

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2016**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chairman Tim Kessler
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tom Pretz
Dan Frio
Tom Schuetz
James Holderfield
Brian Doyle

Members Absent: Michelle Spruth

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Chris Bong, Development Engineering Manager
John McGuirk-City Attorney
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the November 1, 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 November 1, 2016 Plan Commission meeting. Mr. Doyle abstained.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. Prairie Center (former St. Charles Mall site) (Shodeen Group, LLC)**
Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Pretz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to continue the public hearing to January 10, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, December 6, 2016
Page 2

- 5. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff-None.**
- 6. Weekly Development Report**
- 7. Meeting Announcements**
 - a. Plan Commission
 - Tuesday, December 20, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Tuesday, January 3, 2017 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room
 - 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, December 12, 2016 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Monday, January 9, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- 8. Public Comment**
- 9. Adjournment at 8:29 p.m.**



PLANET DEPOS®

We make it > *happen.*™

Transcript of Hearing

Date: December 6, 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: :
Prairie Centre (former :
St. Charles Mall Site), :
Shodeen Group, LLC, :
Application for Special :
Use for Planned Unit :
Development, Application :
for PUD Preliminary Plan. :
-----x

HEARING, Volume II
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, December 6, 2016
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 97804
Pages: 97 - 177
Reported by: Melanie L. Humphrey-Sonntag,
CSR, RDR, CRR, CRC, FAPR

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 Melanie L. Humphrey-Sonntag, a Certified
14 Shorthand Reporter, Registered Diplomate Reporter,
15 Certified Realtime Reporter, and a Notary Public in
16 and for the State of Illinois.

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
- DAN FRIO, Member
- MEMBER JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member.
- LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic
Development Manager
- CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering Manager.
- JOHN MC GUIRK, City Attorney

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
St. Charles Planning Commission will come to order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

MEMBER FRIO: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

Item 3, presentation of minutes of the
November 1st, 2016, meeting.

Is there a motion to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Abstain.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry?

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Abstain.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. That motion
9 passes.

10 Moving on to Item No. 4, Item 4 is a
11 continued public hearing, Prairie Centre, former
12 St. Charles mall site, Shodeen Group, LLC,
13 application for special use for planned unit
14 development and application for a PUD preliminary
15 plan.

16 Those of you who have not been with us
17 before, welcome. The St. Charles Planning
18 Commission is tasked by the City Council to conduct
19 public hearings for applications that come before
20 it, as this one is, and what we do is gather
21 information from the developer and from any other
22 person who wishes to offer information.

23 At the end -- as soon as we've gathered
24 enough information, the public hearing will be

1 closed, which will not be happening tonight. It
2 will be continued.

3 But after we have all the information, we
4 will close the public hearing, and then we'll make a
5 recommendation to the City Council to either approve
6 or deny the application, and that will be at a
7 future meeting.

8 Any questions regarding our purpose?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Anyone who wishes
11 to offer any testimony for or against the
12 application, ask any questions, make any comments,
13 you must be sworn in, if you could raise your hand.

14 (Witnesses sworn.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

16 And just please take note that there's a
17 court reporter here in the room, and she's taking
18 down all of the proceedings here. And because of
19 that, only one person can speak at a time, so
20 I would ask that you wait to be recognized by me.

21 And when you are speaking, if you could come
22 up and speak into the microphone so everyone in the
23 room can hear you. And, also, please state your
24 name and your address, spell your last name for the

1 record.

2 Any questions?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Russ, before I
5 begin, do you have anything?

6 MR. COLBY: No.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

8 So this -- before the Applicant gets up,
9 this is a continued public hearing. And if the Plan
10 Commission will allow me, I have a couple of
11 suggestions based on the materials.

12 We definitely are going to be continuing
13 this for at least another public hearing date.
14 I know several times in the materials it is
15 suggested that there will be revised materials based
16 upon a higher number of units. We don't have those
17 materials yet.

18 It would be my suggestion that we -- I know
19 at least my feeling is I would like to see some of
20 the materials before we have a discussion regarding
21 the studies that are based on those new site plans
22 and the new numbers.

23 But I would like to know from the Plan
24 Commission -- basically, my suggestion is to address

1 the issues and the questions that came up last
2 time -- the developer has provided a list of answers
3 to a lot of those questions -- and to focus on those
4 things instead of getting into other things that
5 rely on future information.

6 Is the Planning Commission in agreement?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are any of the
8 engineering studies relevant now? Or do they have
9 to wait for future information?

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I guess that's really up
11 to -- I mean --

12 MR. BAZOS: We had talked at our last
13 meeting about discussing the infrastructure and
14 things like water, engineering --

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

16 MR. BAZOS: -- and traffic.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are any of those
18 three reliant on future information?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, at least the
20 traffic study is.

21 MR. COLBY: Yes, that's correct. The
22 traffic study, we're not prepared to present
23 information on that tonight. But the water modeling
24 study and the sanitary sewer study, we're prepared

1 to present that information.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Were you going to say
3 something?

4 MR. BONG: Yes. That's what I was going to
5 say, is repeating what Russ said.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

7 I guess that my thought would be, instead of
8 going thoroughly into them, if there is information
9 that relies on future information that we don't have
10 yet, if we find that that's the case, I'd prefer to
11 wait until we have all the information.

12 And I would state to the Applicant that, at
13 our next meeting -- since we are waiting for those
14 items, I'm hoping that we'll have them at the next
15 meeting. We're going to be setting them over --
16 setting the meeting over to a date in January.

17 MR. BAZOS: Mr. Wallace, the water and
18 sanitary sewer studies that the City staff has to
19 present tonight wouldn't be affected by the
20 additional units.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. You know what?
22 I was mainly talking about the traffic study and the
23 revised site plan.

24 MR. BAZOS: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So not -- sorry if I was
2 unclear.

3 All right. Yeah.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Are you seeking input on
5 that? So I have one comment.

6 At the last meeting, there -- different
7 members of the Plan Commission had, I think, a
8 number of different opinions about the baseline
9 density of the proposal, 609 units.

10 And we deferred any discussion about that
11 beyond our comments at the -- that were offered at
12 the end of that meeting -- to this meeting when we
13 would have the traffic study.

14 Now that the traffic study is being revised
15 to account for the density bonus, the underlying
16 question of the baseline density and whether the
17 baseline density is proposed and supported by the
18 traffic study is complicated because, as the
19 Applicant pointed out three times in the materials,
20 we're not charged to comment on the density bonus or
21 on the inclusive housing ordinance.

22 And so I think the Plan Commission has an
23 interest in assessing the -- answering the question
24 as to the propriety of the baseline density prior to

1 any consideration or additional information that
2 we'd receive about that that factors in the density
3 bonus.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. And I have a
5 feeling that we'll get a little further into that
6 tonight as far as whether the Inclusionary Housing
7 Ordinance has any bearing on our decision-making.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Because, certainly,
10 I have -- I have an opinion. But I would like for
11 the -- unless there's anything else, I'd like for
12 the Applicant to go ahead and --

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Sure.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't know if you want
15 to start by addressing some of the things -- I know
16 that we have a list of questions and answers in our
17 materials. I don't know -- I mean, it's your dime
18 so -- if you want to address those things or
19 highlight those things, that's up to you.

20 MR. BAZOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Peter Bazos, attorney for the Petitioner,
22 Town Center Equities. Here with me again this
23 evening are Dave Patzelt of the Shodeen Group, the
24 developer; and John Talty of OKW, our principal

1 designer.

2 And I was going to make just some overview
3 remarks and then let John address for you some of
4 the changes that are being proposed tonight based
5 upon comments made at the last public hearing.

6 So, obviously, as you indicated, we -- this
7 is the second phase of a -- or the second part of a
8 public hearing that began on October 18th.

9 In the December 2nd staff analysis memo, the
10 staff called out certain items which have been
11 submitted since the date of the first public hearing
12 and, also, included certain other updates. I think
13 these deserve mention.

14 As requested by the Plan Commission, we
15 submitted a written response to all the questions
16 that were asked at the last public hearing. My
17 client was clever enough to get the transcript and
18 actually download the questions so they were
19 literally verbatim as to what was asked. We make
20 ourselves available to you and the public to provide
21 any other information on these that you want, but
22 responses were provided.

23 And as to the Inclusionary Housing
24 Ordinance, I just wanted to say, for the record,

1 that the City Council has imposed an affordable --
2 an inclusionary housing ordinance that requires
3 affordable housing units. And it designated -- the
4 City Council has designated the St. Charles Housing
5 Commission as the body which is supposed to review
6 and recommend to the City Council the affordable
7 housing, how many, where, et cetera.

8 My client made a submission and attended a
9 public hearing -- or a public meeting, I'll call
10 it -- before the Housing Commission, and the
11 proposal was reviewed and there was a recommendation
12 that a full 10 percent of the appropriate 609 units,
13 which comes out to 61, be included, that a density
14 bonus of 1 additional nonaffordable unit -- or
15 regular unit, let me call it, instead of -- would be
16 provided for each affordable unit, so that's where
17 the 61-unit increase to the 609 would come from.

18 The Housing Commission nodded its head at
19 that and, also, agreed to recommend that those
20 61 bonus -- or density -- excuse me -- affordable
21 units -- excuse me; I'm trying to speak here --
22 affordable units could be put together in one or
23 two buildings at the election of the developer.

24 And the reason we thought that was important

1 is because there's a significant likelihood that
2 those affordable units will be senior affordable
3 housing units, and it doesn't really make sense to
4 scatter senior units throughout the otherwise
5 nonsenior project.

6 And Mr. Talty or Mr. Patzelt can speak
7 better to it than I, but I think seniors have tended
8 to prefer to live together in a more quiet
9 environment. So that's what we're envisioning, and
10 the Housing Commission seemed to agree with that, so
11 that's been their recommendation. I wanted to
12 report that to you.

13 It's our understanding that it's the
14 province of the Housing Commission to consider those
15 issues and recommend to the City Council on these
16 matters.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Mr. Bazos, if I could
18 just interrupt you.

19 MR. BAZOS: Please.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't think that anyone
21 disagrees that it's the Housing Commission's role to
22 do that; however, I do think that the density and
23 how that plays into the PUD plan is relevant.

24 And so if we have a total number of units

1 that is 61 units more than what a previous version
2 of the plan was, I do think that that is relevant
3 and that's something that certainly should be
4 subject to questioning.

5 MR. BAZOS: I'm nodding my head. We don't
6 disagree with that. I just want to make a comment.
7 Mr. Talty will do, again, a better job of that.

8 I don't think we envision any change in the
9 number or height of buildings by reason of these
10 bonus units, but Mr. Talty can talk to you about
11 that. But we agree with you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Uh-huh.

13 MR. BAZOS: We've also submitted a revised
14 set of engineering plans and a colored -- a revised
15 site plan. Mr. Talty is going to go over that with
16 you this evening.

17 I also submitted a letter to Mr. Colby,
18 Russ Colby, dated December 2nd, which then that
19 letter is in your package. And that December 2nd
20 letter attempts to further clarify the departures
21 and deviations that are being requested, many of
22 which were discussed at the first session and
23 otherwise called out in prior staff memos.

24 But one of the reasons that I felt it

1 necessary to send this clarification is that, while
2 we've discussed many of the things about this
3 project with staff over many months, we wanted to
4 make sure that it was clear to you, in your
5 consideration and recommendation, that you knew all
6 of the nuances of the variations and deviations that
7 this PUD would involve.

8 One of the reasons that you do a PUD is
9 because you try and creatively design a project,
10 which often requires deviations from the strict
11 standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and so we're
12 trying to update these each time we come before you.

13 For example, this project is proposed to you
14 as a one-lot subdivision as we sit right now;
15 however, it's very likely, in the future, after
16 the -- if and when the project is approved, it's
17 likely that we would come back to the City and try
18 and -- and ask to resubdivide the project to create
19 one or more additional lots that could be sold to
20 developers who could then own the site that the new
21 lot created and then build a project that's
22 consistent with the site plan that you and the City
23 Council would have approved.

24 For example, you know that our site plan

1 along Lincoln Highway, Route 38, includes proposed
2 retail restaurants. It's very, very possible, if
3 not likely, that one, two, or all of those future
4 restaurant users may want to own their site.

5 The only way to accomplish that, really, is
6 to subdivide those sites, so I've called out to you
7 what -- in my letter -- that -- the implications of
8 the subdivision and the departures that would be
9 involved in that.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is that typically done?
11 Is a single lot subdivided when it's within a PUD
12 and the created lots have the characteristics of the
13 overall PUD?

14 MR. BAZOS: I guess I don't know how to say
15 typical, but it's probably -- we've done it before
16 and I understand, in discussions with staff, that
17 you've done it before so --

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I didn't --

19 MR. BAZOS: So kind of with that as a
20 background, I will ask John Talty to explain to you
21 some of the plan changes, if we could. After John
22 is done, I'd like to jump back up for a minute and
23 make a couple comments more to you.

24 Thanks.

1 MR. TALTY: Good evening, everyone.

2 Again, my name is John Talty, T-a-l-t-y, with
3 OKW Architects in Chicago.

4 I want to walk everybody through the plan
5 modifications that we addressed per our last meeting
6 in October. This is all background information.

7 Where did it go? This was working before.

8 We have technology problems here.

9 (An off-the-record discussion was held.)

10 MR. TALTY: Thank you, Russ. I apologize,
11 folks.

12 Again, background information that we
13 addressed last week -- I'm going to use the mouse to
14 best explain changes that have been -- that have
15 occurred to this plan from the ones that you -- from
16 the plan that you saw our last go-round.

17 Much of what you're going to see today is
18 predicated on responses to the fire department in
19 conversations that Dave Patzelt had with them
20 regarding creating a better, safer environment for
21 fire truck access.

22 So as kind of an umbrella statement, that's
23 something that we addressed and that engineering
24 addressed as it pertains to radiuses throughout the

1 development itself, allowing for better movement of
2 fire truck access in and about the property once
3 they're on-site.

4 The buildings that are D3, D4 --
5 residential D3, D4, residential D1 and D2 have been
6 spread apart, creating a greater green space in
7 between here, a larger quadrangle, for lack of a
8 better term. It not only provides, I think,
9 aesthetically a better environment for the
10 residences inboard to their buildings, but it also
11 provides us with buildings more proximate to the
12 curb.

13 In the situation here on the -- in this
14 southern portion of the building elevations, the
15 fire trucks have closer proximity to the buildings
16 in case of fire, so we were pulling the buildings
17 more proximate to the curb line.

18 To the north here, residential D4, D3, as
19 well as E1 and D5, we changed the parking in this
20 area from angled parking to parallel parking to
21 again shorten the distance between the road
22 configuration and the face of the building for the
23 fighting of fires in the event that any of these
24 buildings were to have a fire in them. So what used

1 to be angled parking through here is now parallel
2 parking.

3 It also provides a little bit more green
4 space to face the building, to face the building in
5 this portion of the site. We spoke of the radiuses.
6 We addressed the radii of the roadway here to allow
7 for that fire truck access in and about that portion
8 of the property.

9 Along Prairie Street we've gently moved
10 mixed-use B3 and residential B3 and turned them a
11 bit, cranked them to the north and to the west in
12 order to provide a more uniform pedestrian
13 experience along Prairie Street.

14 So as a result, the geometry of these
15 buildings are not consistent with the geometry of C1
16 and B2 but, instead, they're tipped a few degrees to
17 the north and to the west so that Prairie Street can
18 remain consistent for those walking along that
19 street edge.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can I interrupt you for a
21 second?

22 MR. TALTY: Sure.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the plan that we have
24 before us -- which was 609 units --

1 MR. TALTY: Correct.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- correct? -- and a site
3 plan that could contain 670 --

4 MR. TALTY: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- 70 units, do you
6 anticipate that there would be changes in the
7 footprints of the buildings?

8 MR. TALTY: The footprints would change,
9 yes, sir.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

11 MR. TALTY: We will not add buildings to the
12 site, but we're in the process of investigating how
13 those footprints would be modified, as an example.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just because, personally,
15 I'd prefer not to spend time talking about a plan
16 that is only going to be replaced by another plan,
17 you know.

18 MR. TALTY: Sure. I understand.
19 I understand. I just wanted everyone to understand
20 what is different about this plan that is subtle --
21 or what is different about this plan from the one
22 that you-all saw, you know, two months ago.

23 But, yes, footprints would change, and those
24 changes would be reflected in the next plan.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. But the changes
2 from the previous plan to this plan, what you're
3 saying -- I don't want to put words in your mouth
4 but -- are you saying that the changes are going to
5 carry over into --

6 MR. TALTY: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- we'll call it -- Plan
8 No. 3?

9 MR. TALTY: Yes, sir. Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

11 MR. TALTY: So let's not dwell on the plan,
12 given that. Given that there's more to come,
13 perhaps we can address another issue that was
14 brought up at our last meeting, and that has to do
15 with the buildings' architecture.

16 Mr. Holderfield, you spoke of the project
17 identified as Prairie Centre --

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

19 MR. TALTY: -- and your affinity and
20 appreciation for Frank Lloyd Wright and prairie-
21 style architecture and perhaps is there a way where
22 we could address this site, the buildings, in a more
23 responsive way to that type of architecture.

24 So we've included some -- I've included a

1 sketch tonight that begins, I think, to address some
2 of the issues. This is the building as it was
3 presented a few months back, both the pure
4 residential building and the mixed-use building.

5 But I offer you -- just for your
6 consideration -- and I'm interested in the opinion
7 of the balance of the Plan Commission -- as to --
8 you know, is this starting to move in a direction
9 that's more commensurate with your, you know,
10 thoughts on the building itself?

11 This is a quick sketch of the same
12 building's footprint and elevation only applying --
13 in a freehand way, obviously, not through CAD but --
14 applying some of the ideas of the prairie -- you
15 know -- the prairie architecture up top.

16 Examples of that type of architecture, the
17 upper right is the Winslow House in River Forest,
18 one of Frank Lloyd Wright's greatest. It's his
19 first house that was his first commissioned home, as
20 well as other prairie-style and Frank Lloyd Wright
21 buildings. The home second from left, there's a
22 mixed-use development on the left-hand side we were
23 involved with down in Orland Park.

24 And then something even to the detail of a

1 lantern that would set aside an entry feature,
2 something to kind of reinforce this idea of prairie
3 architecture, the lessening of the pitch of the
4 roof, the deepening of overhangs, the changing of
5 materials and the color on the top floor of the
6 buildings and the expression of that architecture
7 and reinforcing, obviously, the horizontal banding,
8 things like that.

9 I just wanted to show -- we wanted to show
10 this tonight kind of in response to say, "Is this in
11 keeping with what you were hoping to see?"

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It is very much so. My
13 heart's kind of racing because I looked at this.
14 I'm very impressed.

15 All the points I made you just mentioned,
16 you know, the roof overhangs and the low-pitched
17 roofs, horizontal lines. This is exactly the
18 pathway that I was thinking.

19 I'm also thinking, too, dramatically how we
20 would do the landscaping that would reflect this
21 organic architecture that Wright developed, and it
22 would be a perfect blend here.

23 MR. TALTY: I think that's a good point.
24 This is not about applying a veneer to a mass, to a

1 building.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

3 MR. TALTY: This is about an ideology. This
4 is a thought process that starts when you enter the
5 site off of 38 or Prairie.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Absolutely.

7 MR. TALTY: And as you kind of work your way
8 through the site, it's reinforced in the type of
9 lighting that you have, the pedestrian experience,
10 the landscape, obviously, and the buildings
11 themselves.

12 So it's not -- this isn't a one-liner.
13 I don't want it to be that. That would be
14 unsuccessful and it's not how -- that's not the way
15 we operate. That's not the way Shodeen operates.
16 So the thought would be that this is really in
17 keeping with the greater narrative, a bigger story.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have one question:
19 The unit higher that I see, I'm very pleased with
20 that. Is there going to be any change with the
21 mixed-use buildings in terms of the roof? Are you
22 thinking about putting a hip on those, or will it
23 still be a flat roof --

24 MR. TALTY: I don't know if we've gotten

1 that far, to be perfectly honest with you.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: This is definitely a
3 positive step, in my opinion. Very much so.

4 MR. TALTY: And, again, the flat roof was
5 trying to -- you know, the purpose of that was to
6 differentiate the building types, also to kind of
7 maintain a continuity of building height.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

9 MR. TALTY: Because this is a -- the
10 residential building is three floors of residential
11 over a parking deck which is partially submerged.

12 The mixed-use buildings have parking below
13 grade so that they have a -- they're taller. Their
14 ground floor is certainly taller to accommodate the
15 leasable, you know, needs of a retail or
16 service-type use with the three floors of
17 residential above.

18 So I guess I'd like to offer, you know --
19 I'd like others to weigh in on this idea. Is this
20 something that the Commission, as a whole, would
21 like to see us pursue more?

22 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a question for you, as
23 well as for Jim.

24 MR. TALTY: Sure.

1 MEMBER DOYLE: And I'm not certain if we can
2 display this on the monitor.

3 Google Maps, if you look up -- I'm certain
4 you're familiar with Oak Park City Apartments on
5 Lake Street just east of the Oak Park mall. It's
6 a -- looks to be three- or four-story buildings so
7 the height of --

8 MR. TALTY: These are the buildings on the
9 south side of the street --

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Correct.

11 MR. TALTY: -- the old archery buildings?

12 MEMBER DOYLE: So -- it's an apartment
13 complex but they're definitely in the prairie style.

14 MR. TALTY: Correct.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: And I'm looking on my monitor
16 here at some street shots of it. But one difference
17 that I see in these buildings and the sketch that
18 you have here -- I'm not certain how to describe it,
19 but it would be the -- Jim, are these hipped roofs?

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes, hipped.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: So these hipped roofs versus
22 this very linear horizontal roofline where there --
23 you don't have those hip roofs is -- my question to
24 you would be, is this consistent with prairie style?

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It is very much so.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And if I'm thinking of
4 the same apartment complex that you mentioned in
5 Oak Park -- because is that next to the --

6 THE COURT REPORTER: Can you speak up,
7 please?

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: The unit in Oak Park
9 that you're speaking about, is that just the --

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Just west of the high school
11 before you get to the Oak Park mall.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: My comment here is
13 I did research on that unit and brought that before
14 some members of the Plan Commission so they could
15 see before we started this.

16 But what I like about the unit here, the
17 fenestration is much better than the building that
18 I saw in Oak Park. And I'm talking about roof
19 placements and movement of the windows that go
20 across and, once again, supporting that horizontal
21 line.

22 You have to be careful, I think, with
23 prairie style, and I think you'll agree that it has
24 to be softened as much as it can, you know, and

1 I think this is doing a good job of it. But --

2 MR. TALTY: And these -- the roof forms that
3 you see here, these are hipped roofs and these are
4 gabled roofs. So these roofs recede, kind of go,
5 you know, away from the viewer. In fact, from the
6 street level, you wouldn't see much of those roofs
7 at all.

8 So I think there's -- you know, the thought
9 would be to have some kind of a differentiation of
10 that roof form as the building marched along.
11 They're long buildings and you want to break up that
12 mass. We don't want -- we don't want monotony out
13 here. We want to break that up, you know,
14 horizontally as well as vertically.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Is -- this sketch of
16 the elevations that you've presented here tonight,
17 is that any indication of the change in the
18 footprint that you made?

19 MR. TALTY: No, not at all. It's the exact
20 same building --

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Same building?

22 MR. TALTY: -- just an overlay over the top.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, John, you
24 asked if -- feedback from the Plan Commissioners.

1 This is on the right idea. This is the
2 right track. This is the sort of thing that I think
3 Jim was talking about, and I'd like to see more of
4 it in the next -- in our next meeting.

5 I'd like to get into something interesting,
6 like the water monitoring. Come on. Let's talk
7 about something --

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: There's all kinds of
9 possibilities.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think this is
11 exactly what he was talking about.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

13 MR. TALTY: Any other questions or --

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Are you looking for a sense
15 of the Commission on the -- I saw --

16 MR. TALTY: I would be interested -- I think
17 it would be helpful for us to get a better sense
18 that this is -- if this is, you know, the path that
19 we want to pursue, I'm happy to do so, but I'm
20 interested in others' thoughts.

21 MR. BAZOS: If I could add to that, I mean,
22 it's -- John is not free. And so every time his
23 firm does more architecture, it costs more money.
24 We would very much like your sense this evening of

1 whether you prefer something like this versus
2 something of the original so we could come back the
3 next time with --

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. I mean, let's do a
5 quick poll.

6 I mean, I -- I'll start and say, yeah, this
7 is very much along the lines of what we would like
8 to see. I think it's a hundred percent improvement.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I've made my
10 comment so --

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I agree.

12 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Of course.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

18 MR. TALTY: With Christmas coming, this is
19 great. My kids need -- Santa's just around the
20 corner.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Would you like us to
22 change it?

23 MR. TALTY: Thank you.

24 MR. BAZOS: Thank you for doing that.

1 Very briefly, then, the City staff has
2 directed, through its consultants, the preparation
3 of -- we touched on this earlier -- three
4 engineering studies, potable water supply, sanitary
5 sewer flow, and wastewater treatment. And then a
6 traffic study.

7 Tonight we -- the City has already indicated
8 they have their reports ready on the first two,
9 potable water and sanitary sewer, and we'd very much
10 like you to hear those reports from the staff and
11 their consultant.

12 And then at the next public hearing, we
13 would come back and present you the full traffic
14 study, including the additional bonus units.

15 So with that, if I might have the City's
16 engineer take over, and then we're just available
17 for any questions that you might have.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BONG: Good evening. I am Chris Bong.
20 I'm the City's development engineering division
21 manager.

22 And what the Applicant alluded to was what
23 we'll be presenting tonight. It's the Prairie
24 Centre water main, sanitary sewer engineering

1 studies.

2 So earlier this year Shodeen asked City
3 staff to hire and manage consulting engineers to
4 produce site engineering studies. Shodeen provided
5 a deposit to the City to cover all those costs.

6 The engineering studies that will be
7 presented today is a water main modeling study by
8 Trotter & Associates. I'll be giving a brief
9 overview of that. And then there was also a
10 downstream sanitary sewer study performed -- or
11 presented by WBK and produced by WBK, and then, as
12 we told you earlier, the traffic study will be
13 discussed at a future meeting.

14 So, briefly, the water CAD modeling, what
15 this is is the proposed site water main is inserted
16 into a computer model of the City's water main
17 system.

18 And by running it through that model, we can
19 verify whether the proposed water main is in
20 compliance with the International Fire Code, the
21 flows and pressures provided to the proposed
22 buildings, and we can make sure that they're
23 adequate.

24 So when this model is kind of plugged into

1 this -- when -- into the system, the water system is
2 run through various scenarios, some kind of
3 worst-case, some average-day scenarios.

4 So just very briefly, it's run through those
5 scenarios, and it was determined that the fire flows
6 did meet the fire code at all the locations within
7 the site, at all the fire hydrants, at all the
8 buildings. And that had to meet 3,000 gallons per
9 minute, and I don't believe we got below 50 psi, so
10 it passed with no problems.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Chris, can I ask you
12 a quick question?

13 MR. BONG: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's probably an
15 obvious question. But it does meet it on the site
16 without any diminishing -- without diminishing any
17 of the off-site facilities, as well; right?

18 MR. BONG: Correct. Correct. They run it
19 through the program and they -- there is a -- kind
20 of a setting that they can use where they make sure
21 that it doesn't go below 20 psi throughout the rest
22 of the surrounding system.

23 So that's one of the controls that they do
24 when they run it through the model, and it didn't --

1 it didn't go below that.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

3 MR. BONG: So that is the water main
4 modeling for the site. Are there any more questions
5 on the water main modeling?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. BONG: So the next study is the sanitary
8 sewer evaluation study, which I'm going to hand it
9 over to Greg Chismark to present that, Greg from WBK.

10 MR. CHISMARK: Thank you. Good evening,
11 Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members.

12 My name is Greg Chismark. I'm with WBK
13 Engineering. Our address is 116 East Main Street,
14 right across the river from here.

15 So WBK was engaged to evaluate the sanitary
16 sewer system for this project. I've got three quick
17 slides for you to talk about the scope, we'll cover
18 the results quickly and then our recommendations,
19 and, finally, I've got a map of the system and then
20 entertain questions.

21 So the scope of our study -- obviously, our
22 primary goal was to evaluate the impacts of this
23 proposed development. We received the site plan
24 from the City; we received land uses, worked with

1 City staff to determine land uses, potential
2 commercial uses, also determining the number of
3 bedrooms in units, things like that that relate to
4 models to project proposed flows.

5 Geographically, the scope of our study was
6 from the project site, from the old mall site. All
7 the flows flow eastward towards the river, as you
8 might expect, so they're from the project site to a
9 sanitary sewer siphon, which is a pipe that goes
10 under the river, and we stopped our evaluation at
11 that point.

12 The data that we used -- the best available
13 data that we used, we used the current City GIS data
14 in terms of the collection system. We did have some
15 ground survey from 2008, and that was actually from
16 a prior study when this site was called Town Center,
17 and we were involved at that project at that time,
18 so we had some ground survey we could use.

19 And the flow data we used were from two
20 studies the City did, one in 2009 from RJN, and then
21 we also looked backwards to a '96 study that Black &
22 Veatch did. They're a large national firm. In '96
23 they did that for the City, and we looked at those
24 two sets of flow data and basically used the most

1 conservative value of either of them, so we thought
2 that would be the conservative flow, and that's the
3 flow data that we used in our study.

4 And then, finally, in terms of the scope, we
5 did consider adjacent sites where there might be
6 some future development into the same sewers to
7 which this project was tributary.

8 So we looked at what can happen, and there
9 are a few parcels around -- I know as you are
10 familiar with -- that are undeveloped, particularly
11 east of 14th Street. There's a vacant parcel. So
12 we did look at that, as well, and that defined the
13 scope of what we evaluated.

14 Four quick results from the study I'll share
15 with you: Under existing conditions the sanitary
16 sewer collection system has challenges, and I don't
17 think that's a surprise to the City. I'm sure it's
18 not a surprise to some of the residents in the
19 neighborhoods, that there are some sewers that
20 during heavy rainfall events -- and I'm going to use
21 the word -- they're challenged, and that's under
22 existing conditions. We confirmed that in terms of
23 our evaluation.

24 The second result is that the primary

1 component of peak flows is rainfall getting into the
2 sewer system. Again, this is not a surprise to
3 engineers; it's not a surprise to City staff. But
4 that the primary component of flow that's
5 challenging the pipes in the collection system is
6 rainfall getting in through connections, whether --
7 albeit they're illegal or no longer allowed or leaky
8 pipes and just an old system in and of itself.

9 The third conclusion we reached -- to be
10 sure, Prairie Centre adds flows to those pipes that
11 are challenged. There's no doubt about it. But
12 they do not -- those additional flows doesn't
13 significantly change the challenge or change the
14 scope of what we would recommend the City do to
15 address those existing conditions and challenges.

16 So technically there are some system
17 challenges, but the addition of Prairie Centre
18 doesn't significantly change our perspective and
19 recommendations on those challenges.

20 And the final conclusion is, as we looked at
21 the grounding of flows and where the flows are
22 connected to when the mall existed and some of the
23 adjacent uses, some of those flows are routed
24 through the Davis School area -- I've got a map;

1 I'll show you this in one moment -- and there's an
2 opportunity, through this project, to reroute some
3 of not only the proposed flows but some of the
4 adjacent uses to Gray Street.

5 And the significance of that is Gray Street
6 has a larger sewer. It doesn't have the same
7 challenges that some of the Davis School area has in
8 terms of sewer backups, to be totally honest, so --

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does the Davis -- is that
10 the one that runs down Horne Street, the Davis one?

11 MR. CHISMARK: Yes. And I'll show you that.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I live two houses off of
13 there, and we had an issue with that so -- yes.

14 MR. CHISMARK: It is, you know -- part of my
15 history is working here for the City of St. Charles.
16 I'm very familiar with Davis School and the
17 conditions that some of those residents, I'll say,
18 suffer with.

19 It's not a condition that's unknown for the
20 City. The City has taken steps to address it.
21 We'll continue on getting to that, but I just want
22 to say that that is -- that is a result. And
23 I guess I would suggest this is a benefit, that this
24 is something that can be done. It's not going to

1 solve the problems, but, certainly, it's a step in
2 the right direction. I just wanted to point that
3 out.

4 Again, I'll look at -- I'll show you a map
5 here briefly and we can better understand that.

6 So four recommendations, again -- our
7 initial recommendation, if we can derive a benefit
8 from the project, sure, let's do that. So rerouting
9 the flows from one neighborhood to another where it
10 won't have adverse impacts would be the first
11 suggestion we'd make. The current plan, the
12 engineering plan, indicates that, so the Petitioner
13 is certainly on board with that recommendation.

14 We also recommend from the -- I'm going to
15 say -- Gray/Elm/Roosevelt -- and, again, I'll show
16 you a map here in a moment -- that no pipe segments
17 are smaller than 21-inch diameter. The Gray Street
18 sanitary sewer is 21-inch-diameter pipe, and we
19 recommend everything downstream of that be 21-inch
20 or greater. Under current conditions it's not. So
21 that's perhaps an obvious recommendation, that they
22 be made larger pipes.

23 The third recommendation is there's some
24 pipe lining. We suggest two segments be lined. The

1 City currently has a lining program, and these
2 segments would fit well within that program.

3 And then, finally, what we're suggesting is
4 the City continue to monitor the sanitary sewer
5 flows, better define project limits, schedule, and
6 what the pipe sizing should be. We made some
7 initial suggestions, but there's better data to be
8 gathered for a final project.

9 Again, as we looked at the impacts of this
10 project, some of those elements relate more to the
11 existing system than they do to the project, quite
12 frankly.

13 And my final slide -- so this is the -- a
14 map of the system that we studied. Just to orient
15 you, this is Randall Road. North is towards the
16 top. Here's Route 38. The aerial photo is a little
17 distorted. This, of course, is the project site,
18 approximately.

19 The sewer system that we studied is
20 primarily this yellow line that runs down Gray
21 Street. It then heads north up to Roosevelt, down
22 Roosevelt to Route 31, and then to the siphon and
23 across the river. The red line that you see
24 highlighted here, those are the sewers that are

1 challenged, and the yellow line here is the Gray
2 Street sewer.

3 So if I click on my animation here, that
4 line that just popped up -- the old mall, the Jewel
5 store, and this little parcel here and, I believe,
6 Binny's -- actually all flow through Davis right
7 now. Of course, nothing's connected to the mall,
8 but when the mall was functioning, it also flowed
9 through Davis.

10 And what we're suggesting and the
11 opportunity here is that we can connect all of that
12 down through the Gray Street sewer. As I mentioned,
13 the Gray Street sewer is larger, there's available
14 capacity. Even with the INI as it was
15 flow-monitored, there was capacity in that sewer.

16 I'll also point out to you that both those
17 runs of sewers connect -- they combine right here.
18 So, effectively, we're saying "Take this route," the
19 southerly route along Gray Street, rather than
20 through this neighborhood which has, again, some
21 challenges. Once we get beyond that point,
22 they're -- basically, those flows are in the same
23 sewer.

24 This segment here, as well, I'll point out

1 to you the City oversized some years back. That's
2 the 21-inch section of sanitary sewer.

3 So, with that, I'll maybe pause and see if
4 there's any questions or allow us to continue.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do have some
6 questions and clarifications.

7 MR. CHISMARK: Sure.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So the system
9 has challenges regardless of this development.

10 And from what I see on your map -- which is
11 very unusual so it's easier to see this way.
12 The challenges that we're dealing with, regardless
13 of the addition of this development, is that
14 Gray Street route, which is the northerly red route
15 that I see -- correct? --

16 MR. CHISMARK: Correct.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- off the site and
18 then the Roosevelt, then north on 31.

19 MR. CHISMARK: Yes, that's correct.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So those are the
21 areas that are challenged. And my first question --
22 and maybe staff can answer this -- maybe there is no
23 answer at this point.

24 But in the City's regular maintenance and

1 repair, upgrade, upkeep budget, is there -- are
2 there plans to do anything with these items?

3 MR. BONG: I don't think they have anything
4 at the moment. It may be in their long-range plans,
5 but I'm not aware of anything immediately to address
6 that.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. And this
8 isn't the first -- I mean, this is a known issue.
9 I mean, this is a known challenge. It didn't just
10 come up because of this study that was considered;
11 correct?

12 MR. BONG: Correct. Correct.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

14 MR. BONG: And I would say that it's --
15 they're challenged when we have a -- when we have
16 like a 10-year rain event.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: A significant event
18 on --

19 MR. BONG: A significant event, some of
20 those downstream segments get to overcapacity, say
21 like 105 percent of capacity.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, we need that
23 now.

24 MR. BONG: So it's -- they're not challenged

1 in the sense that they're blocked or collapsed or
2 anything like that. It's just that they could be
3 functioning -- they really should be upsized at some
4 point in the future. And that's kind of what this
5 study is representing.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I know that
7 we have regular plans for replacing curb and gutter
8 and, you know, roadway, we -- sidewalks. I just
9 wondered if there was some plan in place for repair
10 or maintenance of these items.

11 MR. BONG: Well, one thing that I do know
12 that public works is working on now is some flow
13 studies of that region. They call it the CMOM
14 project. I forgot exactly what the acronym stands
15 for, but it's basically flow-monitoring to determine
16 how much of that rainwater that we want to keep out
17 of the sanitary sewers -- how much is getting in.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, okay.

19 MR. BONG: So there's continuing studies.
20 So they are working on it, and I think it's more of
21 a -- they're trying to pinpoint exactly what
22 projects they will do in the future.

23 But I'm not aware of any capital projects at
24 the moment that are specifically for repairing that.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All right.

2 And then, Greg, if I could ask a couple more
3 questions.

4 I need to ask you -- I need the map.

5 MR. CHISMARK: Yes. Russ is working --

6 MR. COLBY: This will take just a second.

7 MR. CHISMARK: You know what? I'll add one
8 thing, though, to reconfirm.

9 Chris is right. When I say "challenged,"
10 it's not normal daily flows. In a day like today --
11 you know, it was a 10-year design event. We pick a
12 design event.

13 And it also -- when they're over capacity,
14 that doesn't also -- you shouldn't construe that to
15 mean basements are backing up. That simply means
16 the pipe is full; it's flowing full. So, again,
17 I -- you know --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's a perfect
19 segue, though, into my next comment, slash,
20 question, and that is you suggest that, regardless
21 of the challenges, that this project wouldn't
22 significantly alter the regular use of the system
23 and that, given a significant event with or without
24 the project, it's going to be a problem. Would that

1 be a fair way to say it?

2 MR. CHISMARK: That's a fair statement, yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Then my next
4 and final -- I guess my final question is -- and
5 we'll pretend there's a map up there.

6 The Gray Street line -- okay? -- and you
7 suggest that perhaps it would be wise to reroute the
8 system to the Gray Street line and that it doesn't
9 appear to have the same challenges, significant
10 event challenges, that the Davis line does up until
11 the Davis line hits it.

12 But then wouldn't that increase the flow
13 south of that, where the Davis line ties in and
14 heads east from there?

15 That's okay, Russ. We can figure it out.
16 We can talk without it.

17 MR. COLBY: We'll get something on.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Does that -- do you
19 understand my question?

20 MR. CHISMARK: Yes -- no, I do. I do.
21 I'm going to see if Russ -- if Russ gets the map up,
22 I can answer with the map. If not, I'll try without
23 the map.

24 But to begin to answer your question, the

1 portion of the Gray Street sewer upstream of the
2 junction with the Davis School where the two sewers
3 combine --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. To the west.

5 MR. CHISMAR: -- the capacities even with
6 the project flows -- we looked at the flows in the
7 pipe, and then we assigned a percentage of pipe
8 capacity, for example.

9 Again, this is for a rainy day event, the
10 10-year design event. This is the event that the
11 City -- and I'm just looking through our spreadsheet
12 here.

13 And, again, we also apply some future
14 developments, so we're also applying some
15 undeveloped parcels that aren't part of this
16 project, but we need to understand that they're in
17 the city; they potentially can connect. So some of
18 those capacities -- I'm just looking through my
19 chart here real quick -- are in the range of
20 50 percent.

21 Again, so -- you know, that makes me feel
22 very comfortable. That's with the project; that's
23 the rainy day event; that's with some undeveloped
24 parcels.

1 So -- you know, and, again, here's the
2 project. That undeveloped parcel -- you know, this
3 is -- for example, this is one large parcel. We
4 included that in our evaluation. So this segment
5 right here, this is the junction point where it ties
6 in. So this segment right here, we're looking at
7 a percent capacity in the range of 50 percent.

8 Again, there's a lot of numbers on this,
9 short of going through every one. So we've got a
10 factor of safety.

11 Now, from this junction point downstream is
12 what you asked, "Well, aren't we going to cause
13 problems there?" and that's the portion where the
14 pipe changes from a 12-inch pipe to a 21-inch pipe.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It goes from 12-inch
16 to the west until the junction? It's 12-inch at
17 that point and then it goes to 21?

18 MR. CHISMARK: It was increased. And you
19 had asked the question, "Well, what's the City --
20 doesn't the City have plans?" And there were plans
21 sometime back when Gray Street was rebuilt that this
22 pipe was oversized based on the 1996 Black & Veatch
23 study. I referred to the flow data.

24 Well, that study identified a number of

1 areas, including Davis School area -- it's not a
2 surprise -- up by General -- well, where General
3 Mills used to be there were some sewer issues.
4 There were a number of projects identified the City
5 undertook, and this oversizing to the 21-inch was
6 one of them.

7 So when Gray Street was being worked on, the
8 City took that opportunity to rebuild that segment
9 of pipe as a 21-inch. It never got continued
10 downstream, but we have an opportunity -- I guess
11 I'll say -- from that prior work, that -- the intent
12 was that 21-inch would provide some relief to Davis
13 and perhaps it did. I don't think it solves the
14 problems entirely.

15 So, hopefully, that begins to answer your
16 question as to how this would function and then the
17 opportunity that then is created to begin to route
18 the project to Gray Street.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. CHISMARK: Does that help?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It does. Thank you.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a couple questions.

23 MR. CHISMARK: Sure.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Offhand, do you know how many

1 10-year events we've had in the last 10 years?

2 MR. CHISMARK: I don't.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

4 MR. CHISMARK: And the 10-year event is a
5 misnomer. A hundred-year event's a misnomer. It's
6 a matter of statistics, so it's a chance of 1 in
7 10 occurring annually.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: But I've seen reports in the
9 news that hundred-year events are happening more
10 frequently in the last decade and so -- and that we
11 may need to reset some of those historical
12 benchmarks. And I'm not certain if that's true
13 or not.

14 MR. CHISMARK: I don't know if that's true.
15 Certainly, we can talk about climate change and what
16 that may be doing, and so there's a whole body of
17 opinion that that is changing. That may be true.

18 We've -- I know we do have -- this is based
19 on statistical data, some of our data we have. The
20 longer we collect the data, the better that data is.
21 And, again, trying to forecast the change.

22 You know, again, I hear those comments,
23 "There's more hundred-year events, more 10-year
24 events." You could have 25 10-year events in

1 a year; you could have 2.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Uh-huh.

3 MR. CHISMARK: Again, it's a matter of
4 probability that they occur.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Understood. Thank you.

6 The other question, then, is -- so one of
7 the things that the Commission has to assess,
8 whether it's for sanitary sewer or for traffic, is
9 the adequacy of the surrounding infrastructure. So
10 we -- particularly downstream where you have the
11 red lines there, earlier -- earlier you mentioned
12 50 percent capacity. I assume that meant the Gray
13 Street where it's 21-inch.

14 Do you know what the capacity is right now
15 along those areas where it's marked in red?

16 MR. CHISMARK: So the red -- anything that
17 is marked in red would be at 100 percent capacity.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: Today?

19 MR. CHISMARK: Today and with the project.
20 There effectively is -- there is a change -- and,
21 again, it varies. I can't cite every cite, but I
22 will say this: Everything that we are recommending
23 in red is not over capacity. The capacity of the
24 paper is based on the slope of the pipe as well as

1 the size of the pipe.

2 So where you're going down a hill, for
3 example, it has much greater capacity at the same
4 diameter of pipe. So not every pipe segment is over
5 capacity. If they've got a section of sewer that's
6 flat, that segment would be over capacity. If it's
7 got more pitch on it, it would not be.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

9 MR. CHISMARK: So although we're
10 recommending replacement of this entire segment, not
11 every single pipe segment in this run is over
12 capacity.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

14 MR. CHISMARK: The ones that are over
15 capacity -- to answer your question, the ones that
16 are over capacity are in the range of -- and, again,
17 I'm looking at the chart -- 105 percent or so. So
18 we're over a hundred percent, but it's not 150 or
19 200 percent.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. And the recommended
21 improvements to that stretch would be the same?

22 MR. CHISMARK: Yes.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. CHISMARK: Other questions?

1 MEMBER FRIO: To clear up one thing, there's
2 no -- if they complete this project, it's not adding
3 any capacity to the pipes that are already there?
4 Is that what you've said? Is it adding to or is it
5 pretty much equal to because the property's already
6 there?

7 MR. CHISMARK: So the density -- yeah, the
8 property's already there. You know, it depends on
9 how you consider that. There's no flows there now.
10 Now, when there was a mall, there were flows --
11 right? -- connected to those pipes going through the
12 Davis School area.

13 To be sure, the project will add flows to a
14 system that has some challenges. But what
15 I don't -- but there's no significant difference
16 between the area that we've identified as having
17 challenges without the project.

18 MEMBER FRIO: So where does the runoff
19 go now?

20 Is it going into this piping system, or is
21 it just -- so if it rains now and you get a
22 hundred-year rain, is it piping through this system
23 now?

24 MR. CHISMARK: No. There's two separate --

1 so this is the sanitary sewer system. So this is
2 where the sinks and the bathtubs and the toilets are
3 connected.

4 MEMBER FRIO: Got it.

5 MR. CHISMARK: Rainwater should not go there
6 but it does.

7 MEMBER FRIO: Okay.

8 MR. CHISMARK: And this is different than
9 the storm sewer system. So this is not a drainage
10 condition -- it shouldn't be a drainage condition
11 but it is.

12 And I'm also going to tell you -- that may
13 sound odd or unusual, but old pipes -- I think you
14 can go in any city with infrastructure as old as
15 St. Charles -- up and down the Fox Valley -- that
16 are so much worse, Elgin and Aurora to be certain.

17 You know, with older infrastructure, they
18 have the same challenges. Older clay pipes, they're
19 leaky. The pipes are underground. Roots get in
20 them; they open up the pipe joints. That's how the
21 water gets in.

22 MEMBER FRIO: Got it.

23 MR. CHISMARK: There's some illegal
24 connecting; older buildings are connected to the

1 sewer system and rainwater gets in.

2 Does that help?

3 MEMBER FRIO: Yes. Thank you.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: I'm sorry. I have one final
5 question.

6 MR. CHISMARK: Sure.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Will you go back to your
8 slide with your recommendations.

9 MR. CHISMARK: I'll try.

10 MR. BONG: I don't know if we can get to
11 that.

12 MR. CHISMARK: You know what? I do have --

13 MEMBER DOYLE: It's -- it's okay.

14 There's a slide -- maybe you just remember
15 the language -- that talked -- that used the term
16 "monitor." One of your four recommendations was
17 that the City monitor -- I don't know if you used --
18 just cite the specific language of that.

19 MR. CHISMARK: Yeah. So the last
20 recommendation reads as follows: Continue flow-
21 monitoring to better define project limits, project
22 scheduling, and pipe sizing.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So here's my question:
24 If a portion of the system is currently at

1 105 percent, at what point should the City stop
2 monitoring and say, "Okay. We've monitored enough.
3 It's just time to upgrade it and we have to upgrade
4 it in order to support additional development in the
5 city"?

6 At what point do we come to that point, to
7 a -- "Okay. Monitoring's nice but now it's time to
8 invest some capital dollars"?

9 MR. CHISMARK: Let me say this: When I say
10 "continue to flow-monitor," what I want to say there
11 is -- remember, I told you earlier on we were very
12 conservative with the flow data that we used? We
13 used the highest values.

14 So what I don't want to suggest to the City
15 is that they do something and spend money building a
16 new pipe when they don't need it so --

17 MEMBER DOYLE: So --

18 MR. CHISMARK: -- so that's what I'm saying,
19 is this is a conservative approach, purposefully a
20 conservative approach.

21 And so we looked at -- our focus is the
22 development, what the impacts of development are.
23 So that red line -- to replace all those pipes would
24 be very expensive. And what I would suggest to the

1 City is "Don't just take what we've done and go
2 design plans and go build it. You need to
3 flow-monitor, make sure you understand those direct
4 flows a little better."

5 Your question about when is the time to do
6 that is probably a City question and not for me to
7 answer, when is it time to go build that pipe and do
8 that.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

10 MR. CHISMARK: Does that --

11 MEMBER DOYLE: We always have this sort of a
12 challenge -- I don't want to belabor this but --
13 whether it's sanitary sewer or traffic, where
14 capacity is approaching a D, a D minus, an F. It's
15 failing. But the project isn't changing what we
16 recommend we'll ultimately do at some indefinite
17 point down the road.

18 And then we're here charged to assess
19 whether we have sufficient capacity for the
20 development, and the answer -- the quick answer
21 would be, no, there's not. But you couldn't build
22 an outhouse on that parcel based on a strict
23 definition which says we're at 105 percent today,
24 which defies logic.

1 So, really, what I'm trying to process out
2 loud here is at what point for us to make a
3 responsible decision in terms of being stewards do
4 we say to -- do we recommend to the City as a
5 condition of approval the City needs to -- you know,
6 for instance, I -- you know, needs to implement
7 improvements to sanitary sewer as scheduled that
8 mirrors the development schedule of the parcel in
9 question, rather than simply monitor it until it's
10 really bad and we have a crisis on our hands.

11 So I understand it's a gotcha question.
12 I apologize for dropping that on you.

13 MR. CHISMARK: Yeah.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: But it is one that I think
15 the Commission has to consider, and it's something
16 that we'll have -- we're in a public hearing, and
17 it's something that remains an open question for me
18 at this point.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think you
20 make a good point. It's not just, as you say, the
21 capacity of the sewer or the traffic study, but it
22 seems that -- and I remember doing work with
23 referendums for schools. And it seems that our
24 system isn't set up to say, "Gosh, it would be nice

1 to have this. Let's spend the money on it."

2 Our system is set up to address urgent need.

3 So I don't think that we're ever going to come
4 across a situation where the conditions are ideal.

5 I do agree with your point that it's our job
6 to assess the level of severity of the challenges
7 that the system may face with a significant event,
8 and that's why I asked some of those numbers. Like
9 you say, 20 percent; it's at 20 or at 50 percent.

10 When you exceed those numbers at capacity
11 during a significant event or -- I shouldn't say
12 during -- in normal use, then we have an issue.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Uh-huh.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But an issue that
15 exists here with or without the project I don't
16 think -- I'm trying to be careful how I say this
17 because I don't want to pivot on either side but --
18 I don't think it's the Applicant's fault, nor do
19 I think it's the City's, you know, responsibility to
20 make everything all, you know, flowers and puppies
21 for the Applicant, either.

22 But I think that those numbers that Greg
23 points out of its capacity during normal use and
24 during significant events are the numbers that we

1 need to use when we process this.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, I'll hold any further
3 comment until later in the meeting, if we get to
4 that.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Uh-huh.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
7 else?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you, Greg.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

12 MR. CHISMARK: Thank you.

13 MR. BONG: That was the end for the
14 engineering studies so -- I'll leave it to the
15 Applicant.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17 MR. BAZOS: So thank you. That was a very
18 thorough and interesting approach -- or report.

19 I think what we heard, for the record, is
20 that the project may actually improve the situation
21 by bringing about a rerouting to the Gray pipes, to
22 the Gray system pipes from the Davis, and actually
23 help the situation. And then we also heard more
24 than once that the project itself will not

1 materially worsen the situation downstream.

2 So -- but very interesting comments and --
3 in any event, we're completed with our presentation
4 for this evening. We'll be submitting some
5 additional materials to you, including the site plan
6 with the footprint changes and that encompass the
7 bonus units and the architecture that you've
8 indicated a preference for and -- can you think
9 of -- and if you have any questions of us, we're
10 certainly here to answer them.

11 Thank you.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any questions?

14 MEMBER PRETZ: I have one.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll save the other one for
17 the next meeting.

18 And it has to deal with the -- your response
19 to the comprehensive plan request that I said, which
20 I do appreciate you doing.

21 One line in there -- I'm not sure what
22 page -- I'm not sure what page it was on, but it's
23 the paragraph -- and I'll read the paragraph. It's
24 the paragraph right above page 86, line 18 to 23.

1 And you had written -- you -- "We believe
2 that the above clearly illustrates many of the areas
3 where the development complies with the
4 comprehensive plan. Certainly, there are many more
5 areas. Should you feel that more are needed, please
6 don't hesitate to ask." So I'm asking.

7 I think it is in your benefit, as it relates
8 to the comprehensive plan -- the comprehensive plan
9 is not that old. It's relatively new, a lot of
10 effort and -- from the residents as well as from our
11 elected officials in that. There was a lot of time
12 in that. That comprehensive plan is the economic
13 lifeblood and future of St. Charles, and it's to the
14 overall welfare of the residents.

15 And as -- from my opinion, the comprehensive
16 plan is probably the number one area that you should
17 address while all of the others -- and, again, this
18 is my opinion -- all of the other areas are a
19 more -- making the picture look better.

20 They're all important, all of these
21 different factors, but I think the more you can
22 provide as far as how your development, your
23 project, fits the overall City plan is a benefit to
24 you.

1 And I would also recommend that, in the next
2 meeting -- not today unless you want to -- that you
3 go through those points because there may be some
4 areas that, as you present those points -- and,
5 hopefully, the other Commissioners agree with me.
6 But as you go through that, if there are
7 clarifications that are needed or additions or some
8 corrections, whatever, I think it's for your benefit
9 to have all of those brought up in detail in
10 the minutes of our public hearings.

11 And that would be my recommendation to you.

12 MR. BAZOS: We'll take that seriously and
13 try and address it.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

15 Any questions from members of the audience
16 or comments?

17 Yes.

18 MS. BELL-LASOTA: Vanessa Bell-Lasota,
19 1610 Howard Street.

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Could you spell your
21 name for me, please.

22 MS. BELL-LASOTA: B, as in "boy," -e-l-l,
23 hyphen -- sorry -- L-a-s, as in "Sam," -o-t, as in
24 "Tom," -a.

1 I'll try to make this as brief as possible.

2 To Mr. Doyle's point about monitoring versus
3 making a recommendation, I just want to share --
4 living at 16th and Howard, two years ago -- I have
5 the City main for the sewer line and the water at
6 the base -- the back of my lot at 16th and Howard.
7 And in December the water main did burst and shoot a
8 stream up about 4 feet for several hours before I
9 noticed. So to the point of the aging
10 infrastructure, it is an aging infrastructure.

11 To the point of the prairie style and the
12 sketch that the architect showed -- and forgive me;
13 I really didn't see much more than a very surface
14 difference, but I appreciate the effort.

15 The thing about the prairie style is it is a
16 horizontal orientation. It has a linear emphasis on
17 the horizontal, so I can't quite juxtapose that with
18 the four- to five-story buildings. So I'm seeing
19 some things wrap around it like some horizontal
20 lines; I don't see any change in the windows. I'm
21 looking for some soft arches.

22 The whole idea of the prairie style is that
23 it blends well into the properties based on -- it's
24 not just buildings shooting up with some, you know,

1 window dressing. So I appreciate that you said it's
2 a greater narrative and a bigger story. I would be
3 looking for that in January.

4 I would also suggest that the water feature
5 would change because water is another -- it's the
6 elements of nature that are the prairie style,
7 including water, so I would see something more
8 linear and more horizontal with the water feature.

9 With the landscaping and the lighting,
10 again, it would be accent and recessed lighting, and
11 I would look to see that in January, rather than
12 just lighting for safety's purposes.

13 My concern with -- and am I talking too
14 fast?

15 Resubdividing and selling to developers
16 sounds like a really great idea if that is what you
17 imagine will market the retail and we'll finally get
18 some mixed-use retail. However, my question would
19 be, would the developers be held to be consistent
20 with the PUD and would they build the buildings? Or
21 would the Shodeen Group build the buildings that
22 would then be purchased by these developers? Who
23 would be the builder and how can we protect the
24 project to continue that narrative over time? How

1 can we ensure the appearance is consistent with the
2 vision and spirit of the PUD?

3 And the last thing I want to address is
4 page 59, line 1 through 8. And, again, it is
5 regarding the density bonus, but the Shodeen Group
6 made the statement that the Plan Commission is not
7 charged with the responsibility to review or comment
8 on the affordable housing ordinance.

9 That was me asking the question, and it was
10 not the ordinance that I was asking to be
11 considered. It was the physical result of the
12 Shodeen Group opting to take full advantage of the
13 density bonus.

14 What will that appearance be? What will the
15 livability be? And part of that density bonus,
16 Section B, says, "In implementing this density
17 bonus, the requirements of Title 17 of the
18 St. Charles Municipal Code, the St. Charles Zoning
19 Ordinance may be varied without additional
20 justification," and that concerns me. Lot area, lot
21 width, and building coverage may be varied without
22 additional justification, and that is a major
23 concern to me.

24 Finally, the letter to Mr. Colby ended by

1 saying, "Be advised that we will be seeking external
2 funding sources to fund the affordable units,
3 including grants, tax credits, et cetera," and my
4 concern is those two words, "tax credits."

5 I know this is not City Council, but because
6 it is in public record and it is within this letter,
7 I think I can question -- what type of tax credits?
8 Is that municipal? county? other? It concerns me
9 that we're not getting the fee in lieu. We're
10 getting affordable units built, we're getting
11 additional density, and then the taxpayers perhaps
12 are going to help fund that additional density.

13 So that's a direct concern of mine, and
14 I believe that's it and I thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

16 Any response before we go on to -- or would
17 you like to just speak at the end?

18 MR. BAZOS: I'll -- I can remember to answer
19 now if you'd like.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

21 MR. BAZOS: And I only have two things
22 I would answer: If the PUD and -- the zoning and
23 the PUD, if approved by the City Council, will be a
24 restriction on the use of this property so that,

1 even if it were subdivided and I sold a lot to the
2 Commissioner on the left, he could only develop
3 consistent with the PUD. So that's an answer to one
4 of your questions. And the architecture will be
5 part of the PUD.

6 The second thing about tax credits is it
7 really is not a zoning issue. But to the extent,
8 for example, that there's affordable senior housing
9 that that is financed through the Illinois Housing
10 Authority, that -- those tax credits are part of the
11 IRS allowance for those kinds of developers to sell
12 tax credits to tax credit buyers. It has nothing to
13 do with this City, not even the State of Illinois,
14 frankly. It's just a Federal -- might be a Federal
15 and State tax credit. But people all over the
16 country would buy those tax credits; it's not
17 citizens of St. Charles or the City of St. Charles.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

20 Yes, sir.

21 MR. NORGAARD: My name is Larry Norgaard --
22 it's N-o-r-g-a-a-r-d -- 1214 South Sixth Street.
23 I just have a couple comments.

24 Some years back we had a bunch of people in

1 here -- builders, I think, and the architects -- and
2 we were talking about -- I questioned them. I said,
3 "Well, Shodeen has said we're going to build
4 high-end apartments." I said, "Is that going to
5 happen?"

6 He says, "We all say that."

7 So my question is, if we get that kind of a
8 statement as to the quality and the cost of these
9 apartments' rental, what type of protections does
10 the City have that we maintain that level
11 throughout -- whether or not they're built or not?
12 Because once they start building and they aren't
13 filled, then we go downhill and we've got too much
14 density as there is.

15 Something came up tonight, this -- what was
16 it? -- 4D and 5D going to parallel parking rather
17 than the diagonal parking that -- again, because of
18 the extremely high density, which I object to
19 personally since I live in the area. That's going
20 to reduce the amount of available parking for the
21 people who are renting.

22 And, once again, you still have the same
23 situation: Older people like me, we have two cars.
24 Young couples that are sharing a place, they want

1 to have two cars. We've got to have a parking
2 space for them underground or otherwise where the
3 facility is.

4 I have a concern about this development
5 which was somewhat relieved with the possibility of
6 selling some of the property for a retail. The idea
7 of using the retail as a justification for the -- of
8 using the TIFs and having retail to justify the TIFs
9 bothers me because the properties that Shodeen has
10 that are on the north side of Jewel, there's about
11 five empty spaces there for some time. The ones
12 that they remodeled on Randall Road on the west side
13 of Jewel, same thing.

14 On Lincoln Highway, if you will, where the
15 old Dominick's was, there are still a lot of empty
16 spaces. If you go south and you get into -- I don't
17 know if it's Batavia or Geneva, between Gander and
18 Best Buy, a lot of empty spaces. You can't fill
19 any -- put anything in Charlestowne Mall.

20 So I'm concerned about what the future is,
21 and that's maybe possibly been relieved by what they
22 offered today.

23 So, anyhow, those are my concerns.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

1 Anything else?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Well, if --
4 I think that we've kind of laid out where we're
5 going the next meeting, so I would say that a
6 motion -- unless staff has anything.

7 MR. COLBY: I just wanted to state we need
8 to select the date for the continuing of the public
9 hearing. We had provided three dates based on our
10 meeting calendars that the City Council chambers is
11 available.

12 The normal Plan Commission meeting dates are
13 conflicts with the City Council meetings on those
14 dates because of holidays, so we need to select an
15 alternate date. We have provided dates of Tuesday,
16 January the 10th; Wednesday, January the 11th; and
17 Tuesday, January the 24th, as options for the Plan
18 Commission to consider.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would say I'm
20 available for any of them but I'd prefer that we
21 deal with it on Tuesday.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does anyone have an
23 objection to the 10th? Tuesday, January 10th.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: I don't have an objection,

1 but I would prefer the 11th. But if it's the 10th,
2 I'll be here.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wednesdays are
4 difficult for me.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: Tuesday it is.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, what was the next
7 day after that?

8 There were three dates.

9 MR. COLBY: The other date was Tuesday,
10 the 24th.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. How does the 24th
12 work?

13 MEMBER DOYLE: I will be out of town on
14 business on the 24th.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So will I be out, too.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: I think this is important
19 enough that we should probably take a look at the
20 10th versus two weeks later.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: I mean, this is -- because if
23 we don't finish the public hearing that day, at
24 least then we're still in a very reasonable mode

1 instead of pushing the Applicant out so far.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And are we talking about
3 canceling the meeting on January 3rd?

4 MR. COLBY: We anticipate canceling that
5 meeting date. It depends on what applications we
6 receive over the next month --

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

8 MR. COLBY: -- but we would not anticipate
9 having more than two meetings in January.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Yeah.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Before we consider a motion
12 to continue, I have two comments I'd like to make
13 or -- or really questions --

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Please.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: -- that I'd like to put out
16 on the table for that meeting because I've been
17 listening and reading the materials this evening.

18 I have two questions, procedural questions,
19 that I'll need some help sort of setting some ground
20 rules as we look at this again in January.

21 The first is, given that the inclusive
22 housing density bonus is something that is properly
23 the purview of the Housing Commission and, yet, it
24 has an impact on traffic, there's a bit of a dilemma

1 there in terms of how the Commission is going to
2 consider the question of density.

3 I think that -- I, for example, would like
4 to know what -- if we consider a given baseline
5 departure and look at whether or not that baseline
6 density is appropriate and whether it's supported in
7 terms of the traffic study, et cetera, that we make
8 a decision on the baseline.

9 If we look at the total density, including
10 the bonus, and then we say, "No, that's too high,
11 let's lower it so that it meets our preferences,"
12 then it's no longer a bonus; right? I mean,
13 basically, we've -- so we've reset the baseline to
14 be what we want in the end, and I think that flies
15 in the face of the inclusive housing ordinance and
16 the rationale of it.

17 So I think the Commission is going to need
18 some guidance, given that we have this bifurcated
19 Commission structure, on how we are to adjudicate
20 that question.

21 The other question that you raised earlier
22 tonight does concern this question of infrastructure
23 and how we determine the adequacy and suitability of
24 existing infrastructure when, for instance, the

1 corner of Seventh and Prairie is rated as
2 approaching fail or a portion of the sanitary sewer
3 system is 105 percent.

4 I am not comfortable with the prospect of
5 saying, "We just can't develop" what we all know is
6 a catalyst site and needs to be developed to promote
7 the City's comprehensive plan, and yet I'm also not
8 comfortable saying to the community, "We know that
9 this is -- this infrastructure is approaching
10 capacity or is at capacity; we're going to monitor
11 things and see how bad it gets before we do
12 something."

13 So there's all this sort of fuzzy area --
14 right? -- where we have to make that determination.
15 And, again, I will need some help from City staff
16 and from the Applicant in determining how we
17 adjudicate that question.

18 So -- those are my comments.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I had one more thing.

20 Earlier I had mentioned that I have a
21 question that I was going to -- to be answered at
22 our next meeting. I just wanted to throw it out in
23 the comment realm here so you're prepared.

24 And it deals with page 32, line 24, page 33,

1 line 1 and 2, of your response to the questions.
2 That was "So what phase were you intending in the
3 next plan," et cetera, et cetera. I would like more
4 detail of how the project is going to roll out.

5 MR. BAZOS: What page and line numbers were
6 those again, Mr. Pretz?

7 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, it's in -- it's on your
8 very first page of your response to Russ as it
9 relates to the questions.

10 MR. BAZOS: I see it.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: And it was page 32, line 24,
12 page 33, line 1 and 2.

13 MR. BAZOS: Got it.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: And that's the one -- I'm
15 going to ask you that question or you can volunteer
16 at the next meeting and just go into it and -- but
17 I'd like more detail on how you plan on doing your
18 project.

19 MR. BAZOS: Thank you. We'll do that.
20 We'll prepare for that.

21 Would you like an answer now, or should we
22 save it -- I mean, it's --

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Save it.

24 MR. BAZOS: Next meeting is fine? Okay.

1 MEMBER PRETZ: Save it. Save it and give
2 you time to prepare.

3 MR. BAZOS: All right.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
5 discussion?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I'll
8 entertain a motion to continue the public hearing to
9 January 10th, 2017, at 7:00 p.m. in this room.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. It's been moved
13 and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?

16 (Ayes heard.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes unanimously
20 and that concludes Item No. 4.

21 Item 5, additional business.

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Weekly
24 development report.

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Meeting announcements
3 we've discussed.

4 Any public comment?

5 MR. COLBY: I do want to make a brief
6 announcement about the meetings.

7 We are anticipating having a meeting on
8 December the 20th, so we wanted to make sure that we
9 would have a quorum for that meeting.

10 So is there anyone who will not be in
11 attendance at that meeting?

12 MEMBER FRIO: (Indicating.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

14 MR. COLBY: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion to
16 adjourn?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded. All
20 in favor?

21 (Ayes heard.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the

1 St. Charles Planning Commission is adjourned at

2 8:29 p.m.

3 (Off the record at 8:29 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Melanie L. Humphrey-Sonntag, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-004299, CSR, RDR, CRR, CRC, FAPR, 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 13th day of December, 2016.

My commission expires: May 31, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois