

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2018**

Members Present: Chairman Wallace
Jeff Funke
James Holderfield
Tom Pretz
Peter Vargulich
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tim Kessler
David Pietryla

Members Absent: Tom Schuetz

Also Present: Russell Colby, Community Dev. Division Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the January 9, 2018 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Holderfield, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2018 Plan Commission meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. Cityview (John Henry Builder Developer Inc.)

Application for Special Use

Application for Preliminary Plat of Subdivision

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Ms. Purdy to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: 0

Absent: Schuetz

Motion carried: 8-0

MEETING

- 5. Cityview (John Henry Builder Developer Inc.)**
Application for Special Use
Application for Preliminary Plat of Subdivision

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Funke to recommend approval of the Application for Special Use and Application for Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for Cityview (John Henry Builder Developer Inc.) subject to resolution of all staff comments.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Absent: Schuetz

Motion carried: 8-0

- 6. First Street Redevelopment PUD (City of St. Charles)**
Preliminary Plan for Building #3 Streetscape and Riverwalk Design
Application for Final Plat of Subdivision for Building #2

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Funke to recommend approval of the application Preliminary Plan for Building #3 Streetscape and Riverwalk Design, and Application for Final Plat of Subdivision for Building #2, subject to resolution of all staff comments.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Absent: Schuetz

Motion carried: 8-0

- 7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff**
- 8. Weekly Development Report**
- 9. Meeting Announcements**
- a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, March 20, 2018 – No Meeting (Election Day)
Tuesday, April 3, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, April 17, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- b. Planning & Development Committee
Monday, March 12, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, April 9, 2018 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, March 6, 2018
Page 3

- 10. Public Comment**
- 11. Adjournment at 8:17pm.**



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

Transcript of Cityview Plan

Date: March 6, 2018

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Cityview (John Henry Builder :
Developer, Inc.) Plan; :
Application for Special Use, :
Application for Preliminary :
Plat of Subdivision. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, March 6, 2018
7:04 p.m.

Job No.: 168443A
Pages: 1 - 41
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings 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 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

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 DAVID PIETRYLA, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Cityview Plan
Conducted on March 6, 2018

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry I'm late. This
3 meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission will
4 come to order.

5 Tim.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

15 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Here.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Presentation of the
22 minutes of the January 29, 2018, meeting. Is
23 there a motion to approve?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 4 on our agenda
7 tonight is Cityview John Henry Builder Developer,
8 Inc. We have an application for special use and
9 an application for preliminary plat of subdivision.

10 For those of you who have not been here
11 before, welcome. The St. Charles Plan Commission
12 is appointed by the City Council for the purpose
13 of reviewing applications that come before it, and
14 tonight we are reviewing one for 895 Geneva Road,
15 which is called the Cityview subdivision.

16 The way that this works is the Plan
17 Commission will accept testimony from the developer
18 and will ask questions of the developer. After that
19 if anyone else wishes to ask questions or offer
20 any of their own testimony either for or against
21 the application, they can do so at that time.

22 If the Plan Commission feels that they have
23 enough evidence to be able to make a decision,
24 then we will close the public hearing, and after

1 that -- it's actually on our agenda as Item 5 -- it
2 will be up for a decision.

3 And a decision from the Plan Commission is
4 not a final decision. It's a recommendation to
5 the City Council either to approve or to deny the
6 application. And if the Plan Commission feels
7 that they want to place any type of conditions or
8 include any comments with their recommendation, we
9 have the ability to do that, as well.

10 Any questions regarding that so far?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. This is public
13 record. There is a court reporter here in the
14 room, so because of that I would ask that only one
15 person speak at a time, and I would ask that you
16 be recognized by me before speaking. And when you
17 do speak, you'll have to come up to the lectern
18 and speak into the microphone so that everyone can
19 hear. Prior to speaking, I would ask that you
20 state your name and spell your last name and
21 address for the record.

22 At this time anyone who wishes to speak,
23 whether it's offering testimony or asking
24 questions, you need to be sworn in. So if you'd

1 raise your right hand.

2 (Whereupon, the witnesses were thereupon
3 duly sworn.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And prior to going to
5 the applicant, is there anything from staff?

6 MS. JOHNSON: No. We'll turn it over to
7 the applicant.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is the
9 applicant ready?

10 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
11 and thank you, staff, for preparing your report
12 that was sent to me. They actually wrote my
13 speech they did such a great job.

14 The property is located at 895 Geneva Road
15 at the corner of Mosedale and Geneva Road. We're
16 proposing a four-lot subdivision, and I guess
17 there's a little bit of history to the side.
18 David Weekley Homes came in and wanted to do a
19 seven-lot subdivision. It sat there for some
20 time. David Weekley Homes left the Chicago area
21 and the site sat. So I watched it, watched it,
22 put a contract on it, went to the City, talked to
23 Russell Colby, and I ended up meeting with staff,
24 and we reviewed it with the entire staff at the

1 City, and everybody was pretty much in favor of it
2 overall. It simplified the site, and I thought it
3 would be really nice to do four ranch homes going
4 down on Mosedale.

5 So in brief review the subdivision would be
6 a four-lot subdivision, and it would have its own
7 detention area which would be to the northeast
8 corner. All four homes would front on Mosedale
9 Street. We would install sidewalks along Mosedale
10 Street connecting to the existing sidewalk along
11 Geneva Road.

12 We understand that we would need under
13 City guidelines to form what they call a blanket
14 SSA agreement over the subdivision, and we also
15 have plans on forming an association to take care
16 of the detention area.

17 There's not much more but there was one
18 comment from engineering. We wanted to take the
19 water across the road. You can see the line to
20 the north and go across, but they would like us to
21 reroute it, and that can be taken care of in the
22 final engineering plans. And we would run the
23 water line down and connect in at Mosedale and
24 Geneva Road.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me just interject.
2 You mentioned an SSA. Is that something that is
3 being suggested by the City as a dormant SSA?

4 MR. COLBY: Yes. And that's a requirement
5 of the storm water ordinance.

6 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: So as far as the square
7 footage of the lots go, it would be an R2 zoning
8 district, and we would be -- our smallest lot I
9 believe is 8500. In the zoning district it would
10 be 6600, so we're exceeding that. Our smallest
11 lot is 8500, and they go up from there.

12 It's a rather simple site. The trickiest
13 part about the site is it's just got the terrain
14 drop. In the report the City is concerned about
15 the front walks, and I did some calculations that
16 our walls would only be so high so we would
17 conform for any of the grade drops that would be
18 on Mosedale.

19 The lot width would be 60 feet, and
20 there's normally a 50-foot lot width in that
21 district. So everything kind of gets a little bit
22 larger but it works for the site. The four homes
23 would work in between all the utilities. That's
24 why the driveways would be placed where they're at.

1 I have met with the electric department on-site,
2 and we worked everything out there how they would
3 run everything to make our site work.

4 And I think that's about it. If anybody
5 has any questions I'll be more than happy to
6 answer them.

7 We do have -- it's a little over an acre.
8 It's about 1.05 acres. So it goes over the acre,
9 and you wouldn't think you'd need water detention,
10 but with all the ordinances Kane County has with
11 water detention, we have to provide one, and it
12 fit very nicely in the back. It would be a
13 separate outlot that would be controlled by the
14 association. That's why the SSA would be I think
15 put in place so the City could always step in if
16 something was needed to be done and the
17 association wasn't doing it.

18 The lots are all set up with -- it drops
19 pretty quick, so every home would have a walkout
20 basement and we plan to do -- it will it be master --
21 first-floor masters with a bedroom up, and people
22 have the option to finish the basement.

23 Any questions from the Commission?

24 MEMBER PRETZ: I had one.

1 I'm not -- I didn't see anything that I
2 was really opposed to but I had one question.

3 I didn't have any major concerns and
4 actually kind of excited that there's going to be
5 something to be done. But one of the things that
6 I saw was that you were going to be placing the
7 homes at a 20-foot front yard and then the back
8 yard would be 37. And my concern -- my concern is
9 the closeness of those homes even though it's the
10 average according to what I read there, the
11 average of the lots for the block.

12 My concern is that it's a little bit too
13 close, and mainly because I was trying to put
14 myself into a position of being a buyer of the
15 property -- no, I'm not buying it but if I was --
16 that the cars that would be heading north, and
17 when they cut in on Mosedale, it just seems to me
18 that those homes would be just a little bit too
19 far forward. And to me I would like to see them
20 pushed back slightly, maybe reduce that back yard
21 yardage, but it seems to me that there's more than
22 enough property to give the feel of a very large
23 back yard.

24 But that was a concern and maybe when

1 you're -- you know, if there was a particular
2 reason as it related to the utilities or something
3 or if that was just a line, you know, you just
4 threw it down in the sand and said, "We're going
5 to put it at 20 feet."

6 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I would take it under
7 consideration.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question.
9 Do you have any designs yet for the
10 houses?

11 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: No, we don't -- well, we
12 have two designs that we like, and they're on the
13 drawing board just to sketch them to see where
14 we're at.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: I would just say right now
16 the way you have the houses placed on the site,
17 you have one house on the east end that is three-
18 sided, and then the other houses are two-sided.
19 So the prominent side is going to be the back
20 yard, so I would focus a lot of attention on this
21 because you're seeing this on Geneva Road and
22 Route 31. You're going to be seeing the backs of
23 the houses, so I would take care of --

24 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: You're saying show interest

1 in the rear of the homes?

2 MEMBER FUNKE: Absolutely.

3 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: That's a good comment.

4 We're also -- excuse me; with the R2 district the
5 garages -- which are not shown on this, but the
6 garages have to stay behind the front wall by
7 5 feet. So those were just given to our engineer
8 to put on to show something, but you'll have that
9 differentiation between front door and -- or front
10 garage being back in front of the front face of
11 the remainder of the building.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

13 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Regarding the retaining
14 wall, how tall would that be again at the front,
15 that retaining wall?

16 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: The retaining wall I think
17 as I saw it was about 3 feet. I think at 4 feet
18 we have issues so -- and I'm going to take that
19 into consideration, too, be careful with it because
20 everything slopes. So even the driveways, when we
21 put them in we have to be very carefully how we
22 put the driveways out into the street so they're
23 easy to get in and out of. And the retaining
24 walls up front, I think Ellen had made a comment

1 in her notes that it was 4 foot, anything more
2 than 4 foot, and I looked at it and I think we're
3 at about 3 feet. So we understand.

4 MEMBER PIETRYLA: And also -- you understand
5 there's some staff comments about the western
6 wall. Is that going to be removed, as well?

7 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: The western wall, as I
8 see it from the engineering, I think the wall will
9 be removed because of the height of the next --
10 it's not in great shape, but we'll have to deal
11 with it on that side of it. What I can do before
12 final engineering is go on-site again and take a
13 look at it and make sure that we -- because I did
14 talk to that owner. He might be here this evening,
15 very nice gentleman, and he's concerned about it,
16 also.

17 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Is there also a plan to
18 preserve the trees, to protect them during work?
19 The trees that are being kept on the property, is
20 there a plan to ensure which ones will -- they
21 won't be impacted during construction?

22 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: The engineer has notes on
23 his plans, if you look at them he circled some of
24 the trees. I think Ellen asked if we could do a

1 tree survey. In lieu of a tree survey I would say
2 that we would -- you spend a lot of money on tree
3 surveys, and sometimes it's better just to protect --
4 mark everything that's out there. We have an
5 existing -- or an older tree survey and we could
6 mark it. It is what it is where the houses go,
7 but you try to save as many trees as you can.

8 The site has got some issues. It's just
9 got scrub all over it. I know there are some
10 animals living there that the homeowners don't
11 like. So I would still do the tree survey, but I
12 think I'd rather put the money elsewhere on the
13 site than do a tree survey. I'd rather mark any
14 of the trees that are over 6 feet and go from there.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'd like to ask a
16 question.

17 There was a comment about the Keller Place
18 at the north end of the property. What would you
19 add to this?

20 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I'm sorry?

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: The Keller Place, the
22 road on the north side, I would just like to hear
23 your comment on that, your feelings and what may
24 happen there.

1 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: The Keller Place is there,
2 and it does service the home next door. For us
3 our detention works on our site, everything works
4 proper. I know Keller Place is not in that great
5 of shape, but you do service one of your
6 homeowners there to the north.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, just a question
8 as a follow-up to Jim's inquiry.

9 If Keller Place is vacated, does it split?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes. Based on the procedure
11 in the State statute it would split, and the
12 ownership option would go to both of the adjoining
13 property owners.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: So -- and I think the
15 current right-of-way looks to be 50, 60 feet. So
16 the property owner that is served would basically
17 get a 30-foot-wide location to put a driveway.
18 So, in fact, it could be done, and then it would
19 relieve the City of having authority and
20 obligations for something that really is pretty
21 much ineffective at that point. Yes?

22 MR. COLBY: Yes, that's correct.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: I think that would be a
24 good idea. I don't know if that helps you from

1 having deeper lots, you know, or anything like
2 that. Probably not a whole lot, but I think that
3 it's certainly something to resolve and would be
4 helpful to the City to not have to keep maintaining
5 that for basically one lot because that homeowner
6 would still have plenty of room for an access
7 driveway.

8 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: What would your suggestion
9 be for the owner then on the north for them to get
10 access to Illinois Department of Transportation,
11 how would you access? Would their driveway go
12 right out onto the street?

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes. There's other
14 driveways that go directly onto 31 right now, you
15 know, for a private homeowner.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, just so I'm
17 clear -- because I'm looking on the tree
18 preservation plan for the previous application,
19 and it appears that Keller Place is a private drive.

20 MR. COLBY: No, the portion that's north
21 of this site is a publicly dedicated street. It
22 is maintained by the City.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: I've got a general

1 question, also. Russ, this might be more of a
2 public works question, but there is reference on
3 here to having this sewer and water in a combined
4 trench, and it appears that they're only a few
5 feet apart. Is that a standard practice? I
6 thought they were supposed to have some amount,
7 8, 10 feet of separation between a sewer and a
8 water line.

9 MR. COLBY: There are separation
10 requirements both vertically and horizontally.
11 I'm thinking there appears to have been an issue
12 of them being too close together I'm thinking in
13 the comments. So that's something that will need
14 to be corrected.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. And then just a
16 last comment on kind of combination of things.
17 The tree preservation and whatnot, my general
18 impression is that a majority of the trees on the
19 site are in relatively poor condition especially
20 toward Mosedale and Geneva Road in the corner.

21 One thought would be is to make that the
22 detention pond instead of in the back corner, and
23 then you could have four lots being exactly the
24 same width all the way straight back, and you

1 wouldn't have all those funny jogs to create the
2 outlot, and you could just extend all those lines
3 directly to the north off of Mosedale until they
4 either hit the right-of-way for Geneva Road or
5 that north property line. And your detention
6 would fit in the triangular corner that was left.

7 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: You're saying up front on
8 the right side of the screen?

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

10 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I think the problem is
11 that everything goes to the north there. I'd have
12 to look. I can bring it up with the engineer.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, the topo on 31 is
14 the same contour all the way across your frontage.
15 It's 695. So it's basically dead flat. So I
16 don't see how from a topography standpoint there
17 would be a benefit to it located at the corner or
18 at the north corner.

19 Understood that if it dropped like 3 or
20 4 more feet to the north, then that would be a
21 logical place, but this just might, you know,
22 simplify your plotting to not have all these jogs
23 and creating an outlot. You're still going to
24 have an outlot, but it would be down at the corner

1 of Mosedale and Geneva Road. And the trees that
2 are there are in relatively poor condition. A lot
3 of them are falling over. I mean, they're nothing
4 special, quite honestly.

5 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I'd be more than happy to
6 take a look at it with the engineer. This is
7 primary, so it's a good time to look at it again.
8 I agree 100 percent.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, does the City
10 have a policy against tying in downspouts and
11 tying them to a detention basin?

12 MR. COLBY: No, it's encouraged to connect
13 them to the storm sewer if it's available.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, I would think
15 there would be a benefit to you and the homeowners
16 given the amount of topography. It looks like you
17 were proposing to install pipe, but it was just
18 intended for the sump pumps. And I would say that
19 given the level of topography, and you then get
20 runoff off all the roofs and everything concentrated
21 that it might be worthwhile to pipe all of that to
22 the detention pond and let it all be managed there.
23 That saves you a lot of corrosion because you have
24 to deal with the site topography; it is what it

1 is. You can't level the site.

2 So that would be another thing. And then
3 you said you were going to have a property owners
4 association; is that correct?

5 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: We're going to have to
6 just because you need the detention pond.

7 And we did try to put the detention area
8 on the back of the lot, and I think the staff's
9 comment was they really don't like to do it that
10 way; they like to have it separate. And what's
11 interesting about the new detention areas, the
12 grasses they grow on the bottoms, they're not
13 really mobile anymore. There's a new grass they
14 use; there's a way they filter the water. I don't
15 know the details but --

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: It's just a lot of
17 native species that are used.

18 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: It should be a very
19 nonmaintenance situation. It's probably more work
20 to set up the association than it is to take care
21 of the facility.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, just, again, a
23 policy question. If the lots that -- Lots 3 and
24 4 let's say in the subdivision, so the two eastern

1 lots, if their mirror property lines are part of
2 the right-of-way through Route 31, does the fence --
3 do fence ordinances still apply as far as the
4 types of fence, and the appearances, and all those
5 things?

6 MR. COLBY: Yes.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. I would recommend
8 that maybe if you had your outlot in the corner or
9 even if it ends up being where you have it, I think
10 that a landscape buffer lot would be nicer against
11 Route 31 than allowing the lot lines to abut
12 Route 31.

13 And the reason I suggest that is that
14 there's probably way too many examples across
15 St. Charles and all over Chicagoland where you end
16 up with multiple different types of fencing, and
17 if Geneva Road is our gateway or our thoroughfare
18 in and out of our city, that having a lot of
19 different types of fences and appearances is not
20 the best -- maybe not in the future will be the
21 best look for our community. And if you had a
22 consistent outlot where it was landscaped -- it
23 wouldn't have to be 30 feet or something, maybe
24 only like 15 feet, and you had that maintenance

1 and it was maintained consistently along Route 31,
2 that that would be a better appearance than maybe
3 two or three or four different types of fencing.

4 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I think your comment is
5 well taken, and Mr. Funke could say the same thing
6 about the back of the homes because you'll see them
7 while you're driving. So that's well taken along
8 with the downspouts. So I think those three areas
9 are important.

10 I will say this. We designed that detention
11 area to be so many feet away from that right-of-way
12 because if we're in the right-of-way or next to
13 the right-of-way so close, then we have to deal
14 with IDOT, and we're just trying to keep it
15 simple. Ellen made a comment that it seems to be
16 a relatively simple subdivision, and that's the
17 way we'd like to keep it.

18 So Cemcon is a firm out of -- I think
19 their address is in Aurora. They're pretty well
20 known; they're a good company. So your comments
21 will go back to Randy Bus there, and I'll take it
22 from there.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just wanted some

1 clarification for all of us. This public hearing
2 is specifically for the special use, and if I'm
3 not mistaken it would be a special use for a PUD,
4 and the purpose for the special use application is
5 simply to remove the existing PUD that was passed --
6 how long ago? Last year wasn't it? Just last year.

7 So then -- in removing that PUD then the
8 property would revert back to its underlying
9 zoning, which this plan is for, and it meets the
10 underlying zoning.

11 So I just want to be clear that that's the
12 issue with the special use, and that's the purpose
13 of the public hearing, and I wondered if anybody
14 had any other questions about that specific part
15 of our discussion.

16 We've spent some time and we did talk
17 about the preliminary plat of subdivision, and I
18 just want to say that I believe that we could move
19 forward -- move forward with the special use and
20 just get that cleaned up. I think there's only
21 one finding that's required, is it in the public
22 interest, and it certainly is based on the plan
23 that's in front of us today, so I'm prepared to
24 make a motion.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, let's take
2 questions from members of the audience first.

3 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: Mr. Chairman, can I state
4 my name and address? I was supposed to do it when
5 I came up.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

7 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: John Cebzynski,
8 C-e-b-r-z-y-n-s-k-i, 926 Sunset Road, Geneva,
9 Illinois.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are there any questions
11 from members of the audience?

12 Yes, sir.

13 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Lanny Anderson.
14 Lanny spelled L-a-n-n-y; Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n,
15 and this is my third visit here. Seems like this
16 lot just doesn't get built on, and it gives me a
17 chance to come and visit you people.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What is your address?

19 MR. ANDERSON: 32 Mosedale right on the
20 west side of that lot. Sorry.

21 The density is coming down on the lot.
22 Ten years ago or whenever it was I think there
23 were six units proposed, and then a couple years
24 ago there were seven units proposed, and this time

1 we're down to four.

2 We're getting it down but I have a problem
3 along my lot line at 32 Mosedale on the west side.
4 My house was built back in 1939, 1940. The lot
5 line the house is built from is 4 1/2 feet. So
6 this lot we're proposing here is just 4 1/2 feet
7 from my house.

8 On the east side of the house that faces
9 the east side I have two 4-foot-wide windows.
10 Then I go to the kitchen, I have two 3-foot
11 windows, and then I go to the living room, which
12 is the front of the house, that has one 3-foot.

13 Now, looking at this lot line, like I say,
14 the density is good, but there's one unit on the
15 west side there that's moved right up next to that
16 lot line. And I'm not sure what distance that was
17 from that lot line. But, also, on the side of my
18 house -- from the front of my house to the back of
19 my house the unit that they were going to build is
20 almost exactly the length of my house.

21 Now, again, I don't know what the house --
22 how tall it's going to be or how low it's going to
23 be, but I visualize that along that wall I'm going
24 to have a wall, not knowing what's on that wall,

1 but I will not see anything out of all those
2 windows on that east side.

3 It would be nice if they would move that
4 first unit down towards 31, and, of course, you'd
5 have to move everything, and maybe there's no room
6 to do that but I am concerned.

7 Now, my other concern is there's a concrete
8 wall on my lot line -- on the lot line you're
9 looking at. It's not on mine; it's on theirs.
10 And it looks like somebody broke up an old concrete
11 street and they piled sections of concrete along
12 the wall. Like I say, this was back in 1940. I
13 have no idea when that lot line or that fence was
14 built or that wall.

15 We also have two huge oak trees there, and
16 we also have a black walnut. Now, according to
17 what I can read on the plot that he's shown, those
18 trees are all going to be removed, and also I'm
19 assuming that wall which is on their lot line is
20 going to be moved.

21 Now, I have seen water in the front of my
22 house running towards that lot line, and with a
23 heavy rain there was a waterfall from the front of
24 my yard, and it dropped down 8 feet to that lot

1 line. There's an 8-foot drop approximately down
2 to that lot line.

3 Now, you remove that wall, you remove those
4 trees and everything else, I'm worried about my
5 whole house moving. It could basically slide down.

6 Now, the other developer had proposed
7 putting a wall, or a fence, or some retainer wall
8 there. And when he proposed, I don't know why --
9 I shouldn't talk about the past because it's gone,
10 but he did take the unit that was along my house,
11 and he turned it facing it east instead of facing
12 it south and moved them back 20 feet from my house
13 on one house and 30 feet on the other house. So
14 now all of a sudden that house that was along that
15 wall was turned, and I had -- you know, at least I
16 could see out of my house without looking directly
17 into a wall.

18 So these are some of the concerns that I
19 have in regards to what they're going to do. I
20 know this is preliminary, and maybe they have
21 plans for that. I believe this is the gentleman I
22 talked to when he was looking at that lot line,
23 and I did mention that wall to him. So he might
24 have something in mind what he's going to do there,

1 but I would like to make sure that there's something
2 preventing my house from being washed down into
3 theirs.

4 Again, I'm sure they thought about that
5 because they don't want my house on their lot,
6 either. So I would like to find out a little bit
7 more how far away my house -- their proposed house
8 is from the lot line.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have just one
10 question. Did you say that your house is 4 1/2 feet
11 from your lot line on the east side?

12 MR. ANDERSON: 4 1/2 feet, yes. 4 1/2, 5.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So when it was
14 built, it was built that close to the lot line?

15 MR. ANDERSON: It was built that close,
16 yes. Remember, this was 1939, 1940. But anyway,
17 the garage is within 2 feet, too, of the house --
18 lot line, but that's how they were built back
19 then. Not much we can do.

20 My wife had written a few things. I
21 better check.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You better check.

23 MR. ANDERSON: She's worried about that
24 house next to our lot line. Is there going to be

1 a basement there? Again, she was concerned about
2 the height and looking out.

3 I think I've covered most of it. Again,
4 it would be nice to know how tall these buildings
5 are going to be. I know you haven't got the plans
6 designed for the house yet; all you're doing is
7 figuring out the plot lines. So that's probably
8 next time we have a meeting I get to come and
9 visit you guys again.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just want to
11 make sure I understand it. A big concern of yours
12 is that retaining wall between your lot and the
13 lot to the east?

14 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. Something that's
15 going to prevent anything -- I mean, it is an
16 8-foot drop from my lot line within a few feet of
17 the other lot line where it drops straight down
18 there towards the front. Now, in the back it's
19 not as steep; it's just in the front there where
20 there's an 8-foot drop there.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

23 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I've looked at the
24 engineering and there's two trees -- I can meet

1 you again on-site but you're at 4 1/2 feet. We
2 have to have a minimum of 8 feet.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Oh, there's 8 feet?

4 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: So our side would be
5 double what your side is. And the trees that are
6 right across from -- right here, these trees,
7 they're on our property. So the wall, I think
8 we're just going to have meet and look at the wall
9 to see what can be done.

10 I understand. I don't want your house
11 sliding into mine, but I'll be more than happy to
12 meet with you, and if I could get your contact
13 information again, that would be great.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. Do you want them now?

15 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: Sure.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Let's move
17 on with other questions.

18 Anyone else have questions for the
19 applicant?

20 Yes, ma'am.

21 MS. LANTHRUM: My name is Allison Lanthrum,
22 L-a-n-t-h-r-u-m, and I am the immediate neighbor
23 to the south. I'm at 25 Mosedale Street.

24 Could we please move the presentation back

1 to the plan.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You have it right there.

3 MS. LANTHRUM: May I?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You may.

5 MS. LANTHRUM: Thank you for your patience
6 and good humor. My husband and I are learning a
7 lot about home ownership and participating in
8 committees and meetings such as these. So thank you.

9 I have a couple questions right off the
10 bat. Can you confirm if this water feature is a
11 pond or a retention pond? There are three infant
12 households on Pine Street right now, and we would
13 just like to know if there's going to be standing
14 water year-round.

15 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: No. It's a dry basin.

16 MS. LANTHRUM: So looking at this plan, on
17 the north side of Mosedale it does indicate
18 sidewalks. Can you confirm that the sidewalks are
19 going from Pine Street all the way down Geneva
20 Road on the north side of Mosedale?

21 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: Yes. And we said that
22 those sidewalks would have to possibly wind a
23 little bit as they go down. It might not be
24 exactly straight because of the utilities.

1 Normally you put the walks right on the lot pins,
2 but with the utilities there, we have to work
3 around them a little bit.

4 MS. LANTHRUM: Okay. Thank you.

5 Do you have any idea of anticipated price
6 range that you'll be selling the homes for?

7 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I would imagine the homes --
8 we're selling the homes on Cutler Street in the
9 mid-5s, and I would imagine -- with all the work
10 that has to be done for the development, I would
11 think the ranches would be somewhere in the same
12 price range.

13 MS. LANTHRUM: It's already been said, but
14 I would also like to second the comments about
15 land design and tree preservation, landscaping.
16 Not only is this what my family is going to look
17 directly at every morning and every evening, but
18 it's also one of the first things that visitors to
19 St. Charles are going to see when entering
20 St. Charles from the south. So thank you for
21 representing on that front.

22 I'd like to ask you if any accommodations
23 are being made for parking on the block of
24 Mosedale Street between Geneva and Pine Streets.

1 I ask because this angle at Mosedale and Geneva,
2 that turn there is awful. There are lots of
3 accidents there. Then it's a hill, and then it's
4 another intersection at Pine and Mosedale.

5 Right now I believe there's no parking on
6 the north side, only parking on the south side.
7 With these homes in there, if these homes have
8 several cars, if they have additional parking,
9 what accommodations are being made for that
10 additional parking to hopefully not increase
11 accidents?

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That would be really a
13 question for the developer. I mean, is that under
14 the authority of the -- if you're asking him is he
15 allowing sufficient parking on his property, then
16 that would be a part of the site -- you know, a
17 site question.

18 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I would make a comment
19 that with the R2 district with the 5-foot back on
20 the garages, that also helps. So you can stack
21 cars in the driveway if needed for a party. But
22 to make any other accommodations on the street, we
23 don't -- I was unaware the north side had no
24 parking on it. I'm not sure of that.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I know it's typical in
2 the area where only one side of the street will
3 have parking allowed.

4 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: But I think the garage
5 doors -- 5 feet helps. And then one of our --
6 Mr. Pretz made the comment about possibly kicking
7 the houses back a hair to get to a little deeper
8 building line, which would give you more parking
9 on the actual driveways. They are two-car garages,
10 so you'd probably be able to put four cars right
11 on a driveway.

12 MS. LANTHRUM: And, finally, it does look
13 like this plan is for a four-home subdivision.
14 Are you planning any signage? I'm just wondering
15 about confusion because that is a modest number of
16 homes for a subdivision. Is any signage planned?

17 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: I don't think there would
18 be any need. We would do regular sale signs,
19 which I try to keep moderate and keep on a low key
20 so they're not disturbing to any of the neighbors.
21 We will have to probably conform, the more I think
22 about it, with the -- the building department
23 requires us to put envelopes around the building
24 site when you're doing construction, so that

1 helps, too. And I would think they would consider
2 this an existing neighborhood, so we would have to
3 do that. So you'd have some security there, also,
4 if that's another question.

5 MS. LANTHRUM: Well, thank you, it's good
6 to know. Specifically, I'm wondering about the
7 title "Cityview Subdivision." Is there any
8 signage that's planned that says "Cityview
9 Subdivision"?

10 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: No.

11 MS. LANTHRUM: Thank you.

12 MR. CEBRZYNSKI: You're welcome.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions,
14 comments?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
17 else from Plan Commission or staff?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If Plan Commissioners feel
20 that we have enough evidence to make a recommendation
21 to City Council, then a motion to close the public
22 hearing would be in order at this time.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

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

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

14 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
21 concludes Item 4 on the agenda. Item 5 is
22 Cityview, John Henry Developer, Inc., application
23 for special use, application for preliminary plat
24 of subdivision. Is there a motion?

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd make a motion
2 to recommend approval --

3 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- for Cityview
5 subdivision application for special use PUD and
6 the application for the preliminary plat of
7 subdivision.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: The same.

9 MEMBER PIETRYLA: I have a question; sorry.
10 So it's my understanding -- are you going
11 to entertain some of his proposals, or are we
12 approving exactly this plan tonight?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We're just
14 recommending approval.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There were some staff
16 comments that were contained in there. Do you
17 want to --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I will simply
19 amend my motion.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: To resolution of staff
21 comments?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And you agree on the
24 second?

Transcript of Cityview Plan
Conducted on March 6, 2018

39

1 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other discussion on
3 the motion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.

15 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

22 And that concludes Item 5 on the agenda.

23 Before anyone leaves, will this be -- will
24 this be a planning and development on March 12?

1 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So it goes before
3 the City Council's planning and development
4 committee on March 12th, and then depending on
5 what they do there it would be approved by the
6 full -- or acted on by the full City Council
7 after that.

8 (Off the record at 7:50 p.m.)

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 11th day of March, 2018.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment

Date: March 6, 2018

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
First Street Redevelopment :
PUD (City of St. Charles); :
Preliminary Plan for Building 3 :
Streetscape and Riverwalk :
Design, Application for Final :
Plat of Subdivision for :
Building 2. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, March 6, 2018
7:50 p.m.

Job No.: 168443B
Pages: 1 - 25
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

1 Report of proceedings 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 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 Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

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
- JEFFREY FUNKE, Member
- JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member
- DAVID PIETRYLA, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member
- PETER VARGULICH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. 6 is First Street
3 Redevelopment PUD (City of St. Charles) Preliminary
4 Plan for Building 3 Streetscape and Riverwalk
5 Design, and Application for Final Plat of
6 Subdivision for Building 2.

7 MR. COLBY: This is a preliminary plan for
8 the riverwalk and streetscape improvements to be
9 installed along First Street Building No. 3 which
10 is under construction right now and nearing
11 completion, and the City would be having these
12 improvements installed this spring at the same
13 time the building is completed.

14 Staff had presented a conceptual layout to
15 the Plan Commission back in October for feedback,
16 and based on that feedback the plan has been
17 modified to change the layout somewhat in terms of
18 the shape of the landscape beds. We've used more
19 of a circular shape and added a larger landscape
20 bed at the corner, which was one of the requests
21 of the Plan Commission, and we have finalized the
22 plan in terms of the layout with the planting beds
23 in areas where there's pavers, sort of came up
24 with more of a pattern. I think the Plan Commission

1 thought it was not quite finalized and more in
2 separate pieces. It's now laid out more
3 consistently.

4 One of the other comments that also came
5 up from the Plan Commission was looking into a
6 pedestrian crossing on Illinois Street to connect
7 this section of the riverwalk to the bottom
8 riverwalk to the south, and the City Council
9 agreed with the concept of looking into that from
10 an engineering standpoint.

11 So we asked WBK, our consultant engineer,
12 to analyze the crossing and make a determination
13 if based on visibility a site crossing could be
14 safely accommodated, and they said one could be
15 safely accommodated and also ramps within this
16 section of the riverwalk could be designed to meet
17 ADA requirements for a crossing. But they did
18 note that based on the volume of traffic and the
19 configuration of the lanes within the street that
20 if a crossing was established here, there would
21 need to be other measures taken to improve the
22 safety of the crossing such as having a refuge
23 island in the center of the street, some signage,
24 or warning lights, or some other items that would

1 draw more attention to the crossing.

2 But the actual installation of that crossing
3 is outside the scope of this specific plan. This
4 plan is required under the City's redevelopment
5 agreement with the first three developers to install
6 this portion of the improvements now in connection
7 with the building, but we'd be looking for feedback
8 from the Plan Commission on the concept of that
9 crossing. We'd be asking the City Council if the
10 plan is amended if they would like staff to
11 continue discussions of that crossing.

12 It would be a later project. It requires
13 some input from our public works department in
14 terms of the design of the street and from the
15 police department in terms of what they think
16 would be acceptable from a safety standpoint. But
17 I did provide a copy of WBK's memo in the packet
18 materials.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's all you have?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes. That's all I have.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have -- I guess
22 my question would be -- and I realize that that
23 crossing is outside the scope of this project and
24 outside the scope of our purview right now, but

1 what is the -- I mean, what's the likelihood?
2 We've talked about it and brought it up. In this
3 plan if there is no -- if there's no work being
4 done -- if it's not done in conjunction, what are
5 they going to do at the street? Isn't that part
6 of -- isn't that access to that street part of
7 this project?

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. We even identified a
9 location where it can be installed. In the event
10 that it's not something that would be advanced
11 now, it would be installed in such a way that a
12 ramp to the street could be added easily without
13 significantly modifying the improvements that
14 we've made now. So we'll have a location
15 identified for where it could go.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I mean, the
17 development has to agree to this at this time, as
18 well, right, that there would be an access to that
19 crosswalk?

20 MR. COLBY: It's really the City's decision
21 because it is within the street. Because there's
22 a redevelopment agreement on this property, the
23 developers involved I think agreed to the design
24 for the streetscape for the riverwalk, so they'd

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

8

1 need to agree to that, as well. But, ultimately,
2 that portion will be within the City's street and
3 not on the portion of the site that's the
4 riverwalk parcel. It's actually in the street.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But the access to
6 this site would be part of this parcel, the ramp
7 going down into the street, et cetera, right?

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. It would be within the
9 street right-of-way. It's not actually on the
10 parcel. It would be in this area, but the line of
11 the street is somewhere around here, so there's a
12 separate parcel that the riverwalk improvements
13 are on separate from the street.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So we don't have
15 to have any kind of agreement for construction on
16 the parcel by the owners of this property?

17 MR. COLBY: Correct.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Can I just ask -- I
19 have provided some examples of some traffic calming
20 that once it does go up for discussion -- can I
21 submit these for consideration of ideas?

22 MR. COLBY: Yes.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. Thank you.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: And I have a question. At

1 the last presentation that you guys gave you had
2 trees on this -- are those trees being removed?

3 MR. COLBY: There is a landscape layout in
4 here. It's towards the end.

5 And I included in the memo a number of
6 comments that we had about the layout of the
7 plantings, moving the landscape bed, and also
8 opportunities to add some other larger plantings
9 specifically in these two beds that are along
10 Illinois Street. So those comments do need to be
11 addressed, whether it's going to impact it.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, a couple of
13 questions kind of related to the landscape plan
14 but also the grading plan that was prepared.

15 Currently the -- right now it looks like
16 the grading from the building on the east side is
17 just being pitched to the east over the wall into
18 the river.

19 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Can I ask why they --
21 you're not picking that up in any kind of, if you
22 will, plaza drains instead of just pushing it
23 across?

24 MR. COLBY: I don't have the answer for

1 that. The initial design for the river wall and
2 the buildings was based on this design of the
3 water basically draining out over the wall. There
4 may need to be an ability to collect the water
5 before it goes over the wall. I'm not sure if
6 there was a specific reason why there was no
7 drainage plan contemplated there.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. I would recommend
9 that that be considered and looked at. I realize
10 that that adds some cost, but I don't think it's
11 substantial to the cost of this, and there's easy
12 access to connect any small number of plaza drains
13 there. At the north end there's a 24-inch RCP,
14 and at the south end there's a 36-inch RCP that's
15 existing.

16 So I think connecting those into there
17 would be better, and the reason I recommend that
18 is that you're going to end up with water running
19 down the face of the wall, and over time it's going
20 to pick up debris and other things and probably
21 not make the wall look overly attractive.

22 Secondly, realizing that initially the
23 pavement is going to be very tight against the
24 back of the wall, over time there tends to be a

1 gap there, and what we'll end up doing is having
2 water going down behind the wall, and that's
3 usually not the best from a structural engineering
4 and longevity standpoint, and considering the
5 expense of that wall and going into repair that
6 wall, a few thousand dollars might be worthwhile
7 now to try and eliminate that to the greatest
8 extent possible.

9 And then I would also note and ask that
10 the planting beds probably also be picked up with
11 some sort of an underdrain. It doesn't have to be
12 complicated, but otherwise, they might turn into,
13 if you will, like bathtubs because they're against
14 the building wall, they're against the, if you
15 will, the river wall, and it's all compacted fill
16 all the way around them, and I simply don't want
17 them to turn into marshes because they're collecting
18 and holding water.

19 In general, I think this design is a great
20 improvement from the concept, so thank you and
21 thank WBK for doing that. I think that -- from
22 the number of trees, I think there definitely
23 needs to be more trees.

24 I think especially as it relates to

1 Illinois Street, if you think about First Street,
2 we have trees either in raised planters on one side
3 or in tree grates and probably averaging about
4 40 foot on center. This project has about 120 feet
5 of frontage, and there's only two trees that are
6 in those planters, and if you divide the 120 by
7 40, I think we could use at least a couple more.

8 I don't think they need to be in tree
9 grates; I would just add them to the planters that
10 are already proposed. I think that would be an
11 easy way to do that and would help improve the
12 overall kind of street feel and kind of balance
13 out the use of street trees along the various
14 streets there.

15 I did notice in the landscape notes there
16 they didn't know about irrigation. I was just
17 wondering if they were going to plan to do
18 irrigation for this.

19 MR. COLBY: The island bed will be irrigated.
20 I think it's just not known in this plan set.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. That would be good.

22 And then, lastly, really about -- a
23 comment about the plantings themselves. If I look
24 at the plant list that's in the drawing set, there's

1 a lot of perennials. And while I personally love
2 perennials, the vast majority of the beds are almost
3 all perennials, and I think that for five, six months
4 of the year it's not going to look like much. So
5 I would think adding more small shrubs, the scale
6 still needs to be low, lots of visibility to show off
7 the buildings. But I would think that maybe if
8 the coverage of the bed is closer to 60 percent,
9 shrubs or small shrubs, I think that would be a
10 better balance for -- because of winter look and
11 winter interest kind of thing.

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I don't know how
13 you read that, the perennials. I can't even read
14 the writing.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: It's difficult to read,
16 but I know enough that I know what they are.

17 MR. COLBY: You have to zoom in on that
18 table.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It's still blurry.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: It's almost impossible
21 to read it.

22 MR. COLBY: I apologize for that. We
23 probably did that when we shrunk the plan.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: Not a big deal. I sorted

1 out what it was.

2 Other than that, I think this has come a
3 long way, and I like a lot of what has happened
4 and so I'm pleased. Thanks.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are we talking
6 about 2 now, as well?

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have one more comment
8 on your installation of the fence. The bench is
9 attached to the curb with a mounting plate. They
10 should attach the fence to the wall with a mounting
11 plate and not drill holes in the top of the wall
12 the way they're doing.

13 MR. COLBY: That was one of the points of
14 discussion is trying to determine the best way to
15 attach the fence or the rail. I think there's --
16 from a maintenance standpoint I think there's a
17 concern about the mounting plate versus drilling
18 holes into the wall.

19 MEMBER VARGULICH: What is the maintenance?

20 MR. COLBY: In terms of long-term, we have
21 other examples where the mounting plate has started
22 to deteriorate, rust in, so it has to be painted,
23 maintained more frequently. But then the question
24 was, well, if you mount the fence to the railing

1 of the wall, is it designed for that from a
2 structural standpoint.

3 And from what we can tell the original
4 design for the wall, it was intended to have the
5 railing post drilled through it, but there's no
6 holes there, so we really have the ability to do
7 it either way. If you have, you know, thoughts
8 about why one method is more advantageous --

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here's the -- from a
10 long-term maintenance standpoint drilling holes in
11 the top of the wall is your least desirable approach,
12 and the reason being is that the nonshrink grout
13 that they put in there wears out over time, and
14 then you introduce water into those holes, which
15 introduces water to the top of the structural
16 wall. If you talk to anybody who does forensic
17 work to determine issues when you have failures in
18 walls, especially structurally engineered walls,
19 that is one of the key things that they point to
20 is those holes.

21 So the smaller the holes and the easier it
22 is to seal them, the better off you are. In fact,
23 most engineers will recommend the flange attachment
24 over drilling it in.

1 A way to help your plate from rusting is to
2 have it installed on a neoprene pad so that the
3 steel is not directly in contact with the concrete.
4 There's actually a chemical reaction between the
5 steel and the concrete when they connect, and if
6 you put a 16th-inch neoprene pad between them,
7 that almost eliminates that issue, and you can buy
8 those pads to meet your flange size. All you do
9 is put them down and install them.

10 So I would recommend that you do that
11 because ultimately, again, when you have to come
12 back and fix a structural wall it's big money
13 especially if it's adjacent to the river.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. COLBY: I appreciate that information.

16 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Just curious, what's the
17 color of the paver? The pavers are going to be
18 red, reddish?

19 MR. COLBY: They're going to use the same
20 color they used on the rest as the First Street
21 project. So it's a reddish color, and then there's
22 a lighter brick that's used for the courses around
23 the neighborhood.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have one question.

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

17

1 Do you believe that 2 -- Building 2 and I see the
2 rough plan of what's going to be the riverscape.
3 Will they continue with the same design? Is that
4 the plan? Is it possible that it could change?

5 MR. COLBY: Well, the portion of First
6 Street streetscape, that's already been designed
7 in front of Building 2. So that would be very
8 similar to what's in front of Building 1.

9 What's on the plaza in the area to the
10 north of this still needs to be designed, and some
11 of that is dependent on how much land area the
12 City includes in the plaza. Because the City owns
13 a larger area than was originally planned for the
14 plaza, and there was also a potential for a
15 building or some other use for the property that's
16 on the corner.

17 But the intent is to use the same theme in
18 terms of the type of materials that have been used
19 in the rest of the First Street project.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The colors?

21 MR. COLBY: The colors, the actual layout,
22 and what kind of elements will be included will
23 depend on the space that's available and how the
24 City wants to sort of program that space depending

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

18

1 on how large it is.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. I
3 don't -- frankly, I don't see anything wrong with
4 even changing the design a little bit as long as
5 you have some consistent connection with types,
6 and colors, and that sort of thing.

7 MR. COLBY: And we've done that here really.
8 This design is partially based on the space that's
9 available but also some of the curbing features on
10 the building. So this is a little different than
11 what exists through the rest of the project, but
12 it uses the same kind of materials.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Good work.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Anything else?

16 (No response.)

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you, Russ.

18 MR. COLBY: And I can also talk about the
19 next application that's listed under this item,
20 which is the final plat of subdivision for
21 Building 2.

22 So what we need to do, based on the
23 footprint of Building 2 that was approved last year,
24 the building face, the lot line along First Street

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

19

1 was based on the old building design from 2015. So
2 that is going to be adjusted based on the current
3 approved building which has now been fully designed.
4 And we've drawn the lot lines based on the
5 foundation plans of the building so that the lot
6 line will exactly follow the building face wall.
7 So it's roughly the same area in terms of the
8 encroachment into First Street; it's just the
9 bump-out in different locations.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd make a motion
12 to recommend approval of the First Street
13 redevelopment PUD (City of St. Charles),
14 Preliminary Plan for Building 3 Streetscape and
15 Riverwalk Design and the Application for Final
16 Plat of Subdivision for Building 2, subject to
17 resolution of all staff comments.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll second.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded.
20 Any discussion on the motion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

20

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.
2 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.
4 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.
6 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pietryla.
8 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes.
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.
10 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. 7, additional
15 business from Plan Commission members or staff.
16 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Yes. I just want to
17 take a little bit of everyone's time to provide a
18 summary of our recent Housing Commission meeting.
19 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I can't hear. Sorry.
20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Talk loudly.
21 MEMBER PIETRYLA: When I was appointed to
22 the Commission, I was also asked to be the liaison
23 to the Housing Commission, so I'd like to take
24 this time to briefly discuss what we talked about

1 at our last meeting.

2 So we met on February 8th, and in a
3 nutshell, there was a summary of a visit -- I
4 don't believe you went, Ellen.

5 MS. JOHNSON: No.

6 MEMBER PIETRYLA: The minutes from the joint
7 meeting said you were going to go, but I don't
8 think you were there. Alderman Payleitner as well
9 as the lead chairman -- Chairwoman Eakins went --
10 my notes aren't in front of me, but I believe they
11 both went to the Kane-Elgin HOME Commission, there
12 was a meeting that they attended to ensure --
13 basically to try to get a sense of their activities,
14 their thoughts that a commission sees -- according
15 to the minutes here from the joint meeting sees the
16 Affordable Housing Fund that they're administering
17 as a way to partner with our commission. We can
18 partner with them to potentially provide funds for
19 developers from our trust fund. I think I
20 summarized that appropriately.

21 So they went to go sort of check that out
22 and see how that commission is running, and they
23 seemed to be pleased from the summary.

24 Then we went into some discussion. There

1 hasn't been anything finalized, but the bulk of
2 our discussion was on whether to -- currently we
3 have two fees in lieu of inclusionary housing in
4 St. Charles. So there was a discussion on whether
5 we should continue to have that two-fee structure
6 or merge it into one fee. So there was some
7 feedback on that.

8 And, Ellen, you have a great memo that you
9 provided to us here. So for single-family the
10 current -- and it's in our packets here, as you
11 can see -- \$72,819.50 is the current single-family,
12 the fee for -- per one unit. Am I understanding
13 that correctly?

14 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

15 MEMBER PIETRYLA: So, for instance, in the
16 report that we talked about today, the formula
17 came out to .2 I believe for the subdivision we
18 just discussed. So that formula, he decided to
19 pay a fee in lieu of, and I think it came out to
20 about 14,000 based on that formula. We have a
21 separate multifamily fee of 5,000.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is that per home
23 or the entire subdivision?

24 MEMBER PIETRYLA: That's the fee for that

1 subdivision.

2 So we have two essential fees, multifamily
3 and single-family. So we were just debating
4 whether or not to leave that as is, maybe tweak
5 the fees, or to merge them into one fee.

6 But that's the bulk of our discussion in
7 our last Housing Commission meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

9 Anything else.

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Staff.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 8 is
14 the weekly development report, and 9, meeting
15 announcements. We have no meeting the second
16 Tuesday of March because it's Election Day, and
17 then we have two in April. Do we know if we have
18 anything for sure?

19 MR. COLBY: No, we don't but I think
20 chances are we will.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any public
22 comment?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Public?

24 (No response.)

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on March 6, 2018

24

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Everyone,
2 the St. Patrick's Day parade is this Saturday. So
3 make sure you come.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Why not on
5 St. Patrick's Day?

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: To give our
7 businesses another day of big business. We're the
8 downtown partnership, come on. It's always been
9 the Saturday before St. Patrick's Day, but we are
10 supporting our businesses.

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

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

14 MEMBER PIETRYLA: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
16 seconded. All in favor.

17 (Ayes heard.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
21 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

22 (Off the record at 8:17 p.m.)
23
24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, 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 11th day of March, 2018.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois