

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2019**

Members Present: Chairman Wallace
Vice Chairman Kessler
James Holderfield
Jeffrey Funke
Tom Pretz
Jennifer Becker
Peter Vargulich (7:02pm)
Laura Macklin-Purdy

Members Absent: None

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

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the January 8, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.

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

**4. First Street Building #8 (STC Lot4, LLC/ Frontier Development)
PUD Preliminary Plan**

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to approve the PUD Preliminary Plan for First St. Building #8 – STC Lot 4, LLC-Frontier Development, subject to resolution of outstanding staff comments.

Motion was made by Mr. Funke to amend the motion to approve requiring a greater building setback along Rt. 31. Motion was not seconded; motion failed.

Roll Call Vote (on first motion):

Ayes: Holderfield, Becker, Vargulich, Pretz, Macklin-Purdy, Wallace, Kessler

Nays: Funke

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Page 2

Absent:

Motion carried: 7-1

5. Plan Commission Rules of Procedure Review

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to adopt the changes to the Plan Commission Rules of Procedure.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried: 8-0

6. Comprehensive Plan Update

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

7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

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

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

Tuesday, April 2, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

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

Monday, April 8, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

10. Public Comment

11. Adjournment at 8:15 p.m.



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

Transcript of First Street Building No. 8

Date: February 19, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
First Street Building No. 8 :
(STC Lot 4, LLC/Frontier :
Development) PUD Preliminary :
Plan. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 168464A
Pages: 1 - 36
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 CENTURY STATION

4 112 Riverside Avenue

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of First Street Building No. 8
Conducted on February 19, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of First Street Building No. 8
Conducted on February 19, 2019

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

MEMBER BECKER: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Presentation
of minutes of the January 8th, 2019, meeting of
the Plan Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

Transcript of First Street Building No. 8
Conducted on February 19, 2019

5

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded.

2 All in favor.

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item No. 4 on our
5 agenda is First Street Building No. 8 (STC Lot 4,
6 LLC/Frontier Development) PUD Preliminary Plan.

7 MR. COLBY: I'll start.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

9 (Member Vargulich joined the proceedings.)

10 MR. COLBY: I believe the Commissioners
11 are familiar with the First Street redevelopment
12 project downtown. The site where the construction
13 is ongoing right now is Phase 3 of the project.
14 That phase is expected to be completed later this
15 year. The remaining lots which have been identified
16 for future buildings on the project are Lots 6,
17 7B, and 8.

18 This past year the City issued a request
19 for proposals to solicit interest from developers
20 in constructing on those lots. We have a proposal
21 this evening that's advancing for Building No. 8,
22 which is the parcel that's located at the
23 northeast corner of Route 31 and Illinois Street.

24 An application has been submitted for a

1 PUD preliminary plan, and that is what's before
2 the Commission tonight for review.

3 The staff memo outlines a zoning review of
4 the proposal comparing the data for the project
5 versus the CBD1 and PUD zoning regulations and
6 also compares the proposed building to a building
7 that had previously been approved back when the
8 project was originally approved by the City in 2006.
9 It's similar in size. Probably the biggest
10 difference if you were to compare this proposal
11 versus the 2006 proposal is with the building
12 architecture.

13 The project has been reviewed by the
14 Historic Preservation Commission. They are required
15 to review any PUD developments that are located
16 within the historic district. They reviewed this
17 project back in January and provided some comments,
18 but they did vote to recommend approval of the
19 preliminary plan and provided some comments on how
20 it would impact or not impact the surrounding
21 area, and those are listed in the staff memo.

22 It did also note in the section of the memo
23 regarding building architecture that the building
24 does somewhat differ from the original First Street

1 development guidelines with respect to some of the
2 portions of building materials, but they are
3 consistent with what had originally been contemplated
4 as permitted building materials.

5 The preliminary plans are under staff
6 engineering review. We just provided comments, I
7 believe yesterday. Most of the items for the
8 preliminary review will not require significant
9 changes to the plans; they're more technical plan
10 revisions. So we're not anticipating the plans
11 will change significantly from what's being
12 presented tonight, but there are some comments to
13 be addressed before the preliminary plans are
14 approved by City Council.

15 So with that we have the applicants,
16 Conrad Hurst and Curt Hurst who are present and
17 are available to speak to their plan.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Can I make a comment?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure -- well, let me
21 just say first, since this isn't a public hearing,
22 we don't go by the normal procedure that we would
23 follow with it being a public hearing. So what
24 we'll do first is take any Plan Commission comments

1 or questions, and if you want to fill in any of the
2 information, please, you know, feel free to do that.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have to leave
4 early, so I just have a few questions.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. So on the
7 east side in the back, there is going to be like a
8 service driveway then?

9 MR. CONRAD HURST: More or less.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Is there an
11 existing electrical box back there that's going to
12 have to be moved?

13 MR. CONRAD HURST: That would be what the
14 service road would primarily be access to, the
15 electrical transformer and the flush-mounted
16 transformer bolt that's there, as well as the
17 trash enclosure.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And what is the
19 setback distance -- I have a hard time reading
20 some of these plans. On the south side of
21 Illinois, the pavers, what is the distance between
22 like the street and the entrance of the building?

23 MR. CONRAD HURST: It ends up being 16 feet
24 about. I think it's 15 and some change or 16 and

1 some change.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So that's all going
3 to be pavers on that side?

4 MR. CONRAD HURST: Well, where the planters
5 are is shown to be concrete sidewalk. We're trying
6 to match what was done with the rest of the First
7 Street development there.

8 MR. CURT HURST: And there were some
9 comments in the engineering review that came back
10 that had some recommendation with regard to how
11 the pavers and the concrete perimeter of it would
12 work together. So we'll address those in the
13 engineering comments.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So are those going
15 to be built-in planter boxes?

16 MR. CONRAD HURST: Yes.

17 MR. CURT HURST: Much like what you see on
18 the corner of Illinois and First Street.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Personally, I don't
20 like those at all.

21 MR. CONRAD HURST: That's what's the plan
22 but there were some comments, and there's nothing
23 obviously finalized with the City yet.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: If I could recommend

1 to have like concrete boxes that could actually be
2 moved. During festivals and during high heavy
3 traffic, strollers and all that have absolutely no
4 way to get around.

5 MR. CURT HURST: That's a great suggestion
6 and it actually comes off much better from a look
7 standpoint because you can get some very nice
8 planters that are similarly configured.

9 Engineering comments did come back and say
10 they would like to have it as one continuous, but
11 we can address that within and with your comments.
12 But that's certainly something -- the only thing
13 we're trying to do here is create a barrier that
14 lets us step up because of the change in grade
15 from the curb to the building foundation. So
16 that's really the sole purpose of that. So if we
17 can accomplish that in a similar fashion, we can
18 do that.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: That is what I
20 would aesthetically prefer. I don't know if the
21 City has certain guidelines, but I know I gave a
22 recommendation on the riverwalk where I recommended
23 actually removable concrete planter boxes that I
24 think aesthetically are much more pleasing but

1 that's just my recommendation.

2 And then, also, you give a landscape side
3 view of trees. Like are you planning on putting
4 trees in those?

5 MR. CONRAD HURST: I guess it would kind
6 of be contingent on what we end up doing there as
7 a final design.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: The only reason I'm
9 asking is on First Street it's almost a point of
10 contention because some of those trees cover up
11 the signage for the businesses.

12 MR. CONRAD HURST: Our first swing at this
13 was really aimed at some comments we had from the
14 City and trying to match what was existing. So
15 we're pretty wide open to suggestions.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: That would be my
17 recommendation, just look at the height of some of
18 those trees that you end up putting in there
19 because you don't want to cover up, one, your
20 view, and two, your signage.

21 MR. CURT HURST: We love that comment
22 because signage is very important to businesses.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It's huge. And a
24 lot of the businesses on First Street find that

1 the trees are actually hiding their signs.

2 MR. CURT HURST: I'm sure we can find a great
3 balance in between that doesn't hide the signage
4 but gives you the look and feel from a streetscape
5 standpoint.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And then on Route 31,
7 that's going to be the entrance for the second
8 floor, the offices; right? Is that correct?

9 MR. CONRAD HURST: It's planned as a
10 vestibule. So it would be entry to any of the
11 spaces. So a stairwell up to the second and
12 third floors, as well as entry into the first floor.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And is that planned
14 right now to keep it just the sidewalk like the
15 6-foot sidewalk?

16 MR. CONRAD HURST: Yeah, but we did recess
17 that door so that when the door is open it doesn't
18 encroach on the sidewalk at all. So the width
19 that's there would be the width that's there
20 whether the doors are open or closed.

21 MR. CURT HURST: We have kind of laid the
22 building out so that the primary entrances are on
23 Illinois Street because of the proximity to the
24 core of the parking deck, which is an important

1 factor in terms of parking availability. So there's
2 a core that goes up to four, five stories on the
3 parking deck, and it's very -- within, you know,
4 50 to 100 feet of that southeast corner there, and
5 that's where we have our primary office entrance.

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I swear I just have
7 a couple more questions.

8 Can you explain to me on, I think it's the
9 last page, you have a green wall. Can you explain --
10 I mean, I'm just wondering.

11 MR. CONRAD HURST: It's conceptual. It
12 would be a hanging garden or some kind of --

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: That's awesome.

14 MR. CONRAD HURST: -- aesthetically
15 pleasing feature. I don't know that it would have
16 any kind of echo or green benefits, although, it
17 could. It's just an aesthetic feature to screen
18 the mechanicals.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I mean, aesthetically
20 this is a very pleasing building. I love the
21 concept; I love what you're going for.

22 I think those might be my only questions.
23 That's it. Thank you.

24 MR. CURT HURST: Thank you.

Transcript of First Street Building No. 8
Conducted on February 19, 2019

14

1 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a comment. I'll
2 default to questions.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

4 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got some.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

6 (Member Macklin-Purdy left the proceedings.)

7 MEMBER FUNKE: What's the dimension from
8 the west side of the building to the edge of the
9 curb? It doesn't show it on the site plan.

10 MR. CONRAD HURST: That's the Route 31 side?

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Second Street, Route 31.

12 MR. CONRAD HURST: I don't know off the
13 top of my head. It's a zero lot line, though.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: One thing I'm concerned about
15 is Mia Francesca's, the building just to the south
16 of you. They don't have a setback off the west,
17 either. And especially in the wintertime, I think
18 the sidewalk is too small to have a building that
19 close to the property line. It's very concerning.
20 And then you have a canopy that -- I don't know
21 what the size of the canopy is. Is it like 4 feet?

22 MR. CONRAD HURST: It would --

23 MEMBER FUNKE: The canopy on that side,
24 it's not shown on the plans.

1 MR. CONRAD HURST: It's a narrow canopy
2 but it would hang over the sidewalk.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: I'm just worried that trucks
4 driving by, they're going to hit that canopy. It's
5 pretty close to the curb. So I mean, if you can,
6 I think it would be nice if you could set that
7 building back a couple more feet. I think from a
8 pedestrian standpoint it's dangerous, to be honest
9 with you.

10 Mia Francesca's is an existing building, and
11 I know you guys created a vestibule for the doors,
12 but people passing each other on a 4- to 5-foot
13 sidewalk, especially when you have crowds, I think
14 it's going to be a safety hazard. So just
15 something to think about.

16 MR. CURT HURST: I think our biggest
17 challenge there is just the economics of it.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Of setting it back?

19 MR. CURT HURST: Of setting it back in terms
20 of loss of the square footage and what -- the
21 capital investment to the return on investment, as
22 well. So you start reducing the GLA, gross lease
23 area, and that will be a pretty significant
24 impairment.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: If you can set back the
2 first floor to create maybe like a loge or
3 something where people can -- they're at least
4 protected from getting hit by a car. If somebody
5 drives accidentally onto that curb, you know,
6 you've got -- it's just a safety hazard. Being an
7 architect, I think the building is -- I appreciate
8 density and I appreciate the building's proximity
9 to the property line but I just this -- we go to
10 Mia Francesca's a lot, and I've had my kids out
11 there in front, and just collecting on that
12 sidewalk it's dangerous. I know this is an office
13 standpoint, but I just think people walking back
14 and forth I think is going to be dangerous.

15 The trash enclosure, are you guys sharing
16 that trash enclosure that's existing?

17 MR. CONRAD HURST: That's the plan.

18 MR. CURT HURST: That's currently the plan.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: There's an existing
20 electrical and sewer access. Is that elevated or
21 is that flush to the ground?

22 MR. CONRAD HURST: You're talking --

23 MEMBER FUNKE: In the back of the building.

24 MR. CONRAD HURST: It's actually a little

1 bit of both. The big one that's shown is flush
2 mounted, and then behind it is an above-ground
3 transformer.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: I'm just worried from
5 accessing -- you know, your restaurant to going to
6 have a lot trash. How do you get to that trash
7 enclosure when you have to go over?

8 MR. CONRAD HURST: We have service doors
9 on the back there, and that flush mounted is
10 actually highway rated, so you can drive trucks on
11 it, according to the electrical department.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: You can actually exit here?

13 MR. CONRAD HURST: And we actually had
14 comments about the boulders and bushes, to remove
15 those so they can access that transformer. That
16 whole back area of the transformer gets pretty
17 accessible actually.

18 MR. CURT HURST: It's all very accessible
19 on that driveway.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I guess the other question
21 is the trash from the upstairs. Are you guys
22 planning on having a restaurant on the top floor?

23 MR. CURT HURST: The goal would be that
24 the restaurant user would service the first and

1 the third floor, as well. So the answer would be
2 yes, there would be some restaurant use on the
3 third floor.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: So would you have any trash
5 coming through this vestibule on the southeast
6 corner or no? Right in here, were you going to
7 have any trash in through here?

8 MR. CONRAD HURST: We've gotten some
9 comments about using a dumbwaiter system --
10 including a dumbwaiter system and things like
11 that. But yeah, there's no specific service
12 stairs or service elevator --

13 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

14 MR. CONRAD HURST: -- to answer your
15 question directly.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: Just from a versatility
17 standpoint maybe it benefits you to create some
18 sort of service corridor for the upstairs so it's
19 separated so you're not -- you've got a nice
20 vestibule on that southeast corner. After the
21 fact you don't want trash and things going -- then
22 you've got to come off that sidewalk and go back
23 to the trash enclosure.

24 MR. CURT HURST: And that's a good point

1 and I think we're trying to figure that component
2 out in terms of what the most practical use for
3 that third floor from a -- not only getting the
4 trash down but getting food and everything up, as
5 well, because you don't want to go up three
6 flights of stairs from a kitchen. So we're going
7 to try to figure that out in the context of
8 working with the tenant.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: I love what you guys have
10 done on the south side. I think the more paving
11 you have the better, get away from landscaping,
12 especially if it's a restaurant and you want
13 tables and things. It would be nice to -- you
14 have that indentation, but, you know, make that as
15 large as possible for outdoor dining. It's facing
16 south, so you're going to get some great sun on
17 that side. So the more paving you can have on
18 that side I think the better just from a restaurant
19 standpoint.

20 MR. CURT HURST: You're talking about the
21 indentation right there on the building itself?

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Right. I mean, this would
23 be great if could you make a large terrace, and
24 then, you know, you can kind of screen this off

1 here, and then you could still have the public
2 walk around.

3 MR. CURT HURST: And we're open to
4 redesigning that somewhat for those kinds of
5 comments. We put that in there for the primary
6 reason that we see the -- we spent a lot of time
7 down there, and you look at the challenges of
8 loading docks or loading trucks and trash trucks, as
9 well, down the street, and they're basically sitting
10 on Illinois Street. We're trying to get those off
11 of there.

12 The further we can bring that -- I mean,
13 we brought it to where we thought it would be
14 palatable, and we'll look to see what the
15 ordinance would let us do as close to the corner
16 as possible.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: I mean, it doesn't have to
18 be a curb. It can all be flush and still have an
19 area for trucks to come in the morning and pull up
20 there, but at nighttime or the afternoon when you
21 have diners in there, you could still utilize it.

22 MR. CONRAD HURST: Good point.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: Those are my comments.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a comment.

1 MR. CONRAD HURST: Sure.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Kind of going along
3 with what Jeff said earlier, the alcove there on
4 the west side, I'm glad to see you have one, but I
5 was wondering if it couldn't be deepened a little
6 bit and widened. Because right now it looks like
7 it's about a 3-foot depth based on the swing of
8 the door, and if you can get that a little deeper
9 or widen it. I wouldn't go angle because it's all
10 linear here. I like the looks of the building,
11 but I'd like to see a little depth in there in
12 terms of a safety issue.

13 MR. CONRAD HURST: I don't think that
14 would --

15 MR. CURT HURST: I think that's a great
16 point to make in terms of the safety issue of
17 making that more as a gathering point. Because,
18 again, that's not taking away from GLA. When we
19 look at the GLA, we look at what is going to be
20 actually usable by the tenant. So instead of
21 having some indoor space, we can get those doors
22 back and make it more outdoor space.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I can see where you --

24 MR. CURT HURST: Absolutely.

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- have some wiggle
2 room, which would be very important for the site.

3 MR. CURT HURST: Sure. Absolutely.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions,
5 comments?

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: We can probably start
7 with staff. Is the City granting a permanent
8 easement for ingress and egress on the east side
9 of the building?

10 MR. COLBY: So that property to the east
11 where all the utility structures are located, that
12 is all City-owned property. So the building is
13 right up to that lot line that's there. So right
14 now that area is accessed for utility purposes and
15 also to access the dumpster enclosure. So it's
16 anticipated that this building would also access
17 that area which is used really as just a common
18 service corridor.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. Is the capacity
20 of the trash enclosure as such that they could
21 participate in it? I mean, it looks like a pretty
22 large area.

23 MR. COLBY: It is large. It is heavily
24 utilized, though, by the building. We're going to

1 have determine the size of the dumpsters that they
2 want to accommodate and figure out if they can
3 fit. There is some extra room, but there's not an
4 unlimited amount of space because it is used by
5 other restaurants at the least on the south end.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: When I looked over there,
7 it looked like there were five or six dumpsters in
8 there already, plus a container for kitchen grease.
9 I understand that they would like to do that, but,
10 I mean, how does that work? How would that work?
11 Would they pay a monthly fee to use that?

12 MR. COLBY: The City has a few of these
13 shared refuse enclosures that are City-owned that
14 by ordinance there's a certain rate that's assigned
15 to each address that utilizes it. So we'd have to
16 go through the process of amending the code to
17 include that, and the rates are then set by the
18 rates that the City has for service in all of the
19 bulk dumpsters.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Does the City require
21 like -- I notice in their sanitary connection they
22 didn't have a grease separator. Does the City not
23 require that?

24 MR. COLBY: It will be a requirement. We're

1 trying to determine where that will be located
2 based on where the sanitary service is going to be
3 located. Because right now the sanitary service
4 that was stubbed in the lot may not be in the
5 ideal location.

6 MR. CONRAD HURST: It's likely under slab
7 in the building footprint.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Makes servicing
9 challenging.

10 MR. CURT HURST: They have -- they're
11 getting pretty good about grease interceptors.
12 They have ports that you can service them from the
13 outside, as well, so you don't have to go inside.
14 It doesn't mean that you would never go inside,
15 but it can be serviced from the outside, as well.
16 So that's, you know, an option.

17 So we're going to definitely look at that,
18 and it was in the comments from the engineering,
19 as well, so we'll have to address that, as well,
20 for sure.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: So the drop-off area
22 that you're showing on Illinois Street, is that
23 intended more for service functions, or patrons,
24 or what is the intent of that?

1 MR. CURT HURST: You know, the primary use
2 is going to be for loading, unloading, that type.
3 It's, you know, to get trucks -- because if it's
4 an active restaurant, there's going to be quite a
5 bit of deliveries. So to get the trucks off of
6 Illinois Street when they're loading and
7 unloading, as well as trash and everything else,
8 an auxiliary use would be valet drop-off just so
9 people can have access to valet, that's another
10 opportunity. It's not something that necessarily
11 we're planning at this point, but at least it
12 provides the opportunity.

13 It's a great point that if we can move it
14 even a little bit further to the west, it might
15 provide even a little bit more room for everybody,
16 as well. So as much room as we can get there is
17 going to be beneficial for everyone.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is the primary entrance
19 into the restaurant considered Route 31 or Illinois?

20 MR. CURT HURST: Illinois Street. See
21 where the arrow is right in the middle? That
22 would be the primary door for the restaurant
23 entrance.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is there a reason you

1 don't have a vestibule type of setup on that side?

2 MR. CURT HURST: This is a building
3 footprint at this point. So it would be some sort
4 of vestibule.

5 MR. CONRAD HURST: Those vestibules are
6 really a function of creating access for the
7 staircases and the elevators to the other floors
8 who are going to be separate users. So a
9 vestibule for that single-use point of entry
10 would show up on a tenant's build-out for
11 something like that.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: And you're using the
13 green wall on the north terrace for the roof as a
14 screen for your table dining area; is that correct?

15 MR. CONRAD HURST: It's hard for us to say
16 because we're not the end user there, but that
17 would be the idea is that it screens the mechanicals,
18 rooftop units, et cetera, from what becomes usable
19 roof top square footage.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is there a reason you
21 can't have an architectural screening across the
22 north elevation that would screen all that
23 equipment from people from traveling southbound on
24 Route 31? Because right now you only have the top

1 of the railing, which is about 4 feet. Are you
2 saying the mechanical equipment won't be above
3 4 feet? I find that hard to believe in a building
4 that size.

5 MR. CURT HURST: That can be designed.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: At least from people
7 coming southbound on 31, they don't see the
8 mechanical equipment as they're looking at that
9 elevation.

10 MR. CURT HURST: And we can do some site
11 line analysis and all of that to see what type of
12 sizing of the equipment and what the sight lines
13 are, make sure that that parapet wall is tall
14 enough to screen all of that. Absolutely.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Just from an aesthetic
16 standpoint.

17 MR. CURT HURST: And it will be taller than
18 the buildings to the north of it, so you will
19 definitely get that visibility coming from the
20 north to the south.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: All right. And there
22 had been conversation about the whole side of
23 Illinois and what to do, whether you have planters,
24 whether it's built-in and curbed, whether it's

1 some sort of movable. I think movable is a very
2 misnomer conversation. Because as soon as you get
3 something that's 3-foot-by-3-foot filled with soil,
4 it weighs a ton and a half, and that's not movable
5 other than if you bring in some pretty significant
6 equipment. So the idea that you can easily move
7 those is not really true.

8 So I would be more a supporter of a
9 continuance planter. I think if you look to the
10 south, the pavers cover the entire area from the
11 curb to the building face, and there's not a
12 section of concrete there. So I would think that
13 that streetscape appearance should continue up to
14 Route 31, understanding that on Route 31 it's a
15 sidewalk of 6 or 7 feet wideish and that it's
16 currently concrete in all directions and that
17 would be fine. But I think if you'll continue the
18 streetscape feel of Illinois that's currently
19 stopped with the parking deck that you'd want to
20 do the pavers all the way through and not break it
21 up into concrete and pavers.

22 Understanding that festivals and things
23 like that, you get a lot of pedestrian movement,
24 but I think there is a sense of streetscape that

1 should continue and not stop on any one given lot,
2 that there's a sense of change. I mean, if that's
3 really a topic and an issue that people want to
4 explore here and not have trees because they're
5 afraid about signage, which I think is almost a
6 joke at this point because everybody GPS's everything
7 off of their phone. So if you can't find it
8 because it's not on your phone, then you probably
9 don't exist. And you've got a fair amount of
10 signage planned for the building both on 31 and
11 along Illinois.

12 So I would be more of a proponent of the
13 current curbed planter. And if for some reason
14 we're not going to approve that, then I think the
15 City should consider tearing out what's south of
16 there and making everything consistent. Because
17 why have it be fragmented site, by site, by site
18 based on multiple conversations. It should either
19 be there or not be there and consistency when you
20 go from block to block to the extent possible.

21 I hope that you can work out an arrangement
22 for the trash enclosure because I think that's the
23 right answer, just all the capacity issues.

24 MR. CURT HURST: The way we address it at

1 other centers that we have, the frequency of pickup
2 is one of the ways you can do that. It's going to
3 be at the front door of this restaurant; it's
4 going to be an issue to make sure it's maintained
5 properly and emptied properly so that it's not an
6 eyesore or an odor problem.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah, if that's the
8 primary entrance to the restaurant, then that's
9 definitely an important topic from a leasing --
10 and maintaining your tenants and all that kind
11 of stuff.

12 MR. CURT HURST: Oh, sure.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: But I like the
14 building. I do.

15 MR. CURT HURST: Thank you.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: I like the building.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, being a member of the
19 Preservation Commission, I've had the pleasure of
20 several meetings with these two gentlemen, and I'm
21 questioned out from those meetings, so I don't
22 have any questions here.

23 But I do have a comment, and it relates in
24 reference to the petitioners here. The one thing

1 that has been a pleasure working with them is the
2 fact that they have -- they bring forth their plans,
3 they listen to the comments, and then in turn when
4 they do present their changes, they've taken into
5 consideration every comment that a member would
6 make and to the best of their ability have
7 adjusted their plans to what we have today.

8 And I just wanted you to be aware that it
9 has been a very easy process to work with them as
10 they've come forth with this project, and that is
11 one reason from the Preservation Commission that
12 we endorsed it the way we did, asking many of the
13 same questions that you did today.

14 So I just wanted you all to know that.

15 MR. CURT HURST: We appreciate that.

16 Thank you very much.

17 MEMBER BECKER: I do have a question. I
18 sit at the light going northbound every night on
19 my way home from work, and I'm concerned and just
20 want to make sure that the staff is okay with the
21 corner clip and the line of sight for westbound
22 Illinois going northbound 31 to make sure that
23 that corner clip gives motorists enough visibility.
24 Because it is such a congested intersection, people

1 are turning, and if there's not enough line of
2 sight, it's just a traffic conflict that I see.
3 And if it can be lessened by a little bit bigger
4 corner clip or some other design consideration,
5 that's just something as somebody who sits there
6 every night I would just suggest.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions,
8 comments?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else, Russ?

11 MR. COLBY: No.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: In that case I guess a
13 motion would be in order.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So I would make a
15 motion to recommend approval to the Planning and
16 Development Committee and the City Council the
17 First Street Building No. 8 (STC Lot 4, LLC/Frontier
18 Development) PUD Preliminary Plan subject to
19 resolution of all outstanding staff comments.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second that.

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

23 MEMBER FUNKE: I have a question. So the
24 setback off of 31, are they going to come back and

1 make revisions to that, or how -- are we just going
2 to approve what's existing? Because I have an
3 issue with the setback off of --

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, the motion would
5 be to approve with what is existing as the plan
6 subject only to staff comments. So you can make a
7 motion to amend the existing motion to include
8 those things.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: I'd like to make a motion
10 to include the Planning Commission's comments.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which comments?
12 All of them?

13 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, the most important
14 comment is to set the building off of the west
15 property line.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You want to
17 include your comments to set the building back?

18 MEMBER FUNKE: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the motion is to
20 amend the main motion which is to recommend
21 approval subject to resolution of staff comments
22 to also include resolution of comments made with
23 regard to setback of the building from Route 31.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: Correct.

Transcript of First Street Building No. 8
Conducted on February 19, 2019

34

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second for
2 that motion to amend?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You don't have a
5 second. Sorry.

6 MEMBER FUNKE: All right.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the motion fails for
8 lack of a second.

9 So we still have the main motion, which is
10 to recommend approval subject to staff comments.
11 Any further discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, Tim, roll
14 call.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

22 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: No.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So that
5 concludes Item No. 4 on the agenda.

6 (Off the record at 7:35 p.m.)

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, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of February, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Rules of Procedure Review

Date: February 19, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Plan Commission Rules of :
Procedure Review. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
7:36 p.m.

Job No.: 168464B
Pages: 1 - 10
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 CENTURY STATION

4 112 Riverside Avenue

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Rules of Procedure Review
Conducted on February 19, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8 PETER VARGULICH, Member

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

12 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Rules of Procedure Review
Conducted on February 19, 2019

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 5 is Plan Commission
3 Rules of Procedure Review, and we have the report
4 that was prepared by staff. And I don't know if
5 everyone else has had a chance to take a look
6 through here, but the last time we had discussed
7 this we had made several recommendations.

8 I don't know, Russ. Do you want to do
9 this, or are you okay with me just going through --

10 MR. COLBY: If you just want to walk
11 through the changes, we can go through page by
12 page and see if there's comments.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So looking at this,
14 we're in Article 4. And, specifically, in regards
15 to membership, "Interested or prospective members
16 being considered for appointment by the mayor
17 shall meet with a representative of the Commission
18 and the community development department staff
19 prior to appointment or prior to being seated on
20 the Commission."

21 One of the issues that we were -- one of
22 the challenges that we were facing was just, you
23 know, being able to know who our members are
24 before they're seated and have the opportunity to

1 be involved at that point.

2 "Members are requested to announce their
3 intent to resign from the Commission. An official
4 resignation shall be provided to the mayor with a
5 copy to the chairperson, vice chairman, and
6 community development department."

7 So any questions or issues with those --
8 with that group?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. I'd like to
10 at this point announce that we -- prior to even
11 adopting this we just met with some prospective
12 members to replace an open seat, David Pietryla's
13 seat, and I believe that a candidate was chosen,
14 and she's being approved tonight. So next meeting
15 we have Sue Melton that will be with us.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17 Next, in Article 5, this was just being
18 able to take action by unanimous consent if there
19 is no objection; changing the planning office to
20 community development department; community
21 development department may cancel meetings without
22 consent of chairman. I think that pretty much
23 codifies what we do now anyway.

24 And this is -- was kind of the meat of

1 our discussion, "If a member fails to attend
2 three meetings in a 12-month period, the department
3 shall notify the chairman, vice chairman, and
4 mayor, and then the chairman or vice chairperson
5 should contact the member to determine the cause."

6 I think that pretty much matches what we
7 discussed. Are there any questions on that?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then Article 6,
10 the way that it had our order of business previously
11 really wasn't -- didn't really match what we
12 actually did, so we just changed that accordingly
13 and then rearrange the agenda items by unanimous
14 consent if there's no objection.

15 And, again, that's kind of what we do from
16 a practical standpoint, but we wanted to have the
17 flexibility in the event that there is an item
18 that is fairly short and another one that's really
19 long to be able to take the -- from an efficiency
20 standpoint to be able to take the short one first.

21 And then -- now we're in -- sorry -- we're
22 on page 9, Article 8, and this is just the order
23 of the public hearing. "Application and
24 attachments submitted for public hearing as part

1 of the posted packet are recognized as part of the
2 public hearing record."

3 MR. COLBY: That change is just to reflect
4 the fact that we aren't entering applications as
5 exhibits into the record. We're just acknowledging
6 that there's an application that was filed, and
7 there are other exhibits that are submitted that
8 are entered in the record. We previously have
9 been entering the applications into the record,
10 but we've determined that that wasn't necessary.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That they were already
12 part of the record?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. Because they were filed
14 in the request.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure. Okay.

16 All right. That's pretty much it. If
17 there aren't any changes, then I believe we can
18 take action to adopt the revised rules tonight.
19 Is that your understanding, Russ?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes. I'm reading at the end
21 of the book to make sure.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You don't sound sure.
23 "Amendments may be made by the Commission at a
24 regular or special meeting upon the affirmative

1 vote by a majority of the members prior to which
2 the proposed rules have been distributed to all
3 members of the Commission four days in advance of
4 said meeting. In any case, distribution of proposed
5 rules with the Friday meeting is adequate notice."

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As long as we adopt the
8 amendment as provided here, we're able to do that
9 tonight. If there are any changes to it, then we
10 would have to do that at the next meeting.

11 So any -- I guess I'll take a motion to
12 adopt them from the Commission, and then we can
13 discuss that.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I can make a
15 motion that we adopt the changes to the rules of
16 procedure as outlined in the meeting packet
17 distributed to us on last Friday.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any discussion
21 on that motion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

Transcript of Rules of Procedure Review
Conducted on February 19, 2019

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

7 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And thank
14 you for doing that for us, Russ. Appreciate it.

15 (Off the record at 7:43 p.m.)
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, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of February, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown

Date: February 19, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Comprehensive Plan Update for :
Downtown. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
7:43 p.m.

Job No.: 168464C
Pages: 1 - 27
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 CENTURY STATION

4 112 Riverside Avenue

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Conducted on February 19, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8 PETER VARGULICH, Member

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

12 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Comprehensive Plan
3 Update for Downtown.

4 MR. COLBY: I'm just going to skip through
5 some information here since we don't really have
6 the right setup for this in this room. But to
7 just remind the Plan Commission, we have set up a
8 page for the downtown comprehensive plan update
9 and have been posting documents there. To reach
10 this page from the home page, you go to this menu
11 named City Studies and Initiatives, and it's on
12 the list here.

13 We have posted on this page different maps
14 and existing conditions information. This is --
15 this boundary shows the main study area for the
16 comprehensive plan amendment, which is the area
17 that involves the city police station site which
18 will be available for some other use at the end of
19 the year and also the other riverfront blocks
20 adjacent to the stretch of river that's being
21 considered for the river park that is part of the
22 active river project.

23 The areas on the west side were also all
24 identified as catalyst sites for potential

1 redevelopment in the existing 2013 comprehensive
2 plan, so we'll be looking at those sites in relation
3 to the potential river improvements and also looking
4 at potential future uses for the police facility
5 and other City property in that area. When the
6 2013 comprehensive plan was being drafted, it
7 wasn't known that this site would be available for
8 some other use in the future, so it hadn't been
9 identified as a potential redevelopment site.

10 One of the items that's been recently added
11 is this plan which shows the subarea frontages.
12 This is from the existing comprehensive plan for
13 downtown where the -- it relates to the development
14 character and some of the design characteristics,
15 and there's different categories that are shown on
16 this table which is attached, building mass and
17 placement, architectural style and design, parking
18 and main use, and it broke downtown property into
19 different types of frontages.

20 So, obviously, the red buildings are Main
21 Street buildings. The green areas are gateway
22 frontages, and these are along streets where
23 there's main entrances into the downtown where a
24 certain type of character would be desirable

1 because it serves as an entryway. It also identifies
2 areas that have river frontage and certain design
3 characteristics that might be appropriate for river
4 frontage property. So that would include most of
5 the municipal properties on the east side and also
6 the strip of property that's between Route 31 and
7 the river.

8 So the intent of including this information
9 is just to give the Plan Commission and members of
10 the public some idea that there's already been
11 some effort to try and describe the character of
12 the different development forms within these areas.
13 So we have some parameters to work with, and these
14 are very general but at least give you some idea
15 the type of development that had been contemplated
16 in those areas previously based on how they sort
17 of fit into the framework of downtown.

18 Then we have maps of existing conditions of
19 both the east side and west side of the study
20 area. This obviously is the east side.

21 The zoning maps, what's shown on these maps
22 is you'll see most of the area that's within this
23 study area is already part of the CBD-1 zoning
24 district, which is the central downtown mixed use

1 district that permits taller buildings in both
2 residential and commercial use. So much of the
3 property that's subject to the amendment already
4 has mixed use zoning. The exception to that would
5 be the areas north of the police facility that
6 have some utility structures and part of the
7 impound lot that's north of the police building
8 which is in the public lands district, which is
9 more of a public use or public facilities zoning.

10 The comprehensive plan land use map that
11 identifies future land uses had this entire area as
12 public and semipublic reflecting municipal ownership
13 of the property, so that potentially could change
14 depending on what the recommendations are.

15 It also included topographic maps to give
16 you an idea of the topography. It's notable on
17 the east side it's relatively flat until Riverside
18 Avenue, and as you continue east up State that, kind
19 of divides some of the residential developments up
20 on Second Avenue versus the areas that are down
21 the hill on Riverside.

22 We also included floodplain maps to give
23 you an idea of where the existing floodplain is
24 located. What this shows is that it's on the

1 100-year floodplain on the east side and is
2 primarily the open space areas north of the
3 existing police station and also a large portion
4 of the parking lot open space area that right now
5 is located between the municipal center and police
6 station.

7 We also included information on the historic
8 district. This map shows the historic district
9 boundaries, which is this orange line. The area
10 to the south is in the historic district area.
11 We've also identified -- these hashings are
12 individual historic landmarks, so there's a few in
13 the east side study area, and also these letters
14 show the rating of the buildings in the historic
15 district survey. So L would be landmark, the
16 highest grading category. NC indicates
17 noncontributing, which is the lowest category.
18 And then C is contributing, which is more of a
19 typical building in the historic district that may
20 not have significant architectural features but is
21 consistent with the style of the district.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: Russ, can I just ask, the
23 part of the police station, the Mid-Century
24 Architecture, is that listed as noncontributing?

1 MR. COLBY: All three of -- I think this
2 is marked as three buildings. I'm not sure in the
3 survey if it's -- I know this building, the one
4 along the river is listed as one building, and
5 this building is listed as another. I'm not sure
6 if it's two or three, but I believe they're all
7 listed as noncontributing, correct.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. The only reason I
9 was asking is there will probably be some concern
10 related to that one only building, not the brick
11 building, not those other things. Okay.

12 MR. COLBY: And then we've also included
13 some maps that show very generally where utilities
14 are located. There's a significant amount of
15 utilities both underground and overhead that
16 traverse this area and along Riverside Avenue.
17 There's a large electrical substation and a couple
18 of water facilities at the north end. Those are
19 infrastructure that would be difficult to locate.
20 It could be possible but at significant cost. So
21 we're not looking at that at least in the immediate
22 term as being developable, but then, also, there's
23 some major utility trunk lines that pass through
24 Riverside Avenue and serve properties to the

1 north. There's also an underground sanitary sewer
2 crossing the river in this area.

3 Also, there's two well sites, one that's
4 located right outside the entrance, the north
5 entrance into the municipal center, and there's
6 one that's in between the police station buildings
7 that's within that courtyard. Those obviously --
8 the plans at this point are for those to continue
9 to be utilized, so they create site planning
10 challenges particularly with the reuse of the
11 police facility site.

12 And then we have maps of City-owned
13 property. Obviously, on the east side there's
14 quite a few properties that are City-owned, and
15 there's a few that are non-City owned.

16 So then switching over to the west side we
17 have similar information. Here's the parcel map.

18 The zoning map, most of this area is zoned
19 CBD-1, which allows the most intensive mixed use
20 development, and there's some area that's zoned
21 CBD-2, which is the mixed use transitional district
22 between the core of downtown and the residential
23 neighborhoods on the fringe of downtown. So most
24 of this area is already zoned for mixed use of

1 different types.

2 The comprehensive plan land use reflects
3 this designation and shows this entire area as
4 mixed use other than the railroad right-of-way
5 which is identified as parks and open space and is
6 identified potential for the bike/pedestrian trail.

7 The topographic map shows this side of the
8 river is relatively flat. These are the railroad
9 embankments you see here to the north. There's
10 also a creek, the State Street Creek which runs
11 through this area. Portions of it in this area
12 are buried, but it is a major drainageway that
13 serves property on the west side of St. Charles.
14 So there's a significant volume of stormwater that
15 does travel through that creek.

16 You can see because it is relatively flat
17 and the presence of the creek there's a significant
18 amount of 100-year floodplain along Route 31 and
19 the blocks to the west and along the creek.

20 The historic district boundaries, on the
21 west side the boundary line is State Street. We
22 happen to have survey information from some of
23 these buildings that are outside the historic
24 district that are shown here, but these other

1 properties have not been surveyed. But for the
2 most part they are not old enough to have been
3 considered for inclusion in the potential historic
4 district.

5 A utilities map shows on the -- on this
6 west side there is quite a few underground utility
7 corridors, not a lot of overhead utilities other
8 than what is along the former railroad right-of-way.

9 Really, our purpose in showing this
10 information was to identify, because a lot of
11 these are major trunk lines that serve areas to
12 the north and west of downtown, they're difficult
13 to relocate. There's potential for them to be
14 rerouted, but most of them are pretty large volume,
15 and there's limited opportunities to kind of
16 remove them from the area. So to some extent
17 they'll need to be considered when looking at
18 potential reconfiguration of a street network or
19 which portions of the site could be constructed on.

20 MEMBER BECKER: Are those water lines, or
21 sanitary, or both?

22 MR. COLBY: Both. I think the larger ones
23 that go through here are sanitary lines. There's
24 a large one that follows the creek bed here which

1 leads to this crossing, and there's large lines that
2 come down Route 31 that serve properties to the
3 north. So the sanitary lines are obviously the
4 most difficult to be able to modify, but there's
5 also water lines, water mains in the same areas.

6 A map of City-owned properties on the west
7 side, you'll see the City-owned parcels are
8 limited to public parking lots. One of them is a
9 portion that is riverfront to the south of
10 Salerno's, and the other two are half blocks of
11 parking that serve the surrounding areas.

12 So that's the existing conditions
13 information. And, also, we have posted the current
14 downtown southern area plan that was adopted in
15 the 2013 comprehensive plan, and we went through
16 and just sort of marked items that either appear
17 to be consistent or need to be modified based on
18 the potential of the study area. We've identified
19 the boundaries of the study area and how they
20 overlay with some of the existing plan
21 recommendations.

22 This is information for the frontages. So
23 this is the same information that was included in
24 that color map that had the table and thought it

1 was easier to read than this information.

2 This is the catalyst sites map. Our main
3 purpose in amending the comprehensive plan is to
4 update the catalyst sites exhibit and
5 recommendations. As I mentioned, the study right
6 now includes all these properties on the west side
7 that have previously been identified as catalyst
8 sites, and there's specific recommendations for
9 each of them here. But really they were identified
10 as -- based on their locations downtown as
11 underutilized properties that had the potential to
12 be redeveloped in some other manner that might
13 better fit the adjacent downtown area and better
14 use of location versus how they existed at the time.
15 And there hasn't been any changes I don't think
16 really in the development of that area since the
17 plan was drafted. Obviously, the east side, nothing
18 had been anticipated to change at the time, so
19 there are no recommendations for any of the
20 property on the east side.

21 We also identified some locations where
22 there's information on the First Street project,
23 and some of this information is now updated since
24 elements of the project have already been completed,

1 and this shows the old plan that was prior to
2 what's being constructed today.

3 So, also, on the project document page you
4 can find the full river corridor plan. It might
5 be beneficial for the Commissioners to review this
6 plan at least on a cursory level prior to the
7 upcoming meeting on March 5th. On March 5th we'll
8 have a presentation of the preliminary findings of
9 the economic impact analysis for the river corridor
10 plan improvements. I don't expect that the
11 presentation will include a lot of summary of the
12 existing plan, so if you could familiarize
13 yourself with that, it would be helpful.

14 And the improvements that are being looked
15 at specifically in their analysis are the river
16 park improvements, which is the portion of the
17 project between the Main Street bridge and the
18 railroad bridge, and there's -- in a separate
19 document was an engineering feasibility study that
20 was put together. It also has sort of a visual of
21 what the river park could look like and a couple
22 different options for how it could be configured.

23 So it's these improvements that are being
24 analyzed for the purpose of the economic impact

1 analysis to look at how they will have impacts on
2 the potential development of adjacent property and
3 also how it would impact the City's tax base and
4 what kind of market there is for use of these
5 facilities, looking at it in the context of what
6 kind of revenue could we generate if the City
7 makes the investment in some of the improvements
8 that are shown in the plans.

9 So on March 5th we'll have a presentation
10 by the consultant, HVS, who is working on the
11 report. They presented some preliminary market
12 information to the planning and development
13 committee just last week, but we expect they'll
14 present to the Plan Commission in a little bit
15 more detail on the actual financial considerations
16 for the project. So that will be the first time
17 that information is being presented at least
18 preliminarily, and then eventually HVS will
19 finalize that plan for a final presentation to
20 City Council which we think will occur in April.

21 Then the other date -- and we haven't
22 figured out if this is going to occur on a Plan
23 Commission meeting date or an alternate date, but
24 we're planning a public open house workshop.

1 There will be an interactive event to solicit
2 input from members of the public, property owners,
3 other City commissions on what they would like to
4 see in terms of development in the study area.
5 And we're going to have a couple of different
6 interactive stops along the workshop that allow
7 people to write comments, have a visual preference
8 survey, and we'll also have some identification of
9 land use and try and collect information in that
10 meeting so that we have some idea of some specifics
11 of what concerns stakeholders might want to see in
12 this area as we start to look at potential future
13 development. So that would be scheduled sometime
14 in April at this point.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: Russ, as far as -- and I
16 understand what you said concerning the upcoming
17 meetings and that, but as far as the logistics,
18 because you have the west side of the river and
19 the east side of the river, and it seems like an
20 awful lot to tackle to try to be able to work both
21 of them simultaneously even though they have to.

22 Is the idea from the City to kind of like
23 just for the sake of argument take a look at the
24 west side, try to solidify something for that, and

1 then slide over to the east side to deal with the
2 police station, that property? Or is there some
3 other method that you've thought about that we're
4 going to follow?

5 MR. COLBY: Well, I'd be looking for input
6 from the Plan Commission on that if there's any
7 thoughts. We had been anticipating having one
8 sort of combined workshop for the whole area, but
9 it would be possible to split that up and focus it
10 on each side of the river.

11 I think we'll have to look at that for the
12 workshop, and also I think when the Plan Commission
13 is going through the process of reviewing and
14 developing the recommendations, we'll probably do
15 that east side and then west side.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: From a workshop aspect I
17 could see working both instead of having separate
18 meetings because you'll have interested people
19 and, you know, all of that. I was more concerned
20 about from -- like from our side, our actual meeting
21 and how we tackle it, but you've already thought
22 about maybe we'd tackle one side and then move --

23 MR. COLBY: Yeah.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: You answered my question.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: I had a question. The
2 100-year floodplain on the east and west sides,
3 how does that affect future developments? Is
4 there a way that the City can kind of accommodate
5 that floodplain, raise the land? I don't know if
6 that's possible with FEMA, with Army Corps of
7 Engineers to create areas that are more developable.

8 MR. COLBY: Monica, do you want to talk
9 about that?

10 MS. HAWK: So the existing wall that's out
11 there on both sides isn't high enough, and the
12 100-year floodplain overtops the top of those
13 banks and goes into the surrounding area. You
14 know, if the City was to tackle a project to
15 contain that floodplain, you know, there would
16 need to be some considerable accommodations made
17 for compensating for that fill.

18 It will be interesting to see if a project
19 such as the active river project, how that would
20 address it because that project does talk about
21 removal of the dam and doing some other things
22 through there. That isn't very far at all in any
23 discussions, but it would be I would say a large
24 undertaking to do that. It would certainly need

1 to go through approvals by --

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Is anybody proposing a wall
3 in that new waterfront proposal?

4 MS. HAWK: No, I believe that proposal
5 really is -- I don't think it's driven by walls
6 necessarily, and I think that we'll find out more
7 about that at the next meeting when they do the
8 presentation. I think that is more of actually an
9 open space concept --

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

11 MS. HAWK: -- and providing more open
12 space. I don't think it's necessarily extending
13 walls higher up from what they are now.

14 So it would require, you know, going through
15 Illinois Department of Natural Resources and FEMA,
16 as well, to do those types of modifications.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Just a follow-up
19 question, Monica. Is the removal -- I mean, the
20 active river project is intending to remove the
21 dam and/or relocate it up to the -- really up to
22 the railroad bridge is really what they're talking
23 about, so that they can create a terracing effect
24 between the railroad bridge and Main Street.

1 So in doing so, does that really have any --
2 from an engineering standpoint, does that have any
3 hydraulic effect on the floodplain at all?

4 MS. HAWK: It very well could because --

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: And did part of WBK's
6 study address that at all, or were they just looking
7 at cost and feasibility?

8 MS. HAWK: That's a good question. I don't
9 have the answers to that. I haven't studied it in
10 that much detail. I think that would probably be
11 a question that could be answered at the next
12 meeting.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay.

14 MR. COLBY: I don't think that they
15 considered that.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Not that it was
17 necessarily a direct goal, but that because of
18 that an outcome -- you know, good or bad depending
19 on your perspective, but an outcome is that in the
20 area between Main Street and the railroad bridge
21 the floodplain is modified because of the fact
22 that you're taking the break, if you will, and
23 moving it north whatever, 300 feet or whatever
24 they're doing with it. And because of that you're

1 not -- you're allowing the water to cascade down,
2 which then reduces the floodplain on those sides
3 because of the fact that the water where the dam
4 is now, the water spreads out above the dam, where
5 if you move the dam back, in theory it should
6 come down.

7 Now, I realize that that's a complicated
8 hydraulic modeling; that isn't a simple couple of
9 cross sections that determines that, but I was
10 just curious whether that was anything that they
11 were looking at. Because certainly from a land
12 use -- getting back to Jeff's question, from a
13 land use standpoint and what you could ultimately
14 do in redevelopment, which has an interest to the
15 City beyond spending money on the park and whether
16 you get hotel rooms or any of that other kind of
17 economic spinoff, if one of the by-products was --
18 and, again, perspective -- benefits is that you
19 bring the floodplains closer to the center line to
20 the river itself. Well, it makes a lot more land
21 a lot more valuable just because of that. So all
22 of a sudden you have a secondary reason as a
23 community to want to spend money on that project.

24 Is WBK or is that any kind of thing that

1 this economic study is even cursory addressing?

2 MR. COLBY: That's a good comment. I'm
3 not sure if that's something that they would be
4 addressing because they may not have enough
5 information. Obviously, the economic consultant,
6 they're not engineers; they're relying on
7 engineering information that's going to be
8 presented. That may be something we want to look
9 at because there's an impact to development
10 potential and could be directly related to the
11 project.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: And if we're going to
13 update a comprehensive plan to talk about
14 opportunity sites, catalyst sites, or moving those
15 around, or playing checkers and chess with them,
16 understanding -- since floodplain certainly
17 dictates where you can build and where you can't
18 build, or if you go to build in the floodplain,
19 you have all these 1.5 to 1 compensatory storage
20 issues you have to deal with. And compensatory
21 storage is expensive to construct anywhere.
22 Especially in the downtown it's really expensive
23 to construct.

24 So if part of this project creates the

1 opportunity -- again, you have to go through the
2 CLOMRs, and the LOMRs, and all that other
3 engineering stuff. If that brings that in, then
4 all of a sudden what you do with these parcels,
5 public or private parcels changes dramatically if
6 they're not in the floodplain anymore.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Creating a lot of value.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, as far as ease of
9 developing them. You can still develop, but it's
10 really complicated when you have to do a lot of
11 map amendments and stuff, where if you do one map
12 amendment that has an overall downtown benefit
13 from Main Street to the railroad bridge on both
14 the east and west side of the river, okay, that's
15 worth from a community standpoint really
16 understanding spending money on potentially, and I
17 just didn't know if anyone had even started that
18 question yet.

19 Because they're spending a lot of money on
20 this study and consultants, but how would you not
21 understand that if you take the break point for
22 the dam and move it north 300 feet, or 400 feet,
23 or whatever it is that there's a potential to
24 change the floodplain, and why wouldn't that be

1 important.

2 MR. COLBY: That's a very good point. One
3 other thing I'll offer on that topic is with the
4 First Street project what the City did is the
5 compensatory storage for that development was
6 provided off-site down the river at a parkside
7 along Route 25. It's well off site but it's still
8 within the drainageway. Obviously, there were
9 some costs associated with that. The City had to
10 get the ability to utilize the land. I think it
11 was park district property. But that's a
12 possibility, also, but then it's a potential cost.

13 I appreciate the comment, though.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

15 MR. COLBY: That's all.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
17 concludes Item 6.

18 Item 7, any additional business from Plan
19 Commission or staff?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. I'd like to
21 remind everyone that last week was National Court
22 Reporters week. So if you haven't had the
23 opportunity to thank the court reporter, now is
24 the time.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

2 Weekly development report, meeting
3 announcements. Do we know if there are any
4 meetings in the upcoming near future that are not
5 going to happen?

6 MR. COLBY: I think we have items
7 scheduled for both of the meetings in March.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I will not be at
10 the March 19th meeting.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: I will not be at the
12 March 19th meeting, either.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Do we have
14 any public comment?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion to adjourn?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

20 (Ayes heard.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: City of St. Charles
22 Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

23 (Off the record at 8:15 p.m.)

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, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of February, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois