

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2017**

Members Present: Tim Kessler
 James Holderfield
 Laura Macklin-Purdy
 Tom Schuetz
 Dan Frio
 Peter Vargulich
 Tom Pretz

Members Absent: Chairman Todd Wallace
 Jeff Funke

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
 Ellen Johnson, Planner
 Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Vice Chairman Kessler 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 March 21, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Holderfield, seconded by Mr. Frio, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2017 Plan Commission meeting. Mr. Pretz abstained.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. Meijer PUD, 855 S. Randall Rd. (Callie Robertson, Anchor Sign)

Application for Special Use requesting an amendment to PUD Ordinance 1999-M-24 regarding permitted wall signage on the Meijer building.

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

Motion was made by Mr. Schuetz and seconded by Mr. Holderfield to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Pretz, Frio, Purdy, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Wallace, Funke

Motion carried: 7-0

Agenda item #6 was moved to be the next item for discussion.

MEETING

6. Meijer PUD, 855 S. Randall Rd. (Callie Robertson, Anchor Sign)

Application for Special Use requesting an amendment to PUD Ordinance 1999-M-24 regarding permitted wall signage on the Meijer building.

Motion was made by Mr. Schuetz and seconded by Mr. Frio to recommend approval of the Application for Special Use requesting an amendment to PUD Ordinance 1999-M-24 regarding permitted wall signage on the Meijer building, 855 S. Randall Rd., with a condition that the pharmacy drive-up sign does not go up until the pharmacy is put in.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Pretz, Frio, Purdy, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Wallace, Funke

Motion carried: 7-0

PUBLIC HEARING

5. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)

Ch. 17.22 “General Provisions”, Section 17.22.030 “Permitted Encroachments” and Ch. 17.30 “Definitions”, Section 17.30.030 “General Definitions” (yard encroachment for pergolas and sports courts).

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

Motion was made by Mr. Holderfield, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Pretz, Frio, Purdy, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Wallace, Funke

Motion carried: 7-0

MEETING

7. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)

Ch. 17.22 “General Provisions”, Section 17.22.030 “Permitted Encroachments” and Ch. 17.30 “Definitions”, Section 17.30.030 “General Definitions” (yard encroachment for pergolas and sports courts).

Motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Mr. Schuetz to recommend approval of the General Amendment to Ch. 17.22 “General Provisions”, Section 17.22-030, “Permitted Encroachments”, and Ch. 17.30 “Definitions”, Section 17.30.030 “General Definitions” (yard encroachments for pergolas and sports courts), with a condition that pergolas projecting from the principal structure be permitted to encroach up to 8 ft. into the front and exterior side yard.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Pretz, Frio, Purdy, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Wallace, Funke

Motion carried: 7-0

8. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

9. Weekly Development Report

10. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Monday, April 10, 2017- Joint Meeting with Planning & Development Committee,
5:45pm Council Committee Room

Tuesday, April 18, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, May 2, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, May 16, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, April 10, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, May 8, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

11. Public Comment

12. Adjournment at 7:44 PM



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

Transcript of Hearing - Wall Signage on Meijer building

Date: April 4, 2017

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Application for Special :
Use Requesting an :
Amendment to PUD Regarding :
Permitted Wall Signage on :
Meijer building, 855 S. :
Randall Road. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, April 4, 2017
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 126916
Pages: 1 - 21
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand

14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State

15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

3 DAN FRIO, Member

4 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

5 TOM PRETZ, Member

6 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

7 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

8 PETER VARGULICH, Member

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

11 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Hearing - Wall Signage on Meijer building
Conducted on April 4, 2017

4

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. This meeting
3 of the St. Charles Plan Commission will come to
4 order.

5 Holderfield.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

14 MEMBER FRIO: Here.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

18 No. 3 on the agenda is presentation of the
19 minutes of the March 21, 2017, meeting.

20 Is there a motion? I'll entertain a motion
21 to approve.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So moved.

23 MEMBER FRIO: Second.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

1 (Ayes heard.)

2 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm going to abstain.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. No. 3 and 4
4 on our agenda are public hearings, and we do have a
5 member in the audience. Okay. I'm looking
6 something up real quickly, so just give me a moment.

7 Okay. I will review our -- I'd like to
8 review the procedures for public hearings for our
9 audience of one and the Plan Commission as well.

10 The applicant will present -- make a
11 presentation, and I believe the applicant is the
12 City in both cases. Ellen; right?

13 MS. JOHNSON: No. For the Meijer's item,
14 there is an applicant here, an outside applicant.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

16 MR. ROBINSON: Your audience of one.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You're the
18 applicant. Very good. Okay. Thank you.

19 And so the applicant will present the
20 application. Then we'll ask you some questions, and
21 then you can ask us questions. We'll just ask each
22 other questions.

23 And when we believe we've had enough
24 evidence to make a recommendation, we'll ask to

1 either move or continue the public hearing.

2 When we're done with the public meeting -- I
3 notice that on the agenda both matters are set for
4 the meeting portion; and if we believe that -- we've
5 closed the public hearing, and we believe we have
6 all the information we need to make a
7 recommendation, we'll do so at that time.

8 So I would -- I'm going to ask, and I want
9 to make sure -- this actually came up, I think, at
10 our last meeting. We have a court reporter here, as
11 we all know; and so if we could all speak one at a
12 time and hopefully even among the Plan Commission,
13 if we can look to be recognized before we speak so
14 we're not just all, you know, asking out questions.

15 So when you do speak, if you would give us
16 your name and address for the record.

17 And with that, then I guess our first item
18 is the Meijer PUD. So you're up first.

19 MEMBER FRIO: Don't be nervous of the crowd.

20 MR. ROBINSON: Brian Robinson. I work for
21 Anchor Signs. My address is 708 Towhee Lane,
22 T-o-w-h-e-e, Cochranville, Pennsylvania 19330.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Again, did you say
24 T-o-u-h-y?

Transcript of Hearing - Wall Signage on Meijer building
Conducted on April 4, 2017

7

1 MR. ROBINSON: Towhee, T-o-w-h-e-e.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, T-o-w-h-e-e.

3 Okay.

4 MR. ROBINSON: I am here for the Meijer; and
5 to the best of my knowledge, what we're trying to do
6 is reface two signs that apparently were installed
7 on this building with no permit, and add a third
8 sign of a drive-up pharmacy or drive-through
9 pharmacy, I believe it would say, on the wall. A
10 pharmacy drive-up over near where the garden center
11 is. It's not there now. They would also like to
12 add that.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: There's not a
14 drive-up pharmacy there.

15 MR. ROBINSON: There is not a drive-up
16 pharmacy there.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: But there will be.

18 MR. ROBINSON: They're requesting for a sign
19 because I believe they would like to put a drive-up
20 pharmacy there; otherwise, they're going to confuse
21 a lot of people.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. ROBINSON: You're welcome.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I guess we start

1 with the question portion of our meeting. I do have
2 a question.

3 So is it true that they're going to put --
4 they're requesting to put that sign up before they
5 have a drive-up pharmacy? Is that your
6 understanding?

7 MR. ROBINSON: That is my understanding
8 because as of right now, there is no drive-up
9 pharmacy. I believe they're requesting the sign --
10 I don't believe that they'll ever put that sign up
11 or that they will ever make a drive-up pharmacy, but
12 I think they want it as a contingency plan.

13 But I don't personally deal with Meijer.
14 I'm not the account manager. Somebody else does
15 that. They put this in and asked me to ask for that
16 sign.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well --

18 MR. ROBINSON: So my understanding is Meijer
19 would eventually like to have the option to put a
20 drive-up pharmacy. I've surveyed probably 30 to 40
21 Meijers. Most of them now have a drive-up pharmacy.
22 So my guess is they would like to add a drive-up
23 pharmacy to this building.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Ellen or Russ, can

1 you shed any light on this?

2 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Per the PUD for this
3 property, a drive-through pharmacy is a permitted
4 use. So they could add a drive-through at some
5 point, and I think that they're asking to have this
6 additional sign approved just so that in the future,
7 the PUD ordinance wouldn't need to be amended again
8 to allow for an additional sign.

9 I think that's the reason for bundling this
10 sign with the others, just so that it's approved for
11 the future.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there any reason
13 we would not want them to install the sign without
14 the drive-up pharmacy?

15 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. I don't --

16 MR. ROBINSON: I don't believe they would
17 install the drive-up pharmacy sign without the
18 drive-up pharmacy. I believe it's to -- if they
19 decide to remodel and add a drive-up pharmacy, we
20 would just be able to -- the sign would already be
21 approved per your Board, and we wouldn't have to
22 come back to have another meeting to have that sign
23 approved again. We could just permit it and install
24 it.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. That's a
2 different approach, but we'd like to be sure of
3 these things before we --

4 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. The Plan Commission
5 could put a condition on a recommendation for
6 approval that the drive-up sign not be installed
7 until the drive-through goes in.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You know, I've seen
9 stranger things. I don't think that's a bad idea,
10 frankly. It happens. They've installed two signs
11 without any permit, so there's nothing stopping
12 them, if it's permitted, to put the sign up, if
13 there is no drive-through pharmacy.

14 Does it make sense? Probably not. But
15 you're in town from Pennsylvania. Why call you back
16 to put the sign up? I mean that could happen.

17 MR. ROBINSON: It could.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's my point, but
19 anyway.

20 Tom, go ahead.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have a general
22 question. I think I know the answer, but I want to
23 be sure we're all on the same -- I realize you're
24 the sign company, and so you're the messenger.

1 So currently, there's some of these signs
2 existing, and you're going to be adding more signs
3 is what we're looking at here, with more square
4 footage; is that correct?

5 MR. ROBINSON: Technically --

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Square footage of signage.

7 MR. ROBINSON: Technically, yes, if you're
8 considering the two signs, the Starbucks sign --
9 well, the Starbucks sign is up apparently
10 unpermitted, and the U.S. Bank sign is up
11 unpermitted.

12 I believe the original agreement stated they
13 would allow five signs. So there's now seven on the
14 building. So they're trying to get permits for
15 those two signs and this third sign, yes, so more
16 square footage because that sign is 43.88 square
17 feet.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So if we look at the
19 proposed versus the PUD ordinance, we're looking at
20 a difference here -- if the pharmacy sign doesn't go
21 up right away, the 44 square feet comes off and
22 basically it's 511; right? Am I reading it
23 correctly?

24 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Thank you.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a question.

3 So this means that you would have to turn into
4 the -- from the way that Meijer is configured, and
5 I'm assuming this is on -- as you're looking at
6 this, Meijer is on the right side, this drive-up.

7 MR. ROBINSON: Correct. The right-hand side
8 of the store, yes.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: As you're looking at
10 it, on the right side. So you would have to pull in
11 from the front and go around the back.

12 MR. ROBINSON: Correct. Most of the ones
13 I've seen that have this store configuration, if you
14 look at the -- I don't know if you have the same
15 picture --

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yeah, we do.

17 MR. ROBINSON: -- where that little -- the
18 back of that little SUV is, the little gray car.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

20 MR. ROBINSON: Usually, what they have is a
21 drive-up lane that has -- it pulls up to the front.
22 So that's kind of blocked off, and they just draw --
23 you know, they have the parking lot and painted a
24 line for the drive-up.

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So the queue would be
2 in the front of the store.

3 MR. ROBINSON: Basically, right under where
4 that sign is --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Under the sign.

6 MR. ROBINSON: -- the pharmacy drive-up. It
7 would be right there. I mean, this would be like
8 some sort of no parking sign or something right
9 there. It's usually, they put a canopy, and they
10 cut the hole, kind of like a CVS pharmacy. It's
11 just a window that would be cut. So they would have
12 to basically cut out the brick in that -- probably
13 that third, that last section where that parking
14 sign is or no parking sign, whatever it happens to
15 say.

16 They would cut a hole in that window, and
17 basically, it would just be a window right there
18 that you would pull up to and the pharmacy would,
19 you know, have a little microphone and push the
20 button to talk to the pharmacist.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And inside the
22 store, the pharmacy is right there.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I know, but does
24 anyone else see a problem, a potential issue with

1 the queue?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. But --

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: But that's not what
4 we're approving. Okay. I get it, but I'm just --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's a different
6 meeting.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: If they add the pharmacy,
8 are they going to have to -- I'm assuming they would
9 have to develop the plans that show how that was
10 going to be added and what modifications, if any, I
11 assume there will be, to the parking lot and to the
12 configuration and all those things?

13 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is that the kind of thing
15 that will come back to us?

16 MS. JOHNSON: Most likely. We have to take
17 a look at what was approved in the original PUD
18 ordinance and go from there.

19 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I understood you to say
20 that it's already been approved for a drive-through
21 pharmacy.

22 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. The use itself, but it's
23 not clear on the plans where exactly the pharmacy
24 was intended -- or the drive-up was intended to go.

1 So I think that some sort of modification or
2 amendment would be needed to change the approved
3 plan if we needed to pull out the drive-through, but
4 we would analyze that when it comes in.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: So we would get to
6 analyze the queue and those things, if we felt it
7 was an issue.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Subject for a
9 different meeting.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: We would discuss that at
11 that time.

12 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: This just simplifies the
14 amendment to the PUD.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a question for staff.
17 I understand the PUD and the 511 square feet
18 originally approved.

19 If this was not a PUD or without this
20 specific language, based on the square footage of
21 the building itself, does the 511 feet exceed the
22 normal limit of square footage for signs, or are we
23 still under that? Hopefully, that made sense.

24 MS. JOHNSON: So typically, it would be

1 one sign. We would allow one wall sign per
2 business, per street frontage. So in this case, if
3 there's three businesses in the building, we would
4 allow -- and they have two street frontages. So
5 they would be allowed to have six wall signs; and
6 then the total square footage is 1 1/2 square feet
7 per linear foot of the building, the building wall,
8 and I don't know what the building wall length is
9 off the top of my head.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: But probably 511 is probably
11 under that.

12 MS. JOHNSON: It may be. It may be.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, they're showing --
14 on the plan, they're showing 654 feet for the face
15 of the building facing Randall Road.

16 MS. JOHNSON: So it's under what would be
17 allowed.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: So the maximum normally would
20 have been six signs, but yet the square footage is
21 well under.

22 MS. JOHNSON: Correct, yes.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just had one other

1 curious question. Your company has been engaged to
2 reface the Starbucks sign; is that correct?

3 MR. ROBINSON: Correct.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is that what
5 prompted this?

6 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. We called the City to
7 ask about if we needed a permit to reface the sign,
8 to which we found out that the sign was never
9 permitted in the first place.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: See, the last two
11 guys didn't make that call.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: But thank you for calling.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Thank you for calling.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. If we
16 feel we have enough information to close the public
17 hearing, I'd entertain that motion.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'll make the motion that
19 we do approve --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We're closing the
21 public hearing.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm sorry. Motion to
23 close.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Second.

Transcript of Hearing - Wall Signage on Meijer building
Conducted on April 4, 2017

18

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. All in
2 favor.

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And if nobody has
5 any objection, which I doubt they will, we'll jump
6 ahead to Item No. 6 in the meeting portion, which is
7 the Meijer PUD, 855 South Randall Road, application
8 for special use requesting an amendment to PUD
9 Ordinance 1999-M-24 regarding permitted wall signage
10 on the Meijer building.

11 And since we've had some discussion on it,
12 we could discuss it some more, or we could entertain
13 a motion. Is anybody ready to make a motion?

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I was.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, then, you go
16 right ahead, Tom.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. I'll see if I can do
18 this right. So I'd like to make the motion that we
19 do approve the signage that's been proposed with the
20 condition that the pharmacy drive-up sign does not
21 go up until the pharmacy is put in, and that would
22 be the Meijer PUD, 855 South Randall Road, PUD
23 Ordinance 1999-M-24.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So you're

1 recommending approval. You're recommending that
2 we -- you're making a motion to recommend approval.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Correct.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. With the
5 condition that the drive-up sign is not going to be
6 installed until such time as they build the
7 drive-up.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Correct.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All right.

10 Is there any discussion on the motion?

11 MR. ROBINSON: No questions.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Surprise. Okay.

13 I'll take a roll call.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Don't we need a second?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah. We do need a
16 second.

17 MEMBER FRIO: Second.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Holderfield.

19 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

1 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

7 All right. That motion passes. Thank you
8 very much.

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Enjoy your stay in
11 St. Charles.

12 (Off the record at 7:19 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 6th day of April, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Hearing - Encroachment for Pergolas and Sports Courts

Date: April 4, 2017

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888-433-3767

Fax: 888-503-3767

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: :
General Amendment :
Regarding Permitted :
Encroachments and Yard :
Encroachment for Pergolas :
and Sports Courts. :
-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, April 4, 2017
7:19 p.m.

Job No.: 126916
Pages: 1 - 26
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand

14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State

15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Hearing - Encroachment for Pergolas and Sports Courts
Conducted on April 4, 2017

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:

TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

DAN FRIO, Member

JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

TOM PRETZ, Member

LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

TOM SCHUETZ, Member

PETER VARGULICH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager

ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

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

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. We're going to jump back to No. 5, General Amendment, City of St. Charles, General Provisions, permitted encroachments, Definitions and General Definitions, Chapter 17.22. I won't read all the details. Ellen is going to fill us in. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. So this is a proposed amendment being proposed by City staff regarding yard encroachments for pergolas and also sports courts.

The proposed -- first is regarding pergolas. Currently, gazebos and pergolas are listed together in Table 17.22-3, which is a table in the zoning ordinance called permitted encroachments, which lists different types of structures and whether or not they are allowed within the required yard setbacks.

So right now gazebos and pergolas are listed together, and they're not permitted in the side yard or the front yard, and they are allowed up to 3 feet from the rear lot line.

So we're proposing to separate these two structures out, keeping the gazebos the same; and

1 for pergolas, allowing them within the interior side
2 yard up to 3 feet from the lot line, but only in the
3 RT, Traditional Residential Zoning District, and the
4 CBD-2 District and not in the other zoning districts.

5 There's also a definition proposed for each
6 one. Right now these structures aren't defined in
7 the ordinance, which leads to some confusion with
8 enforcement and how to interpret the code. So we're
9 proposing some definitions just to clarify.

10 This diagram shows a typical 50-by-100-foot
11 lot in, say, an RT-3 Zoning District. So it shows
12 the required front yard, 20 feet, the 15-foot
13 exterior side yard because this is a corner lot, and
14 that 30-foot rear yard and that 6-foot side yard.

15 And the green area, the green box shows
16 where a pergola would be permitted per the proposed
17 amendment. So it would be allowed up to 3 feet from
18 the side lot line and then up to 3 feet from the
19 rear lot line.

20 This amendment has come up because over the
21 past several months, we've talked to a number of
22 residents who have wanted to put pergolas in their
23 side yards, and they live in the RT, Traditional
24 Residential Zoning District, which have smaller lot

1 sizes than other residential districts in town, and
2 they haven't been able to do so because of the fact
3 that the structure can't be within the side-yard
4 setback.

5 Due to the smaller size of the lots in the
6 RT district and just the pattern of development,
7 many times there are structures existing within the
8 side yards in these neighborhoods, including garages
9 and sheds and fences, and all of those structures
10 are actually allowed either up to or within 3 feet
11 of the side-yard setback.

12 So with that in mind, it would make logical
13 sense to also allow pergolas since side yards are
14 typically used kind of as part of a back -- part of
15 the rear yard in these districts, and other
16 structures are also found in this area of the lot.

17 So that's kind of the rationale behind this
18 amendment.

19 Are there any questions?

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: How does that work if
21 there's sidewalks?

22 MS. JOHNSON: If there's sidewalks along the
23 side.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Like on the side.

1 Because I used to live on a corner lot with a
2 sidewalk. So how does that work with the 3 feet?

3 MS. JOHNSON: Well, the --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's an interior
5 side yard.

6 MS. JOHNSON: The pergola wouldn't be
7 allowed on a corner lot on the exterior side.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So it wouldn't be
10 allowed on a corner lot on the exterior side.

11 MS. JOHNSON: Within that 15-foot setback.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Within that 15-foot
13 setback.

14 MS. JOHNSON: It's treated -- the exterior
15 side yard is typically treated the same as the front
16 yard in terms of permitted encroachments, keeping it
17 consistent.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

19 MS. JOHNSON: If there's no more questions
20 on that, I'll move on.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

22 MS. JOHNSON: All right. Next is sports
23 courts. So currently right now it's the same table
24 of permitted encroachments. It lists sports

1 courts -- or tennis courts and doesn't include any
2 other types of sports courts. So it's been unclear
3 how far, say, a basketball court or an ice rink can
4 be within the yard or how close those structures can
5 be to the property line.

6 So this came up this winter with ice rinks
7 locating in maybe the exterior side of the front
8 yard, and we didn't have a clear position whether
9 that would be permitted or not because it's really
10 not addressed in the ordinance.

11 So we're proposing to take tennis courts and
12 make it a more general category as sports courts and
13 keep the encroachment information the same as
14 currently exists for tennis courts.

15 So a sports court wouldn't be allowed in the
16 front or exterior side yard or the interior side
17 yard, and it would be allowed in the rear but would
18 need to be 10 feet from the lot line.

19 We also have a proposed definition of sports
20 court to include basketball courts, ice rinks,
21 tennis courts, and other hardscape surfaces that
22 isn't part of a driveway used for access to a
23 garage. So this wouldn't include like a basketball
24 hoop that has a drive -- when you use a driveway as

1 a basketball court, it wouldn't include that. So
2 this diagram illustrates where a sports court would
3 be allowed per the proposal.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question.
5 You say hardscape surfaces. I mean, I see temporary
6 ice rinks being built all around my neighborhood,
7 and they're just 2-by-12 with a plastic sheet on the
8 lawn filled with water. You're saying those aren't
9 allowed?

10 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. Technically, we would
11 want to see a 10-foot setback from the rear lot line
12 for those.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So if it's
14 within the setbacks, it doesn't matter.

15 MS. JOHNSON: Right.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You can do whatever
17 you want.

18 MS. JOHNSON: Right. It would just need to
19 be 10-foot from the rear and then not within the
20 yard setbacks as shown on the diagram.

21 MEMBER FRIO: Where does this apply?

22 MS. JOHNSON: This would apply across all
23 zoning districts.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So what happens if

1 this is already there?

2 MS. JOHNSON: Then they would be
3 grandfathered in. So, I mean, an existing surface
4 would be allowed to stay.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: But if they put up a
6 temporary ice skating rink, they wouldn't be able to.

7 MS. JOHNSON: Right. Next year they
8 wouldn't be allowed to put it back.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm curious. What
10 actually -- is there a specific incident or
11 incidents or application that prompted this?

12 MS. JOHNSON: We had a couple complaints
13 that came in this year for ice rinks in the front
14 yard of certain neighborhoods, and we didn't really
15 have a way to address it because it wasn't clear in
16 the zoning ordinance. So it came to our attention
17 that it should probably be addressed somehow in the
18 code so that we can respond to those types of
19 questions.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Does this apply to
21 temporary or just permanent?

22 MS. JOHNSON: It would to temporary also if
23 it meets the definition.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: There's a few in the

1 front yards of my neighborhood.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Sure.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: Not in my neighborhood. The
4 front yards aren't big enough to hold one.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can you skate?

6 MEMBER PRETZ: That's a different story.

7 MEMBER FRIO: I have a question. I live off
8 of Persimmon. My neighbors put a pad in their
9 backyard. I don't know if it was intended for a
10 basketball hoop or a court, but it is now. They
11 have spotlights, and they're out there every night
12 until 11:00 o'clock. It's literally -- their
13 court -- like, here's my living room. Their court
14 is where that wall is. That's allowed?

15 MS. JOHNSON: I'm not sure where -- it
16 depends on where their property line is. It would
17 need to be 10 foot back from their rear lot line.

18 MEMBER FRIO: They can do like a full-court
19 basketball court and include lights and everything?

20 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah.

21 MEMBER FRIO: That's allowed?

22 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. There are some
23 limitations in our lighting chapter on glare and
24 lighting levels at property lines but yes.

1 MEMBER FRIO: Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And that's a
3 permanent structure.

4 MEMBER FRIO: Oh, yeah. It's a basketball --
5 it's a pad with four spotlights, and they're out
6 there every night until 11:00 o'clock. It's as
7 annoying as all get out.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I want to go back to
9 the question about -- this one is for across all
10 zoning districts. Why RT and CBD?

11 MS. JOHNSON: For the pergolas?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. I understand
13 the RT but --

14 MS. JOHNSON: In CBD-2, typically, the lot
15 size is -- the lot size is the same in CBD-2 as the
16 RT-4 District; and a lot of the CBD-2 District is
17 covered in residential -- is single-family
18 residential.

19 So typically, like when we did the
20 amendments last year for some of the yard
21 encroachments in the RT District, we included CBD-2
22 also just to account for residential uses in the
23 CBD-2.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Any other

1 questions?

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a question. With
3 respect to the pergolas, is there some reason they
4 cannot be in an exterior?

5 MS. JOHNSON: An exterior side?

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah.

7 MS. JOHNSON: It hasn't come up that -- that
8 location hasn't been requested. It hasn't come up
9 as an issue yet. And typically, our encroachments
10 we keep consistent for front yards and exterior side
11 yards just so that the structures don't conflict
12 with, say, a public sidewalk or so that it's not
13 visible from the road also.

14 There's not a reason that we couldn't
15 propose to change the setback -- to allow
16 encroachment in the exterior side, but we're not
17 proposing that right now.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: It would be a visual too I
19 would think on the side.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a condition
21 now that -- I mean, there is no sidewalk on the
22 exterior side yard. There is a hedge, a 20-foot
23 hedge between the house and the street. It wouldn't
24 be visible. It's actually not a -- it's not a front

1 yard. I can see a condition where that would be --

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- very important.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right. I just think it's
5 something to consider. If they could use the
6 exterior side yard, that something like a pergola
7 just could not exceed the front-yard setback, so the
8 front of the house. So you would be able to use the
9 side yard from the -- if you will, extending the
10 front of the house out as far as it could come
11 forward.

12 So you would never impact the front yard,
13 but you could use the exterior side yard much in the
14 same way that they're using the interior side yard.
15 I would think it wouldn't impact visibility, like a
16 corner visibility issue from the setback. The
17 front-yard setback is 20 feet.

18 So from a sight triangle standpoint, it
19 wouldn't be -- it's not like a sight triangle that
20 would create a safety concern, you know, for a
21 pedestrian and vehicle issue.

22 MS. JOHNSON: Would you propose that same,
23 like a 3-foot setback requirement from the exterior
24 side then?

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Could you put that
3 visual on the pergola back. Thank you.

4 MEMBER PRETZ: Living on one of these rather
5 small lots, I'm uncomfortable with the exterior side
6 yard, especially with the 3-foot. I understand that
7 there may be 20 bushes or something like that.
8 There's exceptions to cutting out the visibility.

9 To me it seems like it's more than adequate
10 with the interior and the rear yard, and you wind up
11 having a side yard that is the exterior yard that is
12 I believe from a visibility but also from a
13 congested, amount of structures, and things like
14 that. And I think that the rest of the space is
15 more than adequate.

16 There is plenty of room in the back and
17 plenty of room in the interior side yard. That's
18 just my feeling living in that type of neighborhood.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that if all
20 of the yards -- if all of the homes were configured
21 the same way and all of the lot sizes were
22 identical, I would agree with that; but I think that
23 there are enough conditions in a RT District that
24 would cause that to be, you know, a more useable

1 space. I mean, in some of these houses, that
2 exterior side yard is like where they live. You
3 know, I mean, that's the outside living space.
4 That's number one.

5 Number two, I see your point about the
6 visual and the over-structure condition if it was
7 anything other than a pergola because a pergola is
8 an open structure. It's not a gazebo. It's not --

9 MEMBER FRIO: Why it is coming up for
10 question? I mean, nobody is asking for it now, so
11 why are we looking to --

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Nobody is asking for
13 this either.

14 MEMBER FRIO: Yes, they are.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, the City is
16 making an application, but it's not based on
17 somebody making an application.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, I believe that we
19 probably are going to have one tomorrow.

20 MS. JOHNSON: We do. That was coincidental.
21 Yes.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: That happens to be exactly
23 the pergola. They requested the 3-foot.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: If, say, it were to be

1 approved the way it is currently proposed, and
2 somebody had a situation, like Mr. Kessler is
3 bringing up, would they have the opportunity to come
4 back to the City and get a variance?

5 MS. JOHNSON: They couldn't get a variance.
6 They could request a code amendment to come back
7 and --

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And do this exact
9 same thing that we're doing right now.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, so they would have to
11 come before us and everything. I see.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: And the way I see it is that
13 if we're not having a request and somebody wants to
14 do it, then let them come back and request it.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But who came to
16 request to do this? Nobody.

17 MEMBER FRIO: Who prompted this?

18 MS. JOHNSON: Just conversations with a
19 couple residents.

20 MEMBER FRIO: So it has been somewhat
21 requested.

22 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. We told them that we
23 could request an amendment because we saw a case to
24 be made for it. But in those situations, it was for

1 the interior side yard.

2 MEMBER FRIO: So it had been requested.

3 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. Not formally by the
4 people but --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Not --

6 MEMBER FRIO: She just said it has been
7 requested.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. It hasn't been
9 because there has been no application.

10 MEMBER FRIO: There have been discussions.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There have been
12 discussions about where they could put them in the
13 city, and the City said, We'll come up with what we
14 think.

15 MEMBER FRIO: But somebody has questioned
16 them because they want to do it.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So now we're saying,
18 okay, now that you're here, we've got another
19 condition that we think would be discussed.

20 MR. COLBY: Can I offer a suggestion?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Sure.

22 MR. COLBY: With respect to the front yard
23 and the exterior side yard, we do allow an
24 encroachment of an open unenclosed porch to go 8

1 feet into either the front or exterior side yard
2 setback.

3 So an option might be to allow pergolas to
4 do the same thing since they're a similar type of
5 structure, which would allow you to place them at
6 least adjacent to the face of the building but not
7 necessarily have them freestanding out towards the
8 sidewalk.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: That makes sense.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It makes perfect
11 sense.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: At least there's consistency
13 in there.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: I have a question.
15 You're showing a corner lot here, so the 15-foot
16 side yard. What is the typical lot width for an
17 interior?

18 MS. JOHNSON: Usually, it would be 6 feet on
19 both sides.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. All right. So
21 when you have an exterior side yard, you actually
22 are penalized in usability given this.

23 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

24 MEMBER VARGULICH: If you have an interior

1 side yard, yes, your lot is smaller, but you
2 basically can build the same size house, and you
3 would get to use the other interior side yard.
4 Right now we're penalizing people for being adjacent
5 to a roadway.

6 MS. JOHNSON: Although you can't build as
7 close to the exterior side setback, the house
8 itself.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. A fair
10 recommendation, Russ. Thanks.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Would anybody
12 like to make a motion?

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: To close the public
14 hearing.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I move we close the
17 public hearing.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

20 (Ayes heard.)

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Then we move right
22 to Item No. 7 on our agenda, and we've had the
23 discussion on the permitted use of the signs, and I
24 think we could take a motion. Who would like to do

1 that?

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Me?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah. Would you
4 make that motion.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. I'd like to make a
6 motion to the General Amendment recommendation for
7 approval for Chapter 17.22, General Provisions,
8 Section 17.22-030, Permitted Encroachments, and
9 Chapter 17.30, Definitions, Section 17.30.030,
10 General Definitions, yard encroachments for pergolas
11 and sports courts. With the additional -- and I'm
12 just going to defer to staff. Russ, could you
13 describe that once again.

14 MR. COLBY: Yes. What's permitted for open
15 and unenclosed porches is an 8-foot encroachment
16 into the front exterior side yard.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: As he said.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So to include the --

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Pergolas.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To include the same
21 provision that we use for open porches for pergolas.
22 Okay.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a question for
24 you, Russ. When you're talking about the porch as

1 it exists now, can a porch extend the complete
2 length of the building on the exterior side?

3 MR. COLBY: Yes, yes, it can.

4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It can go all the way
5 to the back.

6 MR. COLBY: As long as it doesn't extend
7 anymore than 8 feet into the yard towards the
8 street.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. We have a
10 motion. Is there a second?

11 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.
13 Holderfield.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

20 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

2 All right. That concludes Item No. 7.

3 No. 8 is additional business for Plan

4 Commission members or staff.

5 Russ, you were going to give us an update on
6 the signage that came up at our last meeting.

7 MR. COLBY: Yes. I don't have any new
8 information.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I do. They
10 have moved the truck so that it's parked properly in
11 the parking stall, although it's in the same spot,
12 and they have removed the spotlights. And
13 technically, they're within the ordinance by leaving
14 the truck there as long as they move it once every
15 24 hours, I believe.

16 MR. COLBY: I don't remember exactly.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Any other
18 business?

19 (No response.)

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. The
21 weekly development report looks good. That's a very
22 helpful tool, by the way. I like that very much.
23 Thank you for that.

24 Meeting announcements, we have meetings on

1 April 10, next Monday, our joint meeting with the
2 Planning and Development Committee of the City
3 Council.

4 MR. COLBY: Yes. Is there anyone that
5 cannot attend that meeting?

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: The one on April 10th?

7 MR. COLBY: Correct.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah. I can't.

9 MR. COLBY: You can or cannot.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Cannot.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Where is that going to
13 be held?

14 MR. COLBY: We have listed here on the
15 council committee room. I'm not sure. It's either
16 the council committee room or A and B, one of the
17 meeting rooms there.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. And then
19 Tuesday, April 8th -- the 18th, I'm sorry. It
20 should be April 18th, May 2nd, May 16th.

21 Anyone know if they cannot attend those
22 meetings? Okay.

23 And then the Planning and Development
24 Committee meeting which follows the joint meeting,

1 and the next one will be on the 8th.

2 All right. Public comment? No public, so
3 there's no comment.

4 All right. I'll take a motion to adjourn.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I motion we close the
6 meeting.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: Second.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor?

9 (Ayes heard.)

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This meeting of the
11 St. Charles Plan Commission is closed at 7:44.

12 (Off the record at 7:44 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 6th day of April, 2017.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois