charles 3,500 to 4,000 square feet.
8 The clubhouse in Rochester is 6, and that's why
9 we're going with 8 here, 8,000 square feet.

10 This is the outdoor kitchen that I told you
11 about. It is extremely popular in warm weather
12 locations, and we're going to try it out here. I
13 think in the spring and summer, it will be well
14 used. It's a good place for us to do the meet and
15 greets that we do when we're doing lease-ups. It's
16 also a great place to do monthly breakfasts, monthly
17 cook your own, monthly contests of who can make the
18 best chili. It's a full-service kind of kitchen
19 with a refrigerator kind of down here and the grill
20 and stove, water, and the bar to sit at.

21 I screwed up the last picture. I apologize.
22 How did I do that?

23 MEMBER SPRUTH: Actually, I had a quick
24 question.

1 MR. RATZER: Yes.

2 MEMBER SPRUTH: That outdoor barbecue, is
3 that in the barbecue area?

4 MR. RATZER: No, that's separate.

5 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay. So that would be near
6 the clubhouse then?

7 MR. RATZER: Yes.

8 I've got one more. That one. I don't know
9 if I skipped that, but that's a feature again we
10 didn't do in Rochester. Rochester, we kind of
11 punched it a little bit. We should have done a
12 little bit more.

13 That's a nice feature that's in one of our
14 properties in Texas, and people sit around, and they
15 have a glass of wine, and they visit, and they --
16 you know, we typically pipe in music that people can
17 attach their iPod to or listening devices. You
18 know, we don't encourage parties or things like
19 that, but we encourage sit around and hang out and
20 get to know your neighbor kind of thing.

21 Again, to confirm your answer, we have a
22 small barbecue area that's just like you've seen,
23 and we place them throughout the community where
24 they're just on a stand, a metal stand and a grill,

1 nothing fancy. This is going to be a whole kitchen
2 and separate, and all this is going to be around the
3 pool, the outdoor pool.

4 And that concludes the slide show.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

6 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions?

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have one question.

9 If you go back to the elevation views of the
10 building.

11 MR. RATZER: Sure.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think it was the
13 second one. Yeah, it's there.

14 MR. RATZER: This one?

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

16 MR. RATZER: Okay.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Now, we're talking
18 about a two-story building, yet I see in this
19 elevation you have a flat dormer. Are you going to
20 have 2 1/2 stories? Are you going to have storage,
21 a floor area up there or is that just --

22 MR. RATZER: No. What that's going to be is
23 it's going to be a nice feature -- you see the way
24 the building is laid out, all the garages have to be

1 on the first floor, right. So they take up space.
2 It's common sense.

3 So here's what we have. We only have three
4 apartments on the first floor, three units on the
5 first floor. The seven other per building are all
6 second-floor units.

7 To answer your question, that is going to be
8 vaulted ceilings making the second-floor units
9 probably priced higher because now you're walking
10 into your unit, and you have a big expanse.

11 The typical units on the first floor with
12 the second floor above them, those are 9-foot
13 ceilings. So that's a standard height as far as a
14 condominium; but the second floor will not have a
15 third floor, a half-floor loft, or anything like
16 that. It's going to be open.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That answers my
18 question in that regard.

19 My other question is I kind of got lost when
20 you were talking about the entry to the apartments.
21 You're talking about coming into the garage, go
22 right into a mud room, and up.

23 Are some units without an exterior entrance
24 that only have to come through the garage?

1 MR. RATZER: No. Every unit will have a
2 front door for guests or a resident or their
3 children coming home, not driving, you know, coming
4 home from school. Every unit will have a front
5 door.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: All right. It just
7 wasn't clear.

8 MR. RATZER: Absolutely.

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I thought that was the
10 case but --

11 MR. RATZER: Yes. No. You're correct,
12 every one.

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Thank you very much.

14 MR. RATZER: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right, Tom.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have some general
17 questions. As far as the site plan, you kind of
18 skimmed over that, I think. Would you mind bringing
19 that up, and is there like -- is there sidewalks and
20 how does it relate as far as pedestrian, and, you
21 know, how is it going to encourage pedestrian flow?

22 MR. RATZER: I'm really sorry. Yeah, give
23 me just one second.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: More of a community spirit,

1 you know, et cetera.

2 MR. RATZER: Sure.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: How does it relate to the
4 other things around it?

5 MR. RATZER: Okay. Well -- okay. So in
6 order to answer your question, the community feel,
7 if you will, is going to be enhanced by a tremendous
8 amount of landscaping which is one of the fortes
9 that we do. We landscape all over the place.

10 Typically, what I'm envisioning right now is
11 because we back up to the shopping center, which
12 isn't the most attractive to see from behind, these
13 trees will be planted on berms. So we'll probably
14 berm that area there to give all the residents along
15 the right side or the east side of the property --
16 which is four buildings, 40 units, and half of those
17 units facing -- they will be facing a very nice
18 landscaped buffer, if you will. That's first off.

19 Second of all, as far as, you know, giving
20 it a community feel, it's going to be generated, I
21 think, through the clubhouse. Everything is going
22 to flow through the clubhouse. Our memberships
23 range, whatever, Joe, \$19, \$29 at XSport. This is
24 now included in somebody's rent to have a commercial

1 quality gym.

2 It is going to get a lot of use from our
3 residents. So we want to make -- and, you know, the
4 indoor pool is going to get use, the business
5 center. I failed to mention we're going to have an
6 Internet cafe, which is a cool thing in the morning.
7 We serve Starbucks or Keurigs or whatever and juices
8 while people are getting ready to go to work or
9 whatnot or stopping off to do whatever. We try to
10 make the clubhouse a very inviting place for the
11 residents to stop at.

12 So the feel here is going to be -- they
13 didn't do sidewalks and everything, but our
14 Rochester property has sidewalks. Now, we don't
15 want to make it a concrete jungle. I'll be honest
16 with you.

17 And we don't want to sort of have the feel
18 of, you know -- not connectivity, I don't want to
19 use that word. We want connectivity, but we want to
20 connect to where theoretically they are going to go.
21 So we're going to have paths and walkways and
22 sidewalks and curbing and all that will lead to the
23 clubhouse.

24 I don't know if that's answering you fully.

1 Maybe I'm not understanding exactly what you'd like.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: You answered some of it. I
3 do have a general question also.

4 MR. RATZER: Yes.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Then I'll stop so other
6 people can ask.

7 I'm just curious how you chose the areas
8 that you're making the playground and the dog park
9 and the barbecue. You know, I'm just curious why
10 you chose those areas of the entire site.

11 MR. RATZER: Sure. Well, let me make sure
12 one thing is clear, and I'm not sure it is. We're
13 not buying this. Okay. So we're not just leaving
14 that open. We're just not buying it.

15 Then we have this. So it has to be both
16 convenient and also a place that we feel will get
17 use. I don't want to have a dog park where people
18 don't want to walk their dog because it's too far or
19 whatnot. So we tried to make the dog park
20 specifically -- not exactly equidistant but pretty
21 centrally located from the furthest point on the
22 property.

23 The better answer for you though on the
24 playground makes a lot of sense because I had it

1 here. And some wise person told me you don't want a
2 playground along the road. So part two or plan two
3 came here, and we said let's put it here because
4 right now this is very unlikely to be developed.
5 We're not buying it, but this little piece here is
6 unlikely to be developed. We have an option on it.
7 We can buy it if we want.

8 But part of the problem with this site is
9 that wetlands goes through it. Just like wetlands
10 goes through this southwest corner, and that's why
11 we're not buying it. As you're aware, it's very
12 difficult to remediate wetlands and costly and
13 timely.

14 So I'm not betting there will never be
15 construction there, but I'm saying I want to be
16 furthest from Bricher for my playground and my
17 children, and I want to be somewhere where at the
18 very least there is not development right away. I
19 don't want it here, right, and I don't necessarily
20 want it here.

21 Here it could be I guess for now, but I've
22 heard a lot of grandiose plans from Kane County
23 about building a civic center and all of that, but
24 they don't have the money, and they're not going to

1 do it; but the bottom line is if it's there, I don't
2 want my playground there. So I want it to be a safe
3 environment.

4 As far as the barbecue area, I'm not overly
5 sold on where it is. I just want to add one. There
6 will probably be more, to be honest with you; but
7 the main cooking area, why I picked it is we want to
8 have the leasing, clubhouse, and I may honestly move
9 the pool from here to here because it's always nice
10 when things overlook water. I'm enamored with the
11 Pacific Ocean, but I don't live in California, so I
12 don't get to see it. But I know people like water
13 views, and it's a calming effect.

14 So the clubhouse and everything was
15 specifically designed to overlook the water, and I
16 may move the pool to do the same.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you.

18 MEMBER SPRUTH: I have a question. It
19 actually follows from that, from Tom's question.

20 Would you be able to explain your layout,
21 the design of your layout?

22 MR. RATZER: The apartment or the site plan?

23 MEMBER SPRUTH: The site plan, the actual
24 layout, why you've decided to use that layout as

1 opposed to other layouts, traffic flows and just --

2 MR. RATZER: You're talking about that
3 letter you got.

4 MEMBER SPRUTH: I'm just talking about the
5 layout.

6 MR. RATZER: Okay. I'll get to that one
7 next.

8 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay. If you could just
9 provide a little background.

10 MR. RATZER: Sure. The layout is supposed
11 to be conducive to access to everything. I only
12 have the land with which I can work. So the reason
13 for the layout is in order to be an economically
14 feasible property, I have to build between 250 and
15 300 apartments. This is a 20-acre site. So that
16 turns out to be 12 1/2, a little over 12 1/2 units
17 per acre. Rochester is 19 1/2.

18 So this is very atypical of us for land use.
19 Typically, we would use three story, and that's how
20 we would make our numbers. In this particular case,
21 we talked to the architect, asked him what would fit
22 on 20.5 acres. He gave me a layout. We then took
23 out the three acres for detention, which is again my
24 civil engineer's estimate, and we came up with this

1 plan.

2 There's no magic to it or no real -- I mean,
3 there was thought given to it, but the thought was
4 how do we fit it on here. How do we also not make
5 it so rigid that it looks like a bunch of barracks
6 were built because I've seen a lot of properties
7 where they just -- they don't have any green space,
8 the buildings are one on top of the other, and
9 they're the same style, and they're the same
10 direction, if you will.

11 So we wanted to angle some of the buildings.
12 This one got angled. This one got angled. We may
13 angle a few more if it works for the parking ratios.

14 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay. I guess you're very
15 close to Geneva Commons. Pedestrian access -- so I
16 guess there's an opportunity there to connect with
17 the nearby shopping.

18 MR. RATZER: Well, the goal I guess, if you
19 will, is to promote the access to both Meijer's --
20 Lowe's, you know, people go when they need
21 something, but Meijer's would be a typical place to
22 shop as well as Geneva Commons.

23 I guess the question is I can't give them a
24 direct route to it because they have to cross

1 Bricher, right.

2 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes.

3 MR. RATZER: So I'm trying to figure out
4 like -- I understand what you're saying, but at the
5 same point what I can do, what I've been told I'm
6 going to have to do is connect -- I guess there is a
7 sidewalk right here, and I'm now in the sidewalk
8 business apparently. Going from here to here --
9 that's part of being a developer -- I'm going to do
10 some sort of sidewalk.

11 So there's going to be that connectivity to
12 continue the sidewalk to Lowe's, and that gets
13 people to walk to Meijer's, but I can't solve the
14 problem of -- I can't -- I mean, it sounds silly. I
15 don't think you mean this. But I can't built a
16 bridge over Bricher, right, so that they can walk
17 there.

18 MEMBER SPRUTH: No. But if it's appropriate
19 for a path throughout the development to encourage
20 pedestrian flow.

21 MR. RATZER: Just within the development,
22 oh, sure. I got you. Okay.

23 MEMBER KESSLER: I just want to bring one
24 thing up. At the risk of being annoying and

1 sounding curmudgeonry, it's not Bricher.

2 MR. RATZER: Say it again.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: It's pronounced Brisher
4 with an SH.

5 MR. RATZER: Really.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: The Bricher family still
7 lives here.

8 MR. RATZER: Bricher. Bricher.

9 MEMBER KESSLER: They have the farm on the
10 corner of Randall and Bricher Road. It was torn
11 down about 25 years ago, but the family is there.
12 Their name is Bricher. Get that in your head,
13 Bricher.

14 MR. RATZER: Bricher. You got it.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: We don't want to change the
16 name of the road or the family.

17 MR. RATZER: Bricher. No one has ever said
18 that, even the owner of the property.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: I only know that because Tim
20 told me.

21 MR. RATZER: Okay.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: Bricher.

23 MR. RATZER: Bricher.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Tim was born and raised

1 here.

2 MR. RATZER: Okay. You got it. Thank you.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Brian, I'm sorry.

4 MR. DOYLE: So questions -- you mentioned
5 just a second ago that typically you look at
6 three-story buildings. So this is in response to
7 Michelle's question about the layout.

8 So do you have designs for this big style
9 house that are three stories?

10 MR. RATZER: No.

11 MR. DOYLE: No.

12 MR. RATZER: They don't come in three
13 stories.

14 MR. DOYLE: Okay. That's not for this
15 style.

16 MR. RATZER: No. If I go three story, I'm
17 going to build a flat roof deal, maybe even ask for
18 four story; and then I have to go underground
19 parking because as you're going up I need everybody
20 to have parking in Chicago and Rochester. Right.
21 That's the inclement weather I'm dealing with. So I
22 need to make sure that everybody has a heated
23 parking space or two.

24 In Rochester I built a mix of two-story town

1 houses or actually just town houses, a small amount,
2 and two three-story buildings all with underground
3 parking.

4 This is a nicer style, much -- I mean I
5 can't tell you how much nicer, and I don't want to
6 do three story or four story here to get my density,
7 if you will. I could fit -- on 20 acres, I could
8 fit 400, 500 units. I know you've heard that 400,
9 500, and 600 unit speech before. No one is happy.

10 I don't want it. I want 250 units plain and
11 simple, but I want them to be really nice. And I
12 want them to be really aesthetically pleasing from
13 the outside. So even though -- and I was here at
14 some previous hearings where, you know, the hand
15 drawings were shown to make it look a little better.

16 I laughed because I said that's the building
17 I ended up with in Rochester when I had to go up in
18 the three-story concept, and it's very nice. It's
19 fine. It's okay. But it doesn't stand out. It
20 doesn't look residential. It looks like an
21 apartment building. That's what that style looks
22 like. This style looks like homes, town houses.

23 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So I just want to make
24 sure --

1 MR. RATZER: Sure.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: -- that this style, this big
3 house style --

4 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

5 MR. DOYLE: -- is not an option for a three
6 story.

7 MR. RATZER: No.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: It's a two-story product.

9 MR. RATZER: Yeah. It could be -- I don't
10 want, you know, if you look it up online, it could
11 be three story, but not everybody gets a garage, and
12 that's not what I want to do.

13 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So I also just in terms
14 of the layout -- I was looking at this before the
15 meeting, the letter that we received, which I assume
16 you read as well.

17 MR. RATZER: Uh-huh.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: I assume that part of the
19 challenge of laying out this neighborhood is because
20 you have garage access on three sides of the
21 building --

22 MR. RATZER: Right.

23 MR. DOYLE: -- and as well as street-level
24 parking.

1 MR. RATZER: Yes.

2 MR. DOYLE: Are there other -- are there
3 other examples -- you've done this style home, this
4 big --

5 MR. RATZER: Just once. This is going to
6 be it.

7 MR. DOYLE: Just once.

8 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: This is the first one.

10 MR. RATZER: Yeah, now. And the reason
11 we're doing it is because it's much more practical
12 to get everybody a garage on a two-story deal where
13 people aren't doing elevators and going up three
14 stories.

15 Had I met, and unfortunately I did not, meet
16 this architect and their firm until post Rochester,
17 I would have built this in Rochester.

18 MR. DOYLE: Let me ask one more question
19 then. Regarding the parcel that's -- you don't own
20 the entire parcel that's under the PUD; right?

21 MR. RATZER: Right now there is 55 acres in
22 Bricher Commons. Okay. 55 acres. I'm under
23 contract to buy 20.5. Originally, I was under
24 contract to buy 20.5, but it included this.

1 After doing our survey and a wetland
2 delineation, we found out that this is 1 acre of
3 wetland that goes right here on an angle. So what
4 does that mean? This 1 acre can't be accessed.

5 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

6 MR. RATZER: It's blocked by the wetlands.
7 So we traded with the developer -- the owner, excuse
8 me, the owner of the property this piece for this
9 piece.

10 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

11 MR. RATZER: Okay. And our option is for
12 this piece roughly. So this parcel, this whole
13 parcel is 32 acres, right, but we're under contract
14 with the option. 32 acres, but I plan on building
15 on 20 1/2 right now.

16 MR. DOYLE: So I'm going to keep myself to
17 questions at this point because it's sort of assumed
18 in the comments, but you mentioned earlier market
19 viability; right?

20 MR. RATZER: Say it again.

21 MR. DOYLE: Market viability.

22 MR. RATZER: Yes. Yeah.

23 MR. DOYLE: So if you exercise that option
24 to buy the 32-acre parcel so that you don't have to

1 keep that alcove that you have there, what would the
2 density requirement -- would you still be able to
3 make it business viable with the density that you
4 have with 250?

5 MR. RATZER: 250 and buy that?

6 MR. DOYLE: Yeah. What I'm trying to
7 ascertain here is in terms of the comments that
8 Michelle and Tom made regarding sidewalks and
9 continuity within the parcel, if you had more land
10 to spread the buildings out, to give a little more
11 space between the buildings.

12 MR. RATZER: Right.

13 MR. DOYLE: But the density, the same number
14 of units --

15 MR. RATZER: Spread out more.

16 MR. DOYLE: -- spread across more land,
17 across 30 acres rather or whatever that would be,
18 what would that do to your business plan?

19 MR. RATZER: It would hurt. I don't know if
20 it would make it unfeasible, but it would
21 definitely -- I mean, I'm buying land for no reason.
22 It's not income-producing land.

23 But let me say even more practically why
24 it's not feasible. As I mentioned earlier, the

1 reason we took this outcrop, okay, is because over
2 here scattered throughout the option land is
3 wetland.

4 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

5 MR. RATZER: So most of it can't be built
6 on. So other than saying I have 250 units on 30
7 acres, they're still going to be on the same 20 1/2
8 acres.

9 MR. DOYLE: Okay. One final question. I
10 actually have a couple questions of staff here.

11 In terms of subdividing this 55- or 58-acre
12 parcel, these wetlands are carved out and not part
13 of this subdivision, what practically happens to
14 those portions of land? Do they -- you know,
15 they're just not developable? They can't be
16 developed?

17 MR. COLBY: Well, they could be left as
18 parcels that could be developed in the future under
19 the existing PUD. The assumption would be that this
20 applicant, if they are the purchaser of this entire
21 site, would likely be subdividing it so that this is
22 all a single-platted development. And the parcels
23 that remain around it could be platted and developed
24 at some point in the future, if the property owner

1 wished to sell them.

2 MR. DOYLE: Okay. And one more question
3 regarding some of the terms in the 2006 amendment to
4 the PUD. There are provisions in there regarding
5 density bonuses for affordable housing and
6 provisions regarding the maximum density that could
7 be built.

8 The 250 units as provided for in the 2006
9 amendment, is that inclusive of the 20 percent
10 density bonus for the prior version for affordable
11 housing?

12 MR. COLBY: Well, those requirements in that
13 PUD ordinance, that was prior to the City having an
14 inclusionary housing ordinance. So there was no
15 standard requirement. So it was written
16 specifically into that PUD ordinance for this
17 project based on the project that was proposed at
18 the time, so that there is a requirement within that
19 existing PUD ordinance for the affordable units to
20 be provided as part of the residential development.
21 It is necessarily a function of the density bonus.

22 However, the developer's proposal in this
23 concept plan would be for a new PUD ordinance to be
24 put in place, in which case it would be written

1 under our current City code requirements that would
2 require the inclusionary housing. So it will be met
3 through fee in lieu or creation of units. So we
4 would utilize those current requirements to,
5 essentially, replace whatever is written into that
6 2006 PUD that predates our current inclusionary
7 housing requirements.

8 MR. DOYLE: Correct. So I understand that
9 the applicant is proposing a new PUD, but just in
10 terms -- since the 2006 amendment references
11 250 units and this concept plan references 250
12 units, I just want to understand for my own
13 knowledge -- for instance, in Section F-3 of the
14 ordinance on page 5, the text reads -- so there's
15 20 percent of the total number of residential units
16 shall be offered as affordable for sale or rental
17 units.

18 There are -- in Section F-2, it says,
19 "Subject to any permissible density bonus adjustment
20 as set forth below."

21 And then in Section F-4, it says, "A density
22 bonus shall be allowed for affordable housing units
23 offered in excess of the 20 percent."

24 So what I'm just trying to understand is the

1 density requirements or limitations in that -- in
2 those various clauses. 250 units on 7.25 dwelling
3 units per gross acre, that's not inclusive of the
4 density bonus per se. The density bonus is on top
5 of the 20 percent stipulation for affordable units.
6 So like 25 percent of affordable units were built,
7 then an additional density bonus would be applied.

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. I believe that's the
9 intent of how that's read, yes.

10 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

11 I don't have any further questions.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Did you follow what they were
14 talking about --

15 MR. RATZER: Not a word.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: -- with that?

17 MR. RATZER: Not one word.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: I had a feeling.

19 MR. RATZER: You saw my eyes glaze over?

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Maybe it needs to be
21 explained again by somebody.

22 MR. DOYLE: Well, when I get into the
23 portion for comments, I'll explain why I brought
24 that up, what I'm interpreting that to mean.

1 MR. RATZER: Okay. Thanks.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: You're okay with that?

3 MR. RATZER: Yeah. Sure.

4 MEMBER PRETZ: Did you have your drink?

5 MR. RATZER: Yes, I did.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: I did have a couple of items.

7 Early on you indicated that in your
8 discussions with various City personnel, staff, that
9 they were against you providing a gate -- or not a
10 gate but fencing and that around the --

11 MR. RATZER: Not necessarily fencing but
12 gated access.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

14 MR. RATZER: My original plan had a gate
15 basically right here for in and a gate here for out.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. So it was just
17 specific to the gate.

18 MR. RATZER: Correct.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Okay. Thank you for
20 clarifying that.

21 MR. RATZER: Sure.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: You had mentioned -- you had
23 talked about the time frame of Minnesota, which was
24 a very -- is a very impressive time frame.

1 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: It's probably hard to
3 duplicate. Just out of curiosity, what is -- as you
4 take a look at this development and you go to start,
5 what realistically is the time frame that you plan,
6 obviously, from a financial perspective and things
7 like that to do the full build out.

8 MR. RATZER: Build the whole property or
9 lease the property? It's two different things. I
10 just want to be clear.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: I would say lease.

12 MR. RATZER: Lease the property.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Yeah.

14 MR. RATZER: Okay. So I've got to go back,
15 right, because -- I'm going to build the property in
16 15 months, maybe 16, if we're slow.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

18 MR. RATZER: Okay. That's shovel in the
19 ground to final sale of every unit.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

21 MR. RATZER: But here's what we did, the
22 plan will be to build the clubhouse, right, not
23 necessarily the pool but the clubhouse, and these
24 first buildings here on Bricher. That's going to

1 take some time. Those four buildings will be built
2 simultaneously with the clubhouse.

3 I'm not going to wait, smartly, you'd agree
4 I hope, for a CO on 250 units when I can move a
5 project along at a rapid pace by getting a CO on
6 one, two, three, or four buildings. Once I get
7 those and a CO on the clubhouse, I staff that
8 clubhouse, and now I'm leasing.

9 Now, typically, I would say it's probably
10 four to six months from shovel in the ground to a
11 leasing center and four buildings that are, you
12 know, within range of a CO. And then you fine tune
13 it, and you go back, and, you know, you put on some
14 light fixtures, but we can pretty much start
15 pre-leasing them.

16 That's why when I started in Rochester, I
17 leased the first unit -- March to October is
18 what? -- six months. I didn't lease them all. I
19 had a building. It had a CO.

20 So my plan realistically is to complete this
21 entire project in 15 or 16 months; and from the day
22 I get a building, so say six months, I'm going to
23 have it leased up. By the time the last building
24 comes online, that should be the last one to get

1 occupied. But we pre-lease, and that's what we did.
2 We pre-leased Rochester because it was such a high
3 demand for housing, like I truly believe here.
4 Andrew touched on it.

5 Every apartment complex you have in your
6 town and in Geneva has a waiting list, and that's
7 good for the owners. It's not good for your
8 residents. You know, you need more. You need more
9 supply, and you need some newer supply here. The
10 older stuff had its day, but it's not what I'm going
11 to build.

12 But anyway to answer your question, I think
13 I'm being realistic, 15 or 16 months start to finish
14 CO, and leasing seven months or so, maybe eight
15 because it's 25 more units, after I start leasing
16 that first one.

17 And, again, if I think I'm going to get a CO
18 on that building, let's just say, September or
19 October, same thing. I'm going to start leasing in
20 August. I'm going to have balloons out. I'm going
21 to have a trailer. I'm going to have some photos.
22 I'm going to have floor plans, and that's what I'm
23 going to do.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Thank you.

1 Just for clarification, on the entry, the
2 two entries coming into the site --

3 MR. RATZER: Yes.

4 MEMBER PRETZ: -- and I just may have
5 misunderstood, both of those are two-way, not entry
6 only on one and exit on the other; correct?

7 MR. RATZER: Correct. In and out, both.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: Both. Okay. Okay.

9 MR. RATZER: I will also -- as a quick note,
10 if I can share. I think it's okay. I'm going to be
11 providing for the next meeting, January 9th, and I'm
12 sure you guys will have access to it, a traffic
13 study which I was suggested to get done, and we did
14 that.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: My last question is because
16 you come across as being the face of your company --

17 MR. RATZER: It's in sad shape then.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, and the decision
19 making, I think people are going to see you as --
20 because of your communication skills, your body
21 language, and that almost indicates that you'll be a
22 resident within the complex. And you talked about
23 the fact that you manage these complexes.

24 So I think, you know, based on how you're

1 presenting everything and, you know, the mannerisms,
2 how you describe it, your honesty with answering
3 questions, my question to you is -- people are going
4 to buy into your management of that, and they may
5 have a certain comfort level with that.

6 Do you sell your properties at some point,
7 or are all of your developments staying with --
8 currently staying within your management structure?

9 MR. RATZER: We have a saying in our office,
10 and it's the truth. The chairman of the company,
11 the founder, the patriarch, who, by the way, all he
12 wants to do is build apartments. We have gyms, and
13 we have hotels, but all he wants to do is build
14 apartments. Why? Because he's a big kid. He's
15 72 years old, and he wants to play in the dirt.

16 He is the one on the bobcat. He is the one
17 on the backhoe. He is the one on the heavy
18 machinery. He will be building this property, and
19 he -- the comment we say to him is, Hey, do you want
20 to sell one? Do you want to sell one?

21 And he says, I'm not selling. I don't sell.
22 And the comment that goes around to him is we have
23 to pry the deed from his cold dead hands to sell the
24 property. So we have done it. Okay. I'm not going

1 to lie to you. You've told me, thank you, that you
2 think that I'm honest. I am. We have sold
3 properties.

4 The one in Rochester we just put on another
5 five-year loan, a brand new property. We've gotten
6 offers, but he'd rather own that property. That's a
7 private ownership one.

8 This one will be his baby. Why? He lives
9 up here six months out of the year. This is going
10 to be the most heavily managed property in our
11 portfolio. I feel bad for the onsite people. I
12 really do. We're already talking about what we're
13 going to spend at Lowe's because there was a Lowe's
14 right in front of us at Rochester.

15 And he is extremely excited about it. I
16 can't promise we won't sell it, but there are no
17 plans to build this and sell it. It is going to be
18 a long-term hold, in my opinion, because I believe
19 it's going to cash flow. Right. We want to sell
20 when things are kind of not going good. Right. I
21 think this is going to make money.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: That's all I have on that.

23 MR. RATZER: Even with that extra sidewalk.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I have a few

1 questions. You know, most of mine -- as I write
2 them down, most of them center around traffic flow,
3 and the concerns that I have -- ideally, I would
4 like to eventually see a north/south collector road
5 between 38 and Bricher, and my concern is developing
6 property that would hinder that.

7 And so I guess my first question would be if
8 there was a north/south collector road to the west
9 of the property, how would this property interface
10 with that?

11 MR. RATZER: You mean not on this property,
12 like through Kane County?

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

14 MR. RATZER: Well, I mean, I guess would you
15 want it to interface, I guess, is what I'm asking.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, ideally -- I guess
17 let me ask my next question --

18 MR. RATZER: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- before you answer that
20 one. What is the concern about interfacing with the
21 stuff between Meijer and Lowe's?

22 MR. RATZER: Nothing. Nothing. I don't
23 have a concern.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Just because it's

1 not there on the site plan.

2 MR. RATZER: Oh, no, I hear you. The reason
3 is is because we didn't know where to put it because
4 we kept trading land. We weren't buying this. We
5 didn't know if it was going to be -- if our property
6 was going to touch that easement. There is an
7 easement there. We can connect to it.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

9 MR. RATZER: We will connect to it. Because
10 we're not going to be gated or fenced in, it's just
11 another access or more likely an exit point for our
12 residents. So there is no problem with us
13 connecting to Meijer's.

14 If I'm allowed later to touch on the letter
15 that we all got, that's the only thing in the letter
16 I agreed with.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And, you know, I
18 mean, I'm perceiving that residents will want to --
19 you know, obviously, they're going to want to access
20 Randall Road there. They're going to want to access
21 Peck Road, which is no problem.

22 MR. RATZER: They're easy, yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But they'll also want to
24 access Route 38, and that can be, you know -- by

1 doing it from here, you're going out onto Bricher,
2 and you're going to a difficult light on Randall to
3 another difficult light at 38, as opposed to just
4 being able to go through Meijer and out that
5 direction.

6 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So I think that that
8 would be something that's important.

9 MR. RATZER: If that's something you guys
10 want in lieu of talking about this road because no
11 one is going to build this today. Right. I mean,
12 it doesn't exist, this north/south road.

13 So if you're talking about having access
14 through the Meijer's and Lowe's easement where then
15 they get to go wherever they want to go, whether
16 it's to 38 or not, I have no problem with that.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Or to Meijer or Lowe's.

18 MR. RATZER: Exactly. Yeah. Exactly.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There is an unfortunate
20 pinch point that I believe was not the best planning
21 by an adjoining municipality at the entrance to
22 Geneva Commons. And that's not right. I mean,
23 there are always people turning into that
24 development that are blocking the road.

1 You know, and if the only access that people
2 are having is going east and hitting that traffic
3 jam, I mean, just -- I was there last night, you
4 know, and I saw four different cars stuck in the
5 middle of the road and people not being able to go
6 east.

7 So I want to give -- I'm sensitive to
8 traffic flow and making --

9 MR. RATZER: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- it make sense.

11 MR. RATZER: I think you'll be happy with
12 the traffic study.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

14 MR. RATZER: I got a premium. I think
15 you'll be very happy with it; but I wish I had not
16 my unit mix on this corner because I'm blocking the
17 view of what you're talking about.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

19 MR. RATZER: I'm sorry about that.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's okay.

21 MR. RATZER: But I have absolutely no
22 problem with what you're saying.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the other thing that
24 I would -- in conjunction with that, my opinion is

1 it would be better if there were kind of a more
2 defined east/west and north/south collector road
3 within the development. The issue that I see on the
4 site plan is right here.

5 MR. RATZER: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Because people are coming
7 in the main entrance --

8 MR. RATZER: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- and they're hitting a
10 T. I would just -- I don't know if there is a way
11 that you could explore making that more of a
12 throughway as opposed to, you know --

13 MR. RATZER: Well --

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- hitting that turn.

15 MR. RATZER: The problem is I have to get
16 people to these two buildings. Right. So if I just
17 took your suggestion and took this and sort of just
18 went up here as a north/south, I can get these two
19 buildings, but I lose these two. Otherwise, they're
20 going past their apartments, right, and then having
21 to come back down.

22 And I don't see a benefit to that because
23 it's not a -- really the feeder road, if you will,
24 that you're mentioning, it does exist right here

1 straight across east/west.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

3 MR. RATZER: So that branches off, right,
4 but unfortunately, I don't have a perfectly square
5 site. I have detention in the middle. So I've got
6 to live with what's going on. I just -- you know, I
7 don't know how to do that north/south.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Well, I guess the
9 message would be is to have more of a clearly
10 defined road that approaches as straight in as
11 possible to reduce confusion. I'm thinking of -- I
12 mean, my brother used to live in AMLI and getting
13 around that parking lot was so confusing with all
14 the --

15 MR. RATZER: Well, they have a lot of dead
16 ends too.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Exactly. Exactly.

18 MR. RATZER: I don't have that many dead
19 ends. I tried to make -- and it's still a work in
20 progress. I'll take what you're saying into
21 consideration, but I don't know how I can get all
22 the way up and get all my buildings in. If my
23 architect can do it, he's supposed to be so smart,
24 right. Let me ask him.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

2 MR. RATZER: Let me ask him how to do it.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the other minor
4 thing, there's a little island up there, the green
5 island.

6 MR. RATZER: This?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. This here?

8 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't know if there's a
10 way to eliminate that and --

11 MR. RATZER: Done.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- lengthen out the
13 driveways.

14 MR. RATZER: Next conversation. Done.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It seems confusing going
16 in there and two streets here and here, you know,
17 so.

18 MR. RATZER: Put it in your column. That's
19 a win. That's a win. I don't know what it's doing
20 there either.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

22 MR. RATZER: I thought it was dust. So get
23 rid of it.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't want to --

1 MR. RATZER: Yeah. I get tougher as it
2 goes, but that's all you. That road going through I
3 agree with. Like I said, there was that letter. I
4 don't agree with anything else the man said, but I
5 agree with that. And I agree that whatever it's
6 there for in the architectural world, I don't need
7 it.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

9 MR. RATZER: It's just more space. So we
10 can clean that up.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the only other thing,
12 and you would know this better than I, but I just
13 have to ask the question.

14 MR. RATZER: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are there enough parking
16 spaces at the clubhouse? I mean, do you foresee
17 driving and parking there?

18 MR. RATZER: Of course, a lot of -- I see in
19 the winter people driving there.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

21 MR. RATZER: And it's 24 hours, by the way.
22 People get an access code, keypad, and we change it
23 every month. We notify the tenants, right, like one
24 of those door lock things 411, and they get in.

1 So I think there's probably enough parking.
2 I could probably squeeze in more. Okay. But --

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that's more a -- just
4 a question that I'm -- suggestion, you know.

5 MR. RATZER: No, no. It's a fair question,
6 and I could probably squeeze in more. I mean, if
7 you look, I do have plenty of land right around
8 that. I mean, I can make it a longer row. I can
9 attach it.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Of course, you know, you
11 don't want an empty parking lot for people to look
12 at as opposed to green --

13 MR. RATZER: Yeah. That's true.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- but at the some time,
15 you want to give people the opportunity to park.

16 MR. RATZER: Absolutely. Yeah. And
17 especially if we're going to have classes where we
18 have, you know, personal training or whatnot. Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah, Brian.

20 MR. DOYLE: Before we go into questions or
21 comments, the applicant did -- well, the applicant
22 did mention -- he had asked if he would have a
23 chance to reply to the letter that we received, and
24 I just wondered if we want to --

1 MR. RATZER: I mean, if you don't care, I
2 don't care, but it was way off.

3 MR. DOYLE: Well, if you think --

4 MEMBER KESSLER: We have more questions, so
5 before we go there.

6 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

8 MR. RATZER: It's your call, guys.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I always say that a
10 written statement from someone who doesn't appear at
11 the meeting has limited credibility to me but --

12 MR. DOYLE: Well, I would just point out
13 that I think the purpose of a hearing is to give the
14 applicant a chance to rebut anything that's
15 presented to the Commission. So if you feel --

16 MR. RATZER: I can run through a couple
17 things that are just beyond reasonable, but after
18 you folks are done.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If it was a public
20 hearing, I mean that -- no, it's a concept plan. So
21 we'll take it and consider it; but if it was a
22 public hearing, I mean, it's not subject to
23 cross-examination, so to speak. I mean, it just
24 doesn't make very good evidence, you know.

1 MR. RATZER: I hear you. That's fine.
2 However you guys want to do it.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

4 MEMBER SPRUTH: Just looking at -- you
5 talked about the wetland.

6 MR. RATZER: Uh-huh.

7 MEMBER SPRUTH: And then you also talked
8 about your need for a wet detention area.

9 MR. RATZER: Say that again. I'm sorry.

10 MEMBER SPRUTH: We talked about your
11 wetlands --

12 MR. RATZER: Yes.

13 MEMBER SPRUTH: -- and that you needed the
14 wet detention area.

15 MR. RATZER: Well, I need a detention area.
16 I'm choosing to make it a wet one for aesthetics.

17 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay.

18 MR. RATZER: Yes.

19 MEMBER SPRUTH: Have you explored or the
20 engineers explored using the wetland area as your
21 detention area?

22 MR. RATZER: Not allowed, surprisingly.
23 That was my first suggestion. You cannot use
24 wetlands for detention.

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Is that -- can't you make
2 an application for that?

3 MS. TUNGARE: Yes. You can make an
4 application.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What are we using behind
6 Aldi? Isn't that wetland, their detention area?

7 MEMBER SPRUTH: We have worked on projects
8 where we've used wetlands as detention areas.

9 MR. RATZER: If you involve the Army Corp of
10 Engineers.

11 MS. TUNGARE: The application time for that
12 is two to four months for that application.

13 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

14 MEMBER SPRUTH: I guess that's what my
15 question is.

16 MR. RATZER: We considered it then.

17 MEMBER SPRUTH: So you considered it?

18 MR. RATZER: Yes.

19 MEMBER SPRUTH: But then you said, no, you
20 can't --

21 MR. RATZER: We can't do it in a practical
22 manner is what I meant to say.

23 MEMBER SPRUTH: So discuss with them -- you
24 can't -- I don't understand that.

1 MR. RATZER: It was a lot easier for us to
2 trade land that doesn't have wetlands than to enter
3 in negotiations with the Army Corp of Engineers. It
4 just wasn't practical for us from a timing
5 perspective.

6 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay. But --

7 MR. RATZER: So your point is correct.

8 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yeah. I guess if you were
9 limited in your area using -- you could then use
10 this detention area to perhaps maybe facilitate the
11 layout of the site.

12 MR. RATZER: Okay. Fair enough. But I
13 think it would turn out to be exactly the same. Let
14 me say why. The reason that we have the site laid
15 out the way it was is I had originally -- if you
16 look at this screen somewhere, here. I had
17 originally had that piece of property with the
18 wetlands under contract. Right.

19 I no longer have that piece of property
20 under because I didn't want to go through the two-
21 to four-month process of working with the Army Corp
22 of Engineers.

23 So what I did was I traded the same amount
24 of acreage for this parcel up here. This parcel was

1 within, you know, a thousand feet is the same as
2 this, and it doesn't have wetlands, so I don't have
3 to talk to the Army Corp of Engineers.

4 So if you just imagine that with what you're
5 suggesting, these four buildings would be over here.
6 I'd have the same layout and the same streets and
7 the same everything. I would just be behind two to
8 four months.

9 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes. I'm actually talking
10 about using the detention area. The detention area
11 could go to the other side.

12 MR. RATZER: The detention area you say
13 would come here?

14 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes.

15 MR. RATZER: Okay. But I still have 3 acres
16 of detention; right?

17 MEMBER SPRUTH: Well, yeah, you know, you
18 would just connect -- increase the area. You would
19 apply for an additional area for your detention. So
20 that would be an acre and a half. I forget what you
21 said about --

22 MR. RATZER: This area here was about -- I'm
23 sorry -- the piece we're not buying is 2.08 acres.

24 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yeah.

1 MR. RATZER: And we traded --

2 MEMBER SPRUTH: So you need 3 acres.

3 MR. RATZER: Right.

4 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yeah. First of all, it
5 starts with a conversation, a discussion with the
6 Army Corp of Engineers --

7 MR. RATZER: Right.

8 MEMBER SPRUTH: -- about what you want to
9 do, and then, you know, you kind of go from there.

10 I mean, I guess it's been raised several
11 times regarding the site layout, and I'm just
12 perhaps giving additional ideas of where this site
13 layout can be improved, the area that you have.

14 MR. RATZER: I guess here's my question, if
15 I may, in response. Personally, what don't you like
16 about this site layout? What am I missing?

17 MEMBER KESSLER: Well, we're going to get to
18 that.

19 MR. RATZER: Oh, okay, great. I can't wait.
20 That's going to be terrific.

21 MEMBER KESSLER: That's a comment.

22 MR. RATZER: To answer your question, the
23 real bottom line is we build all over the country,
24 everybody seems to have wetlands, and the Army Corp

1 of Engineers could maybe quote you two or four
2 months; but when push comes to shove, they take as
3 long as they want, and there's no resolution. It's
4 not it will definitely be done. Right.

5 I want to jump on this project. I'm very
6 excited about the project. I want to start in
7 April. I have a lot of meetings to get through. I
8 don't want to have it all contingent on come back
9 after you deal with the Army Corp of Engineers.

10 So we put it aside, and we decided to trade
11 land so that we don't have to deal with the
12 wetlands, so that we can start the process formally
13 with you folks. This is our first meeting formally.
14 You know, I have three more, I understand, if I get
15 that far. I don't want to talk to the Army.

16 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Before we do
18 anything further, the Plan Commission, are there any
19 comments from members of the audience? Nothing?
20 Questions?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Chris, did you have
23 anything that you wanted to add.

24 MR. BONG: Yeah. I'd just add that I

1 believe you can -- you could expand the wetlands,
2 but it would take a permit from the Army Corp.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

4 MR. BONG: So that's what I wanted to add.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. All right.

6 MR. RATZER: Did Tim have questions?

7 MEMBER KESSLER: No, no.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. We're going to --

9 MR. KOLB: I have one comment I just wanted
10 to address real quick. I think, Brian, your comment
11 was --

12 MR. DOYLE: Yes.

13 MR. KOLB: -- regarding the 2006 PUD
14 agreement. I think you were saying, essentially,
15 the density was the same as what we were proposing
16 but on a larger area of land. Was that your point?

17 MR. DOYLE: I was actually asking the
18 question about some of the stipulations under that
19 PUD agreement.

20 MR. KOLB: Right.

21 MR. DOYLE: So the number of units is the
22 same; but in this application, it's for a smaller
23 parcel of land --

24 MR. KOLB: Exactly.

1 MR. DOYLE: -- which means the density is
2 higher.

3 MR. KOLB: Right. And I guess my only point
4 to that was that the applicant in '06, DMC I think
5 it was called, obviously, didn't get that project
6 off the ground the way that that project was
7 proposed in '06; and I think while you have the same
8 density in a smaller area from what was proposed in
9 that PUD, we're proposing a brand new PUD that
10 actually has an economic -- that can make economic
11 sense for the applicant.

12 So I think that's really the contrast. We
13 get into a slippery slope when we start looking at
14 the standards of an application from 2006 that
15 didn't get -- you know, the plan never got off the
16 ground.

17 MR. DOYLE: I understand your concern, and I
18 think I'll -- when I make my comments, I'll put your
19 questions to ease.

20 MR. KOLB: Okay. Great.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So I do want
22 to wrap up the comments before we get to that. If
23 you want to say anything about this, that's fine.

24 MR. RATZER: If you don't care, I don't

1 care. I just want it on the record that he's off on
2 everything but that road. The road is a legitimate
3 thing.

4 I mean, just for example -- let me give you
5 one example. He is afraid that the people in the
6 back here by that playground, for example, are going
7 to be -- they will feel secluded, isolated, and over
8 time probably unsafe.

9 And unless you guys know something about
10 St. Charles and its security that I don't know and I
11 shouldn't be investing here, I think no matter which
12 corner these people live in, they're going to feel
13 safe.

14 As far as the other items, secluded and
15 isolated, I could tell you for a fact that in my
16 Rochester project, the people in the back facing a
17 field, nothing, paid extra for the solitude, the
18 view, and the peace and quiet.

19 So there's other things in here that I
20 strongly disagree with. One other one, just to get
21 a point across, is he says that the layout is so bad
22 that there should be buildings along these roads
23 here. That's what he's saying, buildings along
24 these roads. Again, if I'm a resident in a nice

1 community, the last thing I want to do is live along
2 a road. I want to live along a berm or a pool, a
3 playground, or anything else.

4 This is filled with items like that. Other
5 than one sentence, they should extend the private
6 drive between Meijer and Lowe's and line up
7 buildings on both sides of this street. I guess I
8 agree.

9 Thank you for letting me say that.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

11 All right. Anything else? All right.

12 Then we will -- anything from staff?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. I just wanted to direct
14 the Plan Commission to page 11 of the staff memo,
15 which is the last page, where the items are listed
16 for the Plan Commission to provide feedback so that
17 we could provide our comments in that format would
18 be helpful.

19 I also wanted to comment there was some
20 discussion regarding a potential road connection
21 between Bricher Road and Route 38. Right now that
22 is shown in the Bricher Commons PUD ordinance based
23 on the development from 2006. It's shown going
24 through this property.

1 In the City's 2013 Comprehensive Plan,
2 there's a road in this general area that's shown
3 connecting Bricher and Route 38 along the western
4 property line, and it's shown going over a portion
5 of the County's property, which is part of the
6 Judicial Center property.

7 That property is on the Geneva side of the
8 future boundary line. So that property will not be
9 annexed into St. Charles based on our current
10 boundary agreement with Geneva, so --

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Where is that?

12 MR. COLBY: The Judicial Center property
13 immediately to the west, that is considered to be on
14 the Geneva side in the future boundary line.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: Really.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the line that goes
17 from Bricher to 38 on the west side of this
18 property, everything to the west of that is Geneva?

19 MR. COLBY: The boundary line, the future
20 boundary is drawn around the Judicial Center
21 property. So it goes up to Route 38 and then
22 extends over to Peck Road and down Peck Road back to
23 the township line.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the Judicial Center

1 right now is not incorporated into St. Charles?

2 MR. COLBY: Correct. It's unincorporated.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It does have a

4 St. Charles address.

5 MR. COLBY: It does, but it's an

6 unincorporated St. Charles address.

7 MR. DOYLE: May I ask a question here?

8 On the picture that we have in front of us

9 where Fisher Drive meets Bricher Road --

10 MR. COLBY: Yes.

11 MR. DOYLE: -- could you imagine a line

12 moving north along -- an imaginary line north of

13 Fisher Drive there to 38, is that area just to the

14 west of this parcel within the boundary line of

15 Geneva, or would that be on the Geneva side?

16 MR. COLBY: That is on the Geneva side.

17 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So is it safe to infer

18 then that if St. Charles wishes to implement the

19 concept in its comprehensive plan to facilitate a

20 connective road between Bricher and 38, the only

21 place where St. Charles has any opportunity to do

22 that is on this parcel?

23 MR. COLBY: That is correct. Really that's

24 the reason we're raising this point is that if it's

1 not accommodated on this site, it's unlikely that
2 the City of St. Charles will be able to compel that
3 road to be created. This is really the only
4 opportunity for it to be created through a
5 development. That is to say that it doesn't have to
6 go through this site, but that should be a
7 consideration.

8 MR. DOYLE: Right. Thank you.

9 MR. RATZER: Brian, can I clear up just one
10 thing up here because this picture is better.

11 MR. DOYLE: Sure.

12 MR. RATZER: When you were talking about
13 what if I bought the option, right, this is the
14 whole parcel I'm under contract. Well, that's with
15 the option. And I wanted to point out to you that I
16 did the trade for this -- for this, right, but you
17 had said, well, what if I just took this. See that
18 going through it, that's all wetland.

19 MR. DOYLE: Yep.

20 MR. RATZER: And I don't want to deal with
21 that.

22 MR. DOYLE: Understood.

23 MR. RATZER: Okay. I'm just saying that's
24 what it is.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So I will now
2 poll the Plan Commissioners to provide comments both
3 in favor of and -- well, favorable and unfavorable
4 comments. And I will go in alphabetical order which
5 means, Mr. Doyle, you're first.

6 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Could you bring up the
7 site plan, please? So on paper, I came in feeling
8 somewhat negative about this concept plan, and I
9 have to say that you changed my mind on a number of
10 points. I'd like to start with things that I like
11 about the concept plan.

12 This building type is very innovative. I
13 think that the benefits that you've articulated for
14 the feel of a single-family or townhome-type
15 development with the benefits of a multifamily
16 development are pretty commendable. It's
17 interesting to me that it has not been developed
18 before and that this is the first time.

19 MR. RATZER: For us.

20 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

21 MR. RATZER: The architect has done
22 hundreds.

23 MR. DOYLE: I don't know if we have an
24 example like this in St. Charles or the Fox Valley,

1 but I think it's a very innovative --

2 MR. RATZER: There is none in Chicago.

3 MR. DOYLE: -- type of development. And so
4 I really appreciate that aspect of it. I appreciate
5 the quality, the build quality of the interior
6 fittings and exterior, and so I think that's great.

7 I think that a lot of the comments that
8 you've heard tonight are about the challenges of the
9 layout and what we are accustomed to, which is a
10 traditional neighborhood street grid with sidewalks
11 and the ability for, you know, pedestrian-friendly
12 streetscapes where I can get from my living --
13 building to not only other amenities inside the
14 complex but also to amenities outside of the
15 neighborhood.

16 I think that's mostly what you're hearing,
17 whether it's in the letter or whether it's from
18 questions from the Plan Commission; and I would urge
19 you to strongly take a look at that again.
20 Especially, make certain that you look at how you
21 can ensure -- since you've talked about families and
22 school-age children and have a positive impact on
23 the schools, how kids who are going to be living in
24 this neighborhood can get to the various amenities

1 as well as to shopping outside without walking
2 through a parking lot.

3 MR. RATZER: Okay.

4 MR. DOYLE: Without walking through areas
5 that are clearly designed for vehicular traffic.

6 MR. RATZER: Sure. And we will do that. I
7 didn't put it on the site plan because I was trying
8 to see if it works from a financial standpoint
9 getting 250 units, a sizeable clubhouse, detention,
10 all of that. Our Rochester property has sidewalks.

11 MR. DOYLE: But it's not this building type.

12 MR. RATZER: A different building type but
13 sidewalks are sidewalks right. I mean, as long as
14 they put them with curbing and all of that. So yes,
15 we're going to have sidewalks.

16 I think it wise -- I could redo this for the
17 January 9th one and kind of put where the sidewalks
18 would go and you can see that there's various
19 sidewalks.

20 MR. DOYLE: I think that would be
21 beneficial.

22 MR. RATZER: Yeah. I don't want the kids or
23 the adults walking through a parking lot to get to
24 anywhere. I agree 100 percent.

1 MR. DOYLE: Good. Some other things that --
2 features of this layout that I like, the playground
3 area. The areas that -- there are a couple of
4 buildings where you have sort of a green courtyard
5 between two buildings. Those are very nice because
6 you can take -- I don't know if there are back doors
7 where you can walk out into those areas, if that's
8 sort of a space where people can have a patio.

9 MR. RATZER: Well, what it is is it's
10 actually in some cases facing a front door.

11 MR. DOYLE: Okay.

12 MR. RATZER: So yeah.

13 MR. DOYLE: So --

14 MR. RATZER: They can get to that green
15 space. Frankly, because this is only the second run
16 and these things take 10 months to get 100 percent
17 right for everybody, I want more of that.

18 MR. DOYLE: Yes.

19 MR. RATZER: I want more of the green
20 between the buildings, and I could probably steal
21 some, when I sit down with the architect from like
22 here, right, move a building around here. Here,
23 it's just green space. Where if I move the drive
24 over, and I move this, and I get some green space

1 here. So yes, as much as I can get between the
2 buildings is what I would like. I can't get it
3 through all.

4 MR. DOYLE: Right. So those are my comments
5 about the concept plan.

6 I'd like to then make some comments about
7 the relationship between the concept plan and your
8 application and the existing PUD, which may be
9 minimal by the time you're done.

10 But right now, the way it's being presented,
11 when I first read it, I thought that the residential
12 use was predicated on the 2006 amendment,
13 particularly the correlation of 250 units and a
14 250-unit restriction in the 2006 amendment made me
15 think that I was comparing the requirements of a
16 2006 amendment to your plan, and there are a number
17 of important differences, especially, the affordable
18 housing requirements and density.

19 So there's -- specifically, there's a
20 requirement or a limitation in the 2006 amendment
21 limiting density to 7.25 units per acre which in
22 this case would be 145 units for 20 acres.

23 So I think it's important as you proceed
24 with this concept plan that you predicate the value

1 of your plan on just the concept and not on the 2006
2 amendment.

3 MR. RATZER: I agree.

4 MR. DOYLE: Because members of the community
5 will look at that and say, Well, we agreed to this,
6 and now you're changing it. Why should we go with
7 that change. And, in fact, what you're proposing is
8 a brand new proposal.

9 So the only risk there is that the
10 comprehensive plan is somewhat tied to that PUD; and
11 if you throw it out entirely, some members of the
12 community might want to relitigate the idea of
13 residential at all because there's a lot of
14 resistance in the community to residential
15 development. So it's a tricky --

16 MR. RATZER: Any residential?

17 MR. DOYLE: In some cases, yes. In some
18 cases where it's in place of commercial or office
19 retail. There's a lot of sensitivity to that.

20 MR. RATZER: Okay.

21 MR. DOYLE: Especially where it's higher
22 density. So you will have to be prepared to speak
23 to the issue of density and just the perception that
24 this is an attempt to load up the parcel with a lot

1 more density.

2 And then to that point, I would say I'm not
3 convinced that you need RM-3. I think RM-2 might be
4 sufficient. Typically, RM-2 might be more
5 palatable. It's average 10 units per acre --
6 dwelling units, and it includes multifamily. It's
7 more in line with the 2006 amendment, even though
8 that may go by the wayside.

9 So our RM-3, I'm going to put it out
10 there -- 20 dwellings per acre, if that's the
11 underlying zoning, people get anxious about it, you
12 know.

13 MR. RATZER: What if I commit to only doing
14 the 250, then I'm only at 12.

15 MR. DOYLE: That's under the auspices of the
16 PUD, but if we change the underlying zoning to RM-3,
17 by right any property owner has the right to go for
18 20 dwelling units per acre, so.

19 MR. RATZER: If I did what you suggest and
20 do the RM-2, though, I can only do 10 units per
21 acre.

22 MR. DOYLE: Not if there's a PUD attached
23 to it.

24 MR. RATZER: Oh, so go for the lower zoning,

1 but attach the PUD.

2 MR. DOYLE: Staff, am I correct?

3 MR. RATZER: That sounds like a good idea.

4 MR. COLBY: Yes. You can do what you
5 described.

6 MR. DOYLE: So I would recommend --

7 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

8 MR. DOYLE: -- RM-2 in place of RM-3.

9 MR. KOLB: Is that a deviation you're
10 suggesting?

11 MR. DOYLE: It's not a deviation if it's
12 under a PUD. The PUD supercedes --

13 MR. KOLB: The ordinance can be right in the
14 underlying --

15 MR. DOYLE: The PUD basically takes
16 precedence.

17 MR. RATZER: So the residents wouldn't be
18 afraid that I'm going to build 400 --

19 MR. DOYLE: Right.

20 MR. RATZER: -- on 20.

21 MR. DOYLE: You wouldn't have -- you
22 wouldn't have a right to do that. You have a right,
23 the ability to develop up to 10 dwellings per acre.

24 MR. RATZER: 200 with the PUD, though.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 200 per acre?

2 MR. DOYLE: 10.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I thought you said 200
4 per acre.

5 MR. DOYLE: And RM-1 is 8. So RM-1 is
6 actually closest to the 2006, you know, PUD. So
7 that's why 3 looks --

8 MR. RATZER: This may be getting into the
9 weeds a little bit, and I don't want to -- I know
10 that counsel is not here. But what if it burns
11 down?

12 MR. DOYLE: What if what?

13 MR. RATZER: What if the whole place burns
14 down? Can I rebuild under the same PUD?

15 MR. COLBY: Under the PUD?

16 MR. RATZER: Yes.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: If it all burns down, can
18 he rebuild on the PUD?

19 MS. TUNGARE: The property --

20 MR. RATZER: If the property burns down --

21 MS. TUNGARE: Yes.

22 MR. RATZER: My 250 units that I build only
23 really the zoning is calling for 200, right, 10
24 units an acre, but the PUD still exists. I can

1 rebuild it?

2 MS. TUNGARE: Correct.

3 MR. DOYLE: Under the terms of the PUD.

4 MS. TUNGARE: The PUD --

5 MR. RATZER: Under the terms of the PUD, not
6 the zoning.

7 MS. TUNGARE: The PUD stays with the land.
8 Correct.

9 MR. RATZER: That sounds like a good idea.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. DOYLE: The last thing I wanted to
12 comment, and then I'll let my colleagues comment, is
13 given the conversation with Russ about the connector
14 road, I really feel that we need a connector road
15 between Bricher and 38, and that means that the only
16 way for the City to make that happen is through this
17 development application.

18 Todd talked about the traffic snarl on
19 Bricher and Randall, and it really is just a
20 nightmare. So not only for traffic in the area, but
21 also for the benefit of your perspective tenants, I
22 would urge you to look at an easement on the parcel
23 that would allow a future connector road to be built
24 between Bricher and 38.

1 And that concludes my comments.

2 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Mr. Holderfield.

4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. I'm very
5 impressed with the whole project.

6 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I liked it from the
8 beginning, and Brian has detailed all the density
9 problems, but I am just -- I'm excited about and
10 always looking at the style and elevations of the
11 units; and as you said, I think they are very
12 pleasing. They have a variety of surface structures
13 and everything is great.

14 I've been on this Plan Commission now for
15 about three years, and I'm so excited to see a
16 two-story apartment. This is great. That's why I
17 asked about the dormer up there and another half a
18 story.

19 MR. RATZER: Yeah. I'm sorry.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think it's wonderful
21 to stay a two story, and it does speak for a
22 community sense of feeling, and along with sidewalks
23 along that area and the sidewalk along Bricher Road
24 from up to your entryway -- both entryways it

1 will be.

2 MR. RATZER: Yeah. Whatever you guys want.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Mr. Kessler.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

6 I'm going to make my comments in the order
7 that the staff has laid out in the staff report, and
8 I'll start with land use, zoning and density, site
9 layout, building type and architecture, and then
10 access.

11 I do think it's an appropriate land use
12 based on the comprehensive plan, which states that
13 the northern areas of the site should develop with
14 commercial uses fronting Lincoln Highway with either
15 multifamily, single-family attached, or offices and
16 commercial services, in the rear and interior of the
17 site. I do agree that it's an appropriate land use.

18 When it comes to zoning and density, I don't
19 object to the density, but I have to agree with
20 Brian in the approach you have taken to achieving
21 the density that you're having. I'd rather see the
22 underlying zoning remain RM-2, and then the property
23 site controlled through a PUD.

24 MR. RATZER: That seems like a good option,

1 yes.

2 MEMBER KESSLER: Then on the issue of site
3 layout, I don't like the site layout. I'm going to
4 say the resident -- you kept referring to this
5 letter that we received, and I'm going to tell you
6 that I haven't read the letter. You've told me more
7 about that letter than I would have known if you
8 hadn't brought it up.

9 MR. RATZER: Fair enough.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: I don't like the way the
11 buildings are sited. It appears to be somewhat -- I
12 can't tell exactly if the designer was trying to
13 make it cool or if he was doing it to maximize the
14 property or if it's part of the grand plan of having
15 a community that has a health center. I don't know.
16 It doesn't work.

17 Now, you brought up a couple of things in
18 your comments. I can't remember specifically what
19 they were. But one of them was you talked about the
20 properties -- the four buildings at the north end of
21 the property and how nice it is for the people to be
22 looking at a field, which isn't going to be there.
23 Okay. That property is going to be developed some
24 day. Some day everything to the north will be

1 developed. Some day.

2 MR. RATZER: You hope. We all hope.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Okay. We hope, but the
4 likelihood is greater that it will than it won't.
5 And when we as planners -- we have to,
6 unfortunately -- I realize, we're dealing
7 specifically with you and with your application or
8 your concept plan, and we're happy to do that, but
9 we have to consider what could happen in the future.
10 Okay. And that is where we come into those types of
11 layouts.

12 The other thing that you mentioned somewhere
13 in your comments throughout was that somebody had a
14 property that had a lot of dead ends. I see a lot
15 of dead ends, just a lot of dead ends.

16 You know, I like the project overall. I'm
17 glad you're here, and I think we can work on this,
18 but I just want you to know how I feel about the
19 building layout. I don't think it works. I see a
20 lot of, you know, tight corridors, a lot of small
21 intersections. You've got to drive down here.
22 You've got a double T dead end. Over to the north,
23 there's three dead ends there. There's dead ends
24 into the pond area.

1 I'd like to see a better flow line on the
2 site. I just -- and I think it can be achieved.
3 You already, you know, are amenable to talking about
4 connecting the Lowe's; and if that property -- if
5 that road came off of there and curved down and made
6 that across, you know, you're being -- and this is
7 one -- it just needs -- you need to be more linear.

8 I understand that you want it to be somewhat
9 attractive. You want some things to do this, but
10 there are a lot of ways that this site could be laid
11 out to achieve that. I hope you're not looking at
12 this layout as your final plan. And so that's my
13 comments on the site layout.

14 The building type and architecture, I've got
15 no problem with that. I think it's pretty
16 attractive. I think that, you know, what you're
17 trying to achieve there is a good product for
18 St. Charles, and it looks really nice.

19 And then finally, I'll talk about the
20 access. I think -- again, I go back to what our
21 role is in reviewing plans like this, and that is to
22 tell you we like what you're doing, but we have to
23 figure out how we can connect it to the rest of the
24 community.

1 And actually this road, this connector road
2 that we keep referring to between Bricher and Route
3 38 is actually, if you look at the big picture, it's
4 to connect Bricher Road with Route 64. If you look
5 at a map, you see how it can run all the way through
6 this property.

7 That's not your problem, but what we
8 would -- what I would suggest to you is figure out a
9 way that you can allow an easement at the west end
10 of your property so that a future road could be
11 built from -- this would be the section between
12 Bricher and Randall, and you actually already have
13 something there as long as -- you know, you've got a
14 road there or a parking area or something, that
15 somehow readjust those buildings --

16 MR. RATZER: You're saying here where I'm
17 pointing?

18 MEMBER KESSLER: Yes. So there would be an
19 easement there so a future roadway could go in
20 because again, you know --

21 MR. RATZER: But who would I give an
22 easement to? The City?

23 MEMBER KESSLER: You have to talk to staff
24 about that, however that works.

1 MR. RATZER: The City would want the
2 easement now?

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Pardon me?

4 MR. RATZER: You think the City would want
5 the easement now?

6 MR. COLBY: It's a possibility. I think
7 that it could -- you'd be reserving the property for
8 the future use of a road. It could be in the form
9 of an easement or a dedication or an outparcel or
10 something.

11 MR. RATZER: Okay.

12 MR. COLBY: We could be figure it out.

13 MEMBER KESSLER: At any rate, these are just
14 my comments.

15 MR. RATZER: I understand.

16 MEMBER KESSLER: When you come back with
17 whatever you come back with, it is what it is. I'm
18 telling you what, you know, I'm considering and what
19 I'm thinking about when I look at this plan.

20 I'll just end there, and I'm glad you're
21 here.

22 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

23 MEMBER KESSLER: We've got something to talk
24 about.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Mr. Pretz.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, you've been standing a
3 long time, and you're starting to wobble.

4 MEMBER KESSLER: His eyes aren't glazing
5 over.

6 MR. RATZER: Yeah. Most of this I'm
7 understanding.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm going to be merciful --

9 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: -- because there really --
11 many items have been covered by the other
12 commissioners, and it's really more a rehash than
13 anything else.

14 I would just say that there has been enough
15 presented that it excites me, and I think you should
16 go for it and continue with your project and your
17 application.

18 MR. RATZER: Okay. Will do. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Mr. Schuetz.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I won't belabor it as well,
21 but I just want to say when I came -- looked over
22 everything in the last couple days and came here
23 tonight, I had some major concerns about the layout
24 of the property and the density, et cetera.

1 However, you have presented a lot of very
2 good, you know, information and made me feel a lot
3 better about things. However, what Tim brings up,
4 and I think we all struggle with this as far as
5 there is a lot of dead ends. If you could consider
6 maybe a loop, circular, figure eight, something that
7 flows, and they could come in and come out instead
8 of -- you know, something along those lines.

9 On a positive light, I know everybody has
10 said this. I just want to make sure you guys
11 realize we are glad you're here, and I know several
12 people said that, and I want to say it as well. I
13 do like the huge -- what do you call it -- big home
14 design, I think it's called.

15 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm really glad to see
17 that. I'm glad to see that it's not a bank of
18 garages on one side, which you see all the time. I
19 think that's fantastic.

20 The better flow would be huge; and then as
21 Tim brought up, I think, earlier, maybe it was one
22 of the guys down there as far as the connection to
23 Lowe's and Meijer. You should definitely consider
24 that.

1 MR. RATZER: Absolutely. That's no problem.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's all I have. Thank
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Ms. Spruth.

5 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes. Yeah. I mean the
6 building type and the architecture is great.

7 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

8 MEMBER SPRUTH: I think it's going to be a
9 really popular development, certainly with the
10 younger professionals coming into the community.

11 As far as Brian said, the density will be an
12 issue, so I think the proposed PUD is probably the
13 way to go. That will come up again.

14 MR. RATZER: Okay.

15 MEMBER SPRUTH: Some of you have pointed out
16 the site layout. I think it could be done better.
17 We talked about looping around or I just -- for what
18 you're presenting, the building type and
19 architecture is great. I think the site layout
20 should be great, and I think there should be maybe a
21 couple of iterations to see what you can -- what you
22 can do.

23 MR. RATZER: Okay.

24 MEMBER SPRUTH: Looking at a through road,

1 the traffic going through the development. I mean,
2 there is potential where it could be a hazard. If
3 it's here, it does appear as though there could be
4 some traffic calming measures, but maybe on your
5 final plan there will be.

6 MR. RATZER: Like speed bumps? Like stop
7 signs?

8 MEMBER SPRUTH: Well, I mean, or roundabouts
9 or, you know, center islands or something like that,
10 but the traffic flow and the layout I think will
11 basically -- I think if you improve one, you're
12 going to improve the other as well. But thank you.

13 MR. RATZER: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That leaves
15 me. As far as the land -- I'll be brief. As far as
16 the land use, I agree. I think it's an appropriate
17 land use. I agree with what Brian pointed out
18 regarding zoning. I don't have any problem with the
19 density.

20 The site layout, you know, I had already
21 pointed out my concerns. The building type and
22 architecture, I think that they're good. I mean, I
23 like them.

24 And access, I'm in agreement with what has

1 been said. Just I'd like to see something --
2 basically, I'd go with what Tim said on that one
3 regarding the north/south, the east/west collectors
4 within and interconnectivity to the surrounding
5 properties.

6 MR. RATZER: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that's it.

8 MR. RATZER: Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

10 Look forward to seeing you again.

11 MR. RATZER: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that brings us to
13 additional business for Plan Commission members or
14 staff? No.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: Did anybody see the
16 roundabout, the first roundabout in Kane County?
17 They built a roundabout at Burlington Road and
18 Route 47.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I missed that.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I was just out there the
21 other day, and it was still closed.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: It opened on November 31st,
23 or at least that's what the County sign said.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Weekly

1 development report, meetings announcements. Are we
2 on for the upcoming meetings?

3 MR. COLBY: We are anticipating canceling
4 the meeting on the 3rd.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6 MR. COLBY: It will come out tomorrow.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You're going to cancel
8 the 3rd.

9 MR. COLBY: That meeting will likely cancel.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Public comments?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion to
13 adjourn?

14 MEMBER KESSLER: So moved.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded. All
17 in favor.

18 (Ayes heard.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The meeting of the
22 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at
23 8:50 p.m.

24 (Off the record at 8:50 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 24th day of December, 2016.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois