

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2017**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Tim Kessler
James Holderfield
Tom Schuetz
Peter Vargulich
Tom Pretz
Jeff Funke

Members Absent: Laura Macklin-Purdy
Dan Frio

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Dev.
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 April 18, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

4. Generation Rescue (Tyler & 64 Business Park PUD) (Vincent Fiore)

Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the Application for PUD Preliminary Plan for Generation Rescue (Tyler & 64 Business Park PUD).

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Funke, Pretz, Wallace, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Frio, Purdy

Motion carried: 7-0

5. Appeal of Administrative Design Review Decision – 828 S. 3rd Street (Clark Evans)

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

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to continue the item to the Plan Commission meeting on May 16, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. based on the comments contained in the record.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Schuetz, Vargulich, Pretz, Kessler, Wallace, Funke

Nays:

Absent: Frio, Purdy

Motion carried: 7-0

6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

7. Weekly Development Report

8. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

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

Tuesday, June 6, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, June 20, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

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

Monday, June 12, 2017 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment at 8:26PM



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

Transcript of Generation Rescue

Date: May 2, 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: :
Generation Rescue :
(Tyler & 64 Business Park PUD) :
Application for PUD :
Preliminary Plan. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, May 2, 2017
7:04 p.m.

Job No.: 126918
Pages: 1 - 11
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Transcript of Generation Rescue
Conducted on May 2, 2017

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 Generation Rescue
Conducted on May 2, 2017

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 TOM PRETZ, Member

7 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

8 PETER VARGULICH, Member

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

12 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

13 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

14 Development Director

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Generation Rescue
Conducted on May 2, 2017

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Presentation
of the minutes of the April 18th, 2017, meeting. Is
there a motion for approval?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded. All
in favor.

1 (Ayes heard.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes.

5 Item No. 4 on the agenda is Generation Rescue
6 (Tyler & 64 Business Park PUD) (Vincent Fiore),
7 application for PUD Preliminary Plan.

8 MS. JOHNSON: This project is proposed at
9 the Tyler & 64 Business Park PUD. It's proposed on
10 Lot 2. There's a portion of Lot 2 that's a building
11 pad that has yet to be developed. So the proposal
12 is to develop the remaining building pad with a
13 clinic for Generation Rescue, which is a nonprofit
14 organization. The proposal is to construct a one-
15 story 5100-square-foot building. Approval of a new
16 PUD preliminary plan for the site is required because
17 the plan is a little bit different than originally
18 planned under the PUD ordinance.

19 The plans have been submitted, including site
20 plan, architectural elevations, and landscape plan.
21 Staff reviewed these materials and found them to be
22 in compliance with the PUD ordinance and the zoning
23 ordinance.

24 The applicant is here in case there are any

1 questions on the use or anything outside of the
2 staff report.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Plan Commission,
4 questions?

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I read -- I thought there
6 were some questions on parking. Did I read that wrong?

7 MS. JOHNSON: The parking we have analyzed,
8 and we've found that there is adequate parking for
9 the site.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Thanks.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does the applicant have
12 anything? You don't have to.

13 MR. FIORE: I'm here to address any questions
14 you might have.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: I have a question regarding
16 the trash enclosure. Does that handle both the
17 daycare center and this new facility?

18 MR. FIORE: That is the planned intent, yes.
19 We're going to be sharing the facility.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: And how many yard dumpsters
21 do you have in there? Do you know?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you wouldn't mind just
23 coming up to the lectern.

24 MR. FIORE: Vincent Fiore, general contractor.

1 As far as I know, there's two. I think they're
2 five-yard.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It seems minor but when
4 I read the report, there was some concern about the
5 difference in windows from the line elevations and
6 the renderings. Which way are we going? Are you
7 going to go with three-pad in the upper part of
8 double-hung?

9 MR. FIORE: The windows are to be double-hung.
10 The architectural plans don't show any grills,
11 mullions, however you define them. The rendering
12 does show that. That was just to give the ownership
13 the concept. We are not going to use the grills or
14 mullions, however you describe it.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I suppose that's not an
16 issue then. I just saw that.

17 MR. FIORE: I'm glad you brought it up.
18 Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Staff made a comment
20 regarding the turf grass in the portion of the lot
21 that's not going to be built on. Did you --

22 MR. FIORE: We will address that. We'll seed.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You will do what?

24 MR. FIORE: We'll seed.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Then they also
2 commented on the brick color in the rendering not
3 matching the existing buildings in the PUD, and I
4 can go on record as saying it doesn't bother me.

5 MR. FIORE: The renderings are very accurate
6 as to the depiction of the color scheme. We're open
7 to suggestions but that's the avenue we'd like to
8 pursue.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: If they have to build
10 parking, has it been identified what will trigger
11 that other than if they build out the basement area?

12 MS. JOHNSON: Well, if -- so parking within
13 the business park is shared among the uses. So
14 right now with the proposed use and considering the
15 other uses in the other buildings there's four excess
16 parking spaces. But if other uses in the other
17 buildings go to a use that has a higher parking
18 requirement, and at that point if further parking is
19 needed, then there's an opportunity to build that
20 parking on the remainder of this lot.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: So who will be responsible
22 to build it?

23 MS. JOHNSON: I believe it would be the
24 manager, the owner of the business park because it's

Transcript of Generation Rescue

Conducted on May 2, 2017

9

1 under common ownership, the two office buildings and
2 those are under common ownership.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: So that's per the PUD
4 agreement?

5 MS. JOHNSON: Per the PUD, the parking was
6 to be shared, yes.

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: As far as getting the
8 trigger to get it built, that's per the agreement.

9 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. If the ownership wanted
10 to allow those more parking intensive uses in the
11 park, then they need to build the parking.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: How many spaces can they
13 fit in there?

14 MS. JOHNSON: I think it's a 22-spot lot.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
17 else? All right. If there's nothing else, then a
18 motion would be in order.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a motion
20 that we recommend approval of the PUD preliminary
21 plan -- let me get to my note here. One second,
22 please.

23 Recommend approval of the Generation Rescue
24 (Tyler & 64 Business Park PUD) application for PUD

Transcript of Generation Rescue
Conducted on May 2, 2017

10

1 preliminary plan.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
4 discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes
21 unanimously and that concludes Item 4 on our agenda.

22 MR. FIORE: Thank you.

23 (Off the record at 7:10 p.m.)

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 8th day of May, 2017.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Appeal of Administrative Design Review Decision

Date: May 2, 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: :
Appeal of Administrative :
Design Review Decision - :
828 South 3rd Street. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, May 2, 2017
7:11 p.m.

Job No.: 126918
Pages: 1 - 59
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

Transcript of Appeal of Administrative Design Review Decision
Conducted on May 2, 2017

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 TOM PRETZ, Member

7 TOM SCHUETZ, Member

8 PETER VARGULICH, Member

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

12 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

13 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

14 Development Director

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item No. 5 is Appeal of
3 Administrative Design Review Decision for
4 828 South 3rd Street (Clark Evans).

5 Before we go forward on this, I would like to
6 provide some explanation because the Plan Commission --
7 well, it's been a long time since we have heard one.
8 But the way that our City code is set up, if there
9 is an administrative decision that is made by the
10 director of community development and the applicant
11 does not agree with that decision, the applicant has
12 the right to appeal the decision.

13 Those decisions are heard by the Plan
14 Commission, and the Plan Commission has the ability
15 to either affirm the decision or reverse the decision
16 in whole or in part, or we can modify the
17 administrative decision.

18 The decision is -- will be based on documents
19 provided relating to the administrative decision and
20 any testimony that is presented here at the hearing.

21 The Plan Commission's decision is final.
22 This does not go to the City Council.

23 So what we have before us was a decision --
24 and maybe I can -- I'll defer to staff and you can

1 let them know what the decision was, please.

2 MS. JOHNSON: Sure. I'll provide a little
3 background on the proposal.

4 So the applicant Clark Evans has applied for
5 a building permit to construct a single-family home
6 at the property at 828 South 3rd Street, which is a
7 vacant lot. The property is located in an RT,
8 traditional residential zoning district, which means
9 that the property is subject to design review.
10 Design review is an administrative staff-level process
11 meant to ensure that new development is harmonious
12 and compatible with the neighborhood. So staff
13 conducted design review of the proposed structure to
14 determine compliance with the design review standards
15 and guidelines applicable to the RT zoning district.

16 The proposed structure is constructed of
17 shipping containers, and the modern design is not
18 common in St. Charles in our older neighborhoods.
19 So staff provided the applicant with comments on how
20 the plan should be modified in order to comply with
21 the design standards, and our comments are provided
22 in the memo dated March 15th which is in your packet.

23 The one standard that staff believes is not
24 being met by the proposal is the standard related to

1 360-degree architecture, which states that 360-degree
2 architecture is required, meaning that facades must
3 be designed to be viewed from all directions. So
4 staff provided some comments on changes that we
5 believe could be made to the structure in order to
6 meet that standard.

7 So the applicant has not changed the plans
8 to comply with the suggested modifications to meet
9 that design standard, and they have requested an
10 appeal of the administrative design review decision
11 regarding staff's determination that the plan did
12 not comply with that design standard.

13 The applicant is here tonight, as well, to
14 provide some background on the proposal and maybe go
15 through the design, too, if that would be helpful
16 for the Commission.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That would be.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And since this is
19 somewhat of a quasi-judicial process that we're
20 going through here tonight, I think that anyone who
21 is giving any testimony should be sworn.

22 And, also, I would ask that anyone who
23 speaks please identify who you are, first of all, if
24 you wish to speak by raising your hand, being

1 recognized, and coming up to the lectern, stating
2 your name, spelling your last name and your address.
3 And, also, members of the Plan Commission, if you
4 could wait to be recognized before speaking, I just
5 want to make sure that we have an accurate record of
6 the proceedings.

7 So at this time anyone who wishes to offer
8 any testimony, or ask any questions, or make any
9 comments, I would swear you in if you'd raise your
10 right hands.

11 (Witnesses sworn.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

13 And so the -- I guess this is the
14 applicant's case. So go ahead.

15 MR. EVANS: Good evening everyone. My name
16 is Clark Evans. I reside at 2640 Lorraine Circle in
17 Geneva, Illinois. I'm the project manager for
18 group3 Construction and here tonight to talk to you
19 about 828 South 3rd Street, also known as Super Bad.
20 Now, we call it Super Bad -- well, we think it's
21 super but it leaves a bad taste in our mouth. We've
22 been working on this house for about 2, 2 1/2 years.

23 These containers, as you see in the
24 rendering, there's four on the first floor; there's

1 three on the second floor. These containers are
2 called high cubes. They're 9 foot 6 tall, 8 foot wide
3 and 40 feet long. These containers roughly weigh
4 around 6,000 pounds and can hold up to 60,000 pounds.

5 As we've all seen on TV, these containers are
6 supposed to be stacked upon one another approximately
7 12 to 15 high. Given that, the weight that these
8 containers can hold is 340 tons. So, in essence,
9 you guys are looking at probably the strongest
10 structure residentially, if not commercially for
11 most of your commercial buildings.

12 The containers themselves have 8- to 10-gauge
13 steel on the sides -- side walls and a marine-grade
14 plywood which is rot free and resistant to humidity.
15 That comes in about inch and a quarter I believe,
16 which is nearly twice the size of a typical plywood
17 floor in a residential home.

18 Below the marine-grade plywood you will see
19 12-inch-on-center steel C channels which are holding
20 up the structure internally. The shelf life of a
21 container, shipping container in use -- meaning it
22 has to be water- and wind-tight -- is 30 years.
23 Now, 30 years doesn't seem like a very long time,
24 but 30 years out to sea, 30 years of 340 tons of

1 weight on it, offloading and unloading, being stored
2 with pianos, transporting, you know, shoes, slate,
3 cars, it's taking a lot of abuse.

4 The containers we're proposing for this lot
5 are new. So there won't be any scratches; there won't
6 be any dents. The container itself is made out of
7 corten steel. I know we are going to paint our home,
8 but technically you wouldn't have to. Corten steel
9 is what you'll find in bridges with exposed steel.
10 What it's supposed to do is provide a patina of rust
11 which combats further corrosion and extends the life
12 of the steel by hundreds of years. This house will
13 last hundreds of years.

14 The paint is not a normal paint. It's
15 automotive paint which will be done in-house at our
16 fabricator's office and site touched up in the field.

17 The home will consist of three bedrooms,
18 four bathrooms, 2400 square feet not including the
19 garage or the basement. It has a detached garage,
20 two-car, two-story. And tonight I guess the big --
21 the big deal is the 360 element around the home.

22 Now, the reason why you see in the gray --
23 well, we have three elements. We have the container
24 wall itself which is exposed to view. We also have

1 a -- in the gray rendering is Hardie board, cement
2 board, and then third, we have and we left in the
3 container doors as you can see in the front elevation.

4 Now, what we're planning on doing is --
5 speaking of the front elevation, we're planning on
6 removing one set of doors and replacing that with a
7 window, keeping the hardware as one would keep
8 shutters next to their windows.

9 The reason why you don't see the Hardie
10 board wrapping around the front of the home is we
11 just couldn't find an aesthetically pleasing way of
12 doing it without harming what is true -- in fact, it
13 is a container. We feel that by removing such
14 hardware, by removing the doors and whatnot and
15 covering it up with siding would do more harm than
16 good. I remind everyone we're building a container
17 home, so it is important to us to show everyone
18 driving by or future owners that we are living in a
19 container.

20 Now, the exterior has architectural value
21 but so does the interior. On that north elevation
22 where you see most of the Hardie board at, the
23 container wall will be visible on the inside and
24 exposed to view. So the framing, insulation and the

1 framing will be on the outside and therefore covered
2 with the Hardie board.

3 On the second floor you will see the Hardie
4 board is covering a small portion. That's because
5 it is -- the two smaller bedrooms on the second
6 floor again will have an exposed view of the wall
7 making it a container and is why you see the Hardie
8 board there. The garage, the detached garage will
9 be wrapped entirely in the same color of the Hardie
10 board that you see here as shown.

11 That being said I'm not sure what else I can
12 explain to you, but if you have any questions, I'd
13 be more than happy to answer them.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Before we begin
15 with any questions, I will just point out typically
16 the Plan Commission, when we're considering an
17 application, we're considering findings of fact, and
18 those vary from application to application.

19 In this case we are reviewing a decision,
20 and the only thing that we are really reviewing is
21 the reason for the denial of the building permit,
22 and the reason for the denial was contained in our
23 staff memo under "Standards: The following comments
24 are related to the design standards. Plans must

1 comply with the following: 360-degree architecture."

2 So I would suggest that we make as much of
3 an effort -- and this goes for the public, as well --
4 focusing on that specifically as it relates to this
5 denial.

6 So I guess I'll start with the Plan Commission.
7 Are there any questions?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, yes. I'm just
9 trying to think of what order to go in or how to
10 begin this conversation for a number of reasons.
11 And I will say, first of all, this is the first time
12 that we've had an appeal like this come before us,
13 so we're working with a specific standard here.

14 And there are a lot of -- while that in itself
15 may not be daunting, what's daunting is what's being
16 proposed. And I think we have to try really hard to
17 separate what we may think about this type of
18 construction, what we may think about how it's going
19 to be viewed and focus specifically on the standard.
20 Because I'm sure that there are people who love this
21 idea, and I'm sure there are people who hate this idea.

22 So starting with that, first of all, one of
23 the items in this 360-degree architecture design --
24 and this to me the simplest one -- the colors. Do

1 these colors represent the colors that this building
2 will be? Because I see in the memo that came after
3 your response they can't find those colors.

4 MR. EVANS: That's correct. So these colors
5 are as close as we can get in the computer. We do
6 have pictures of the color samples currently, but
7 they have not been submitted yet. We thought we
8 were able to find them online when we submitted to
9 Ellen, but we weren't able to log on. But we do
10 have other --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So staff has still
12 not seen -- is that correct?

13 MS. JOHNSON: We understand the colors shown
14 on the screen to be close to what they're proposing.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. That's
16 my first question. And I'm going to make a comment
17 with this next one, and this is regarding the
18 container doors.

19 I think that while your intent to build this
20 structure is to show that it is a container building,
21 I think everybody is going to have a real hard time
22 not knowing that even if you did remove those handles.
23 So I'm not sure that that's the hill you want to
24 die on.

1 Removing those handles wouldn't make me look
2 at that facade and see those two big doors there and
3 not think, those look like container doors. So I
4 would suggest that maybe you take that under
5 consideration.

6 The materials not being consistent on all
7 elevations tell me again why you couldn't incorporate
8 some fiber cement element. I mean, it's going to be
9 obvious that these are shipping containers. Anybody
10 who has driven on a highway, or done any traveling,
11 or watched TV knows what a shipping container is. And
12 I hate using the simple word decorating, but enhancing
13 it with some element of some siding on some elevations,
14 maybe a band or maybe some sort of -- I don't know,
15 but incorporating something like that on all the
16 elevations.

17 Tell me why -- walk me through that again
18 why you couldn't do something like that.

19 MR. EVANS: Well, just looking at the
20 project itself, I'm picturing the front elevation
21 and trying to figure out -- put more siding on it
22 does not reflect an attractive home to me. I don't
23 know why having more siding on a home --

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm not talking about

1 more siding. Maybe it's not siding but coming up
2 with an element that's consistent on all four sides.
3 To me that's a design issue that doesn't detract
4 from the building.

5 MR. EVANS: The verticals -- if you want to
6 call a shipping container wall itself is, I guess
7 you could call it vertical siding, it's metal.
8 That's showing on all sides. I guess maybe it's the
9 horizontal that's at issue, but then again, mix
10 matching the horizontal and the vertical on the
11 front of a home I don't think would be esthetically
12 pleasing to anyone.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's actually a
14 good point. The material itself is -- it is a
15 material when you think about it.

16 I want to say something to you. This is not
17 that objectionable to me. I'm trying to come up with
18 some way to help -- I mean, I understand where staff
19 is coming from, and we actually -- the Plan Commission
20 actually put these guidelines and standards together
21 with the help of staff. So there's got to be some
22 middle ground that we can come to that you meet the
23 standard, and then you can go forward and yet we still
24 retain the integrity of what we worked on.

1 This is an unusual situation. So I'm asking
2 you these questions in the effort to help mitigate
3 or negotiate this thing.

4 MR. EVANS: I understand. Middle ground has
5 been my middle name lately with permit and planning.
6 We finally have approval from Tom for -- you know,
7 it meets code. A lot of negotiations back and forth,
8 a lot of above and beyond by me has been already done,
9 which is understandable. I keep on telling everyone
10 the first person to the wall gets the bloodiest. I
11 understand that.

12 As far as the planning goes, we added a
13 larger window to the north elevation to collaborate
14 with her, and the only two sticking points that I
15 have are the hardware on the doors and the additional
16 Hardie board siding on the front of the home.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I want -- I'm going
18 to just urge you to get off the Hardie board siding.
19 They are just using that as a suggestion to address
20 that particular guideline. It could be something else.
21 It could be some other way that you might suggest or
22 think of to, you know, meet that standard, to help
23 meet that standard.

24 Okay. That's all I have. Go ahead.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: I'm an architect and, actually,
2 I get excited about contemporary architecture, and I
3 applaud you for doing something different. I just --
4 I don't know if it's just the elevations. Typically
5 we work in three dimensions when we do models, and
6 we incorporate the landscaping into the architecture.
7 and that idea of 360-architecture, I agree completely
8 with that.

9 Right now I'm looking at these elevations,
10 and it looks like exactly what it is; it looks like
11 you have stacked containers. I think there should
12 be some more thought put into these containers. I
13 like the idea but when I -- when I look at the
14 imagery of container homes on the Internet, I see a
15 lot of great designs and great architecture where
16 the architects are playing with the forms, or
17 creating shadows, or creating, you know, artwork
18 with the containers.

19 That being said I think -- I still think you
20 have some work here, and I think you should look at
21 this -- it's a great idea but I think you should
22 look at it as a piece of art is what it is, and right
23 now I'm just seeing stacked containers.

24 Maybe that's your plan, but the way the

1 materials wrap around the building, I think that
2 needs to be studied, and you should do that in a
3 three-dimensional program or something or a
4 perspective to show how the material wraps around
5 and how it continues around it and how the
6 fenestration relates to each other around the
7 building.

8 And then the relationship of the front
9 building to the rear, you know, right now I'm
10 concerned that the garage is too tall. You're going
11 to have these two opposing buildings, and you're not
12 going to know which one -- from a drive-by they're
13 going to look like they're competing. They're not
14 going to know it's a garage or -- is it supposed to
15 be a garage or -- what's the space above of the
16 garage? Is that going to be a storage space or --

17 MR. EVANS: Storage space. I got a funny
18 feeling if someone is driving by they'd be more
19 interested in a container home than they would be in
20 a garage.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: You're on an alley.

22 MR. EVANS: That's right.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: You're having these two
24 buildings compete with each other. You're saying

1 it's all wrapped in Hardie board?

2 MR. EVANS: The garage.

3 MEMBER FUNKE: They're going to be talking
4 to each other, and in my mind it's an important
5 dialogue. And I think it needs to be looked at, it
6 needs to be studied. These buildings are -- I know
7 it's just a garage, but you're on an alley, and that
8 in my mind is similar to a corner.

9 So that being said I think it needs -- I like
10 the idea. I applaud you for being different, but I
11 just think that your architects still need to do
12 some design work on it.

13 MR. EVANS: Well, you know, there is --
14 there is a budget to this project and the more
15 artsy-fartsy you get with these homes, the more
16 expensive and increased cost they have structurally.
17 As you can imagine, taking down a wall is not
18 inclusive to the design and takes a lot of structure
19 to support those things. So the more we tamper with
20 the container itself, the cost gets to be unreachable,
21 and we need this project to be within reach; we need
22 the project to be in budget for the owner, for the
23 future owner, if it be me or someone else.

24 Now, as far as being more artsy-fartsy, I

1 just -- I struggle with that because it's a home
2 which is across the street from what is -- looks
3 like to be a boarded-up garage which is kitty-corner
4 to a cookie mart, which is next a doctor's office.
5 Third Street is an eclectic group of homes anyway.
6 There's some multifamily in one or two buildings;
7 there's a couple bungalows, a couple cottagey-type
8 homes, midcentury modern ranch-style homes. I just
9 don't see how my home could be held to a different
10 viewpoint than the rest of the neighborhood. That's
11 all. That's my answer to that question, I suppose.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other questions?

13 MR. EVANS: You're correct, though, they can
14 go really -- we think this is a very nice home, and
15 I'm sure you do, too, but the more artsy you get
16 with this just the more unrealistic and the more
17 problems we run into structurally.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: But this is a container. So
19 structurally -- it's structurally stable.

20 MR. EVANS: That's correct.

21 MEMBER FUNKE: The idea of cantilevering the
22 top box, and turning it, and creating a dynamic
23 display of boxes, I'm an architect so I don't --

24 MR. EVANS: If we had more room for the

1 property, we would love to go opposite directions,
2 you know, perpendicular to one another, but we just
3 don't have that room.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: You have a long property,
5 though. I mean, it's pretty long.

6 MR. EVANS: It is long.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: And what you're doing is
8 you're -- it seems like there's no thought to the
9 garage in back; it's a box; it's a two-story box.

10 MR. EVANS: The garage.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom?

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I love your courage, and
14 your being different here, and your contemporariness
15 here, but I guess what I'm struggling with is, what
16 is your goal here? To be as contemporary as
17 possible? That's what I'm struggling with.

18 MR. EVANS: Well, our goal is to be different
19 from everyone else. There isn't a container home
20 anywhere around here obviously. There are a few of
21 them in the Midwest, just a few of them on the West
22 Coast. They go crazy for this in Europe. I'm sure
23 most of you guys already know that.

24 So our intent was to build a business model

1 on something that's different. Google was different,
2 right? This building is different. So we wanted to
3 be different.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So have you designed and
5 built something similar to this in another community?

6 MR. EVANS: No. This would be the only one.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Thank you.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a question in
9 regard -- I'm very impressed by this. But one thing,
10 where do you put the price range for this house just
11 in broad terms? What are we talking about?

12 MR. EVANS: Well, I think obviously that
13 conversation has been had many times. Probably
14 around the 600,000, 615,000. The interior is -- you
15 know, the first floor will have 10-foot ceilings;
16 the second floor will have 9-foot-6 ceilings with
17 the containers exposed.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any or questions from the
19 Plan Commission?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then I'll ask
22 if any member of the public has questions.

23 Ma'am, if you can come up.

24 MS. HILL: A question or comment?

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's fine.

2 MS. HILL: My name is Mary Hill. I live
3 1003 South 4th Street in the area. I am not a
4 planner; I'm not an architect. I came here trying
5 to be respectful to the creator of this house, but
6 my objection as a simple citizen is just that it
7 does not fit in with our area, and I feel that your
8 comments about my neighborhood were a little
9 demeaning.

10 Over the years that I've lived in our
11 neighborhood, I have seen it improve, actually, in a
12 lot of ways. In many, many ways there have been
13 improvements made to the neighborhood that have made
14 it look nicer and nicer. I feel this is a container
15 home. It's sort of like a trailer home in a sense,
16 and it does not fit in with the other houses that
17 are around it.

18 And to me as a property owner, that is a
19 concern because I think of my property value. Whereas,
20 some people may feel it's artistic, and creative,
21 and groundbreaking, to me I just think not fitting
22 in with everything else, not necessarily something
23 that will make -- bring value to the neighborhood.

24 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, ma'am.

2 MS. FORTUNATO: Pardon me. I was being a
3 little pushy because my poor husband is wrangling
4 our son out in the hall, so I feel like I want to
5 get out of here.

6 But my name is Dana Fortunato,
7 F-o-r-t-u-n-a-t-o, and my husband Nate Lanthrum and
8 I live at 905 South 3rd Street which is across the
9 street directly and then one unit to the south from
10 this location. We purchased our home in June of
11 2015. I'm also here representing my sister-in-law
12 and brother-in-law who just had a baby yesterday, so
13 they're in the hospital but they wanted to be here
14 and express their support.

15 We are -- let me say I'm a lawyer, and I
16 understand how the appeals process goes. So I know
17 there's not any findings of fact at this time, but
18 if we're making a record, I wanted to voice our
19 support in favor of it, of the concept. I'm not a
20 real estate attorney. I am a criminal court trial
21 attorney, so I negotiate all day, and it sounds like
22 there might need to be more negotiations done, but
23 my instant reaction was to contact a real estate
24 attorney to ask him his opinion. I sent him the

1 plans that we found that were filed, and his opinion
2 was that he had no problem with it at all; it didn't
3 look substandard. He wasn't commenting on the
4 stylistic elements, but he wasn't concerned about
5 the value that it might have on our home necessarily.
6 I trust him because he was the former president of
7 the Illinois Real Estate Association and also
8 because he's my father.

9 So we wanted to say that we were in favor of
10 it. I know that there were some objections that
11 it's not harmonious because it's not the same. That's
12 actually not the definition of harmony. Harmony is
13 when things flow together. So we think that this is
14 modern. We live in a 115-year-old house. We love
15 the classic style, but I love this, too. So I
16 wanted to get the opportunity to make those comments.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

18 Any other questions, comments? Ma'am.

19 MS. J. STOPKA: I'm Jackie Stopka,
20 S-t-o-p-k-a, and I'm directly kitty-corner from
21 this. I would be looking right there. When I look
22 out my front door there's all traditional
23 residential homes, all of them. Nothing looks like
24 that. That does not fit in our neighborhood.

1 I'm looking into the zoning that you guys
2 all created. We have "Standards and Guidelines for
3 Site Layout and Context: To be compatible with the
4 neighboring properties." No.

5 Roofs. Put a roof on it to blend with the
6 roof forms throughout the neighborhood. There's no
7 roof. It's flat.

8 "Architectural Details: To compliment the
9 traditional building styles around the neighborhood."
10 It does not.

11 "Use of masonry should be consistent on all
12 sides." It is not.

13 Do you want me to keep going?

14 He even admitted in our traditional -- RT-2
15 traditional single-family home zoned area this is a
16 modern design and it does not fit.

17 What else have I got? I've gone through the
18 whole thing and highlighted whatever is not going
19 to work.

20 Last year we put a porch on our front.
21 Because 3rd Street -- even the mailman, his wife
22 loves our street. Because even though it may not be
23 the perfect street, we have people who love this
24 route from Geneva into St. Charles because these

1 homes are all kept up so well, they're all historical
2 looking; they are all very nice designs. And now we
3 would have something made out of glorified garbage
4 cans; I do not think it matches at all in the
5 neighborhood.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
7 Any other questions, comments?

8 MR. EVANS: Can I respond to --

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you'd like to.

10 MR. EVANS: I guess I'll wait for everyone
11 else first.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Ma'am, back here.

13 MS. D. STOPKA: My name is Diane Stopka. I
14 live at 901 South 3rd Street, and my sister and I
15 have lived there almost 20 years, born and raised
16 here in St. Charles at Delnor Hospital.

17 When this was proposed, when we heard about
18 this last week, we were just like floored, couldn't
19 believe that this was going to be put outside our
20 front door. And like my sister had said, we just
21 put a porch on our house. We want to sit out there
22 and enjoy the nice homes that are in our neighborhood,
23 but I cannot see sitting out there and looking at
24 this home.

1 It's a nice home but I think it belongs in
2 another area, not downtown -- or on 3rd Street in
3 St. Charles because it's a main route in between
4 St. Charles and Geneva. And I just feel myself
5 personally that I would not want to look at that
6 every day because it does not fit in with the
7 architecture of the neighborhood. Everybody else,
8 they're trying to improve their homes.

9 I don't mean to bore you, but that's my
10 thought, and I hope you take it into consideration.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
13 Ma'am.

14 MS. IAVARONE: Good evening. My name is
15 Carmela Iavarone, I-a-v-a-r-o-n-e. I've been a
16 resident of St. Charles for about 18 years now.

17 I do have a question, and I don't know why
18 no one has asked this, but is this home by any
19 chance -- is this home energy efficient? It seems
20 like it has more structural value than my home that
21 is built with wood.

22 MR. EVANS: Correct. It is energy
23 efficient.

24 MS. IAVARONE: Okay. When I saw this, the

1 first thing that came to mind is, yes, I understand
2 in some regard people have a hard time with change.
3 But the world is changing, and pretty soon I'm going
4 to guess if we say no to this, we're going to start
5 saying no to solar panels on our roofs. Things are
6 changing and it is going more environmental.

7 And in my opinion this home is sturdier than
8 my current home the way it's going to be built. I
9 get the aesthetics could be somewhat of an issue,
10 but then again, price point also has to be considered.

11 This is not going into a high-end neighborhood.
12 This is going into a medium- to low-end neighborhood.

13 I get that they may not like it, but
14 St. Charles has an opportunity as I see it to be on
15 the cutting edge, as we've been with other things,
16 to be noticed and notable with something like this.
17 This to me is not anywhere near a trailer home. If
18 you've ever been in a trailer park, this is not a
19 trailer home.

20 I've lived all throughout this country,
21 East Coast, West Coast, south, to here, and in my
22 opinion, being well-versed in this country, I do not
23 see this as a bad thing, and I think it really needs
24 to be considered as an opportunity for this town to

1 have something innovative that's going to stand out
2 not just in our town but probably in our country.
3 Because this is what's coming, and it's going to
4 keep coming, and whether we turn it down doesn't
5 stop this from happening. I'd rather be part of it
6 than not part of it. And that's all I have to say.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

9 Any other comments or questions?

10 Oh, yes, sir. Sorry.

11 MR. GRISHAM: My name is Tom Grisham. I
12 live at 935 South 3rd Street, G-r-i-s-h-a-m. My
13 wife and I have lived in St. Charles for over 35 years
14 on 3rd Street and found it to be a great place to
15 raise kids. But as an engineer and being involved
16 in certain things, I think one of the things you
17 start with is a concept, which this is a good
18 concept. And if you look on the Internet at any
19 time what you will find is in the woods, by the
20 lake, by itself, and they are relatively inexpensive
21 when they quote their prices, below 100,000.
22 \$650,000 seems to be too much for this.

23 I do belong to various engineering societies.

24 I may have misunderstood what he said about corten

1 steel. Corten steel is special. It is used for
2 high-voltage electric lines and towers and it rusts.
3 There have been failures of corten towers in less
4 than 10 years. They are getting better at that, but
5 I don't think -- I think his comment was it will
6 last hundreds of years. I don't know that that's
7 truly the case.

8 There may be some other technical issues
9 beside the esthetics that need to be looked at.

10 Thank you for your time.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

12 Sir.

13 MR. NAGY: My name is Warren Nagy, N-a-g-y;
14 I live at 928 South 3rd Street. I've lived there
15 for about 30 years.

16 As much as I think this is a neat idea, I
17 don't think it belongs in that area. It's filled
18 with 100-year-old homes of similar architecture.
19 Just recently there was a home that was built on
20 2nd Street where there was an older home that was
21 demolished, and a new home was built, and indeed
22 that home matched the architecture of the
23 surrounding area.

24 I think that overall St. Charles has done an

1 excellent job with its comprehensive plan and making
2 sure that there's divisions between multifamily, and
3 commercial, and single-family and that we have
4 planned -- esthetically everything is cohesive.

5 I think we need to look at neighborhoods as
6 being similar to decorating interiors of homes and
7 things like that and that it has character. You may
8 have a design inside your home that -- you may have
9 individual rooms that have maybe Native American or
10 Oriental, but you're not going to mix those two in
11 the same room. And I think that in a neighborhood
12 it's a similar kind of concept that the neighborhoods
13 have character, they have a theme, and I don't
14 believe that this structure is cohesive with that
15 theme, with the character of the neighborhood.

16 I like the idea. I think that it's innovative.
17 I think it's really neat looking. I just don't think
18 it belongs in that area. I guess that's pretty much
19 my opinion on it.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

21 I have a question for staff. Does our
22 review include only the primary structure, or does
23 the basis for denial also apply to the garage?

24 MS. JOHNSON: We conducted design review on

1 the house and the garage. We didn't offer any comments
2 to change the design of the garage, though.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So there was no objection
4 to the design of the garage?

5 MS. JOHNSON: No.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: The height.

7 MS. JOHNSON: The height is a zoning
8 requirement. An accessory structure can't be
9 20 feet in height. This one is I think about I
10 think a foot over, so they have to lower the height
11 a little bit to meet the 20-foot limit.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: They didn't object
13 to that?

14 MS. JOHNSON: They're going to meet that.
15 That's a zoning requirement that has to be met.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Based on that, although
17 we've had discussion regarding the garage, I don't
18 think that can be the basis for any type of decision
19 we render since the denial was based on issues with
20 the house, standards with the house.

21 All right. Any further questions or comments?

22 MR. EVANS: May I?

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

24 MR. EVANS: Well, I appreciate everyone's

1 concerns, and I do apologize if I offended anyone on
2 3rd Street. I didn't mean to. I was simply pointing
3 out different types of structures that are on that
4 street. So I apologize if I offended anyone on that.

5 This is something different and just because
6 it's different doesn't mean it shouldn't happen, and
7 I agree with the speaker a few speakers back that
8 eventually this is going to happen. We all know
9 it's happening on the West Coast, some on the East
10 Coast, and this so happens to be the first. So we
11 hope you guys approve everything. Thank you.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: I just have a few comments
13 regarding the issue at hand with respect to the
14 360 architecture.

15 I would agree with Jeff that I think there's
16 an opportunity to adjust the massing given the
17 containers. You have four on the bottom, three to
18 four on the top depending on how you look at the
19 second-floor plan, and I think that there's an
20 opportunity to slide them. Not -- sure, it would be
21 great if the lot was wider to be able to rotate them
22 90 degrees or something like that, but I certainly
23 think there's an opportunity to slide them. And I
24 think that given where you've applied the Hardie

1 board siding in the siding component of the design,
2 I don't see any reason why that would affect --
3 other than cost per square foot for the siding, but
4 it doesn't affect the containers because you're
5 basically applying -- it appears from the drawings
6 you're applying that to the outside of the container.
7 So it doesn't appear you're taking the walls of the
8 container apart to apply the siding. Is that correct?

9 MR. EVANS: That's correct. My objection
10 was having the siding in the front of the home.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: But I mean with respect
12 to the request by staff to follow the ordinance.
13 Independent of the overall issues of compatibility
14 with the neighborhood, but that's really not a
15 topic, I think that there's an opportunity to add
16 the siding in ways by just adjusting the massing and
17 using those offsets to help bring the siding to
18 particular end points as you slide the containers.

19 I think that the need for the materials to
20 wrap the building, I would agree, I think that
21 colorwise I think it's a little bold. I don't think
22 anybody would mistake -- if the color scheme was a
23 little more compatible with the general tones that
24 are in the neighborhood, I still think you'll

1 identify this very readily as a container without
2 the red or whatever that version of red is.

3 MR. EVANS: I really don't understand how
4 moving three containers forward or backward adds any
5 value to the home itself. It causes structural
6 problems down below on the first floor. It adds
7 cost to a building that doesn't need to be added.

8 Now, this is my first time, as well, so
9 tricking it out, so to say, wasn't my cup of tea for
10 the first one. You take smaller-sized steps.

11 At the second home in LaFox or second home
12 in St. Charles, you'll have an opportunity to do
13 such things and obviously kind of grow with it. The
14 first log cabin home didn't have four bedrooms with
15 a master bath; it was just a square. So this is our
16 beginning step, so please take that into
17 consideration.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You don't show an east
19 elevation in the color photos.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is that correct?

21 MR. EVANS: Well, the rendering is mistaken.
22 On your bottom right where it says -- the electrical
23 meter, that is the east elevation.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's the rear of

1 the building.

2 MR. EVANS: I'm sorry -- that is -- oh,
3 there is no east side. We left the east side off.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I see it below in -- on
5 the next page in the -- what would you call this? --
6 exterior elevations but it's just black and white.

7 I'm just trying to identify -- because there
8 are significantly more windows on the back; correct?

9 MR. EVANS: Correct. The master suite is
10 in back.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Got it. I'm just trying
12 to figure out what types of windows. It looks like
13 at the top we have a couple of double-hungs. On the
14 lower we have two sets of two double-hungs, a
15 sliding door, maybe a wood door.

16 MR. EVANS: That's correct.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And then at the top a
18 window similar to what we have on the south
19 elevation and on the west elevation.

20 MR. EVANS: Right. They're all overclad
21 windows.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The windows that are used
23 of the different types, are they all consistent
24 across the structure?

1 MR. EVANS: That's correct.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the hardware for the
3 doors, for the container doors, is there any function
4 to the hardware?

5 MR. EVANS: In this application, no. It's
6 for esthetics.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's fine. All right.
8 Are there other questions?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. I do want to --
10 I have to ask you again. This is a review of a
11 decision. The discussion about whether or not this
12 fits in the neighborhood or anybody agrees, if the
13 gentleman says, "I'm going to meet every objection
14 that you may have," he can build it. We're not --
15 we're past that discussion.

16 So I realize also that nobody's mind is going
17 to be changed. I mean, if you don't like it, you
18 don't like it, and if you like it, you like it, but
19 that's not why we're here.

20 There is a standard that the decision to not
21 allow it was based on, and that decision was the
22 360-degree architecture. And we're here tonight to
23 review that decision based on staff believing that
24 you don't meet that standard.

1 They have offered some suggestions, and those
2 are just suggestions, and they're not the only things
3 that you might do. So my question is, are you --
4 are you interested in taking this and considering
5 some changes to meet that 360-degree standard, or
6 are you telling us that you're just done; you're
7 done and that's it?

8 MR. EVANS: We're always open to suggestions.
9 However, when it comes to a 360-degree view, we feel
10 like we met that with what we've --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So you're --

12 MR. EVANS: I'm not -- you're looking for a
13 yes-or-no answer. And yes, we're still going to
14 move forward with this project.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you have any
16 interest in taking this back and doing some
17 consideration to that and coming back to us again?
18 Because we're at a decision point.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I think that
20 that's -- the Plan Commission at this point, we do have
21 the latitude to be able to not only confirm or reverse
22 the denial but also to suggest modifications. And we
23 also have the ability to advise the applicant -- or
24 the appellant of the conditions that would affect

1 our approval and allow him the opportunity to continue
2 this and to come back at a later date and make changes
3 or not make changes.

4 So really it's the Plan Commission's
5 prerogative I think on what direction to go as far as,
6 you know, whether we think that the 360-degree
7 architecture issue is something that supports that
8 denial or it doesn't.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: After listening to all of this,
10 I would like to see, Mr. Evans -- this is just a
11 comment. I would like to see Mr. Evans go back to
12 his design people, see what they can come up with as
13 far as meeting that 360-degree architecture, and
14 then come back to us with his new recommendations.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a procedural question
16 that, Rita, maybe you can answer. If we were to
17 take a vote and affirm the denial, would he have the
18 ability to appeal -- to basically make a motion for
19 reconsideration with new evidence, to change his
20 plan and come back to us?

21 MS. TUNGARE: If I may have a second just to
22 review the procedure, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Because I don't -- the
24 last thing that I want is if this is something that

1 can be resolved by our action tonight that's agreeable
2 to you, then what's the point in spending additional
3 time, you know, going back and having you do things.
4 I think at the very least we need to determine if
5 the Plan Commission thinks that the denial was
6 appropriate.

7 I guess the question is, does he just have
8 one bite at the apple? I know in Illinois under our
9 Rules of Civil Procedure you have 30 days to bring a
10 motion, and I think that we most likely -- absent
11 anything to the contrary, if we want to -- if that's
12 what we end up deciding in affirming the denial, I
13 think we could also put in our decision that he has
14 a certain amount of time to file a motion to
15 reconsider.

16 MS. TUNGARE: So, Mr. Chairman, here's our
17 interpretation of the procedure. It would be
18 advisable for the Plan Commission to give the
19 applicant clear direction on whether you wish to
20 affirm or reverse staff's interpretation and then
21 give the applicant an opportunity to respond if they
22 wish to come back for further deliberation.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

24 MS. TUNGARE: So I would suggest we get some

1 clear direction on that in terms of which direction
2 the Plan Commission is leaning toward and confirm
3 with the applicant if they wish to come back with
4 more information.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: My question would be then,
6 coming back would be coming back to the Plan
7 Commission?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes. City Council
9 doesn't have any standing here.

10 MS. TUNGARE: The City Council does not have
11 any standing here. The applicant would present the
12 information to staff. Staff can conduct a review
13 and provide some information to the Plan Commission
14 for consideration.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So I guess my thought on
16 this would be for the Plan Commission to basically
17 enter the jury stage of this and kind of caucus and
18 discuss whether -- what the feelings are on whether
19 this does or does not meet the design standards.

20 I mean, I'll just -- I'll start off the
21 discussion if that's okay. Even if it's not, I
22 still will.

23 You know, part of the reason why I asked
24 questions regarding the rear elevation was because I

1 think that the -- when we do talk about materials
2 being consistent, I think that does -- that doesn't --
3 in my mind it doesn't necessarily mean that we have
4 to have the same material repeating on all four sides
5 of the structure because I know that if you drive
6 around town, especially in newer subdivisions, there
7 are a lot of front facades that don't necessarily
8 match what's on the back. Does that mean that they're
9 in violation of that standard? I don't believe so.

10 I do think that there is some consistency in
11 the eccentricity of the way that it's designed. And
12 I'm just going down through the 360-degree
13 architecture points.

14 The window openings and panes, my take on it
15 is I don't see that they're not balanced. I do know
16 that a variety of window types and sizes are proposed,
17 but it's not trying to be a home where a window --
18 where that consistency belongs. It's appropriate to
19 the -- people who are professionals on this can
20 comment more on it.

21 But the shipping container doors, I understand
22 the intent to make a statement here. As far as the
23 container doors and the handles and hardware, I
24 think that if you built this without the handles and

1 hardware and received an occupancy permit and added
2 them later, I don't really know that there's anything
3 the City could do about it. It would be like me
4 putting something on the front -- you know, putting
5 a container door in on the front of my house. I
6 don't really know that there's any type of an
7 enforcement or mechanism the City could use to get
8 me to remove it.

9 And I don't really think that D is an issue.
10 So I guess I'll open it up for other comments.

11 Jim.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: My comment is that
13 because this is a modern design, I don't think it
14 has to meet the 360-degree elevational. As you were
15 saying before, that is more of a traditional, where
16 this is a modern approach.

17 I think the fenestration also is modern, and
18 it doesn't apply to the traditional where you have
19 balance around the house. So I have no problem
20 on that.

21 So I agree with your point here in that to
22 me the 360 doesn't apply to this.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'll go next. As far as
24 the 360, I do think this is fine. My home is not

1 360. Our homes are 21 years old, and in our entire
2 neighborhood there's not 360. We do have facades on
3 the front, but then many people, including myself,
4 have added things on the side and in the back.

5 So I think -- I never had a problem with the
6 360 myself. I think it's fine. I agree exactly
7 with what Todd's been saying.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Where is the architect that
9 designed the home? Is he here?

10 MR. EVANS: No, he's not here.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Why isn't he here to explain
12 his design?

13 MR. EVANS: I didn't ask him to be here.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: I heard the comments from the
15 people coming up, and my point is I think you have a
16 great opportunity here; I appreciate the fact that
17 you're being different; I just think that, you know,
18 Mies van der Rohe, Frank Lloyd Wright, when they
19 come up with their -- Louis Sullivan -- when they
20 came up with a design that was different, they
21 thought about it; they had an idea behind it. I'm
22 disappointed that the architect is not here to
23 describe his thoughts.

24 I think the interior plan, looking at it, it

1 looks great. I mean, it's going to be a beautiful
2 space. The exterior I have a hard time with.
3 You've got great ideas here. I just think that you
4 need to take it to another level, and you need to
5 show it all.

6 I applaud you to do something different,
7 but I don't want this house to look like stacked
8 containers in 5 years, 10 years. If you do bad modern
9 architecture, it's going to look bad in 10 years.
10 It's true. If you go downtown in the city, people
11 that are doing great modern architecture, it stands
12 the test of time. The people that are doing bad
13 modern architecture, it looks like bad modern
14 architecture after 5 years.

15 So with that being said I think that you
16 need to think about the design a little bit more. I
17 would appreciate if the architect was here to get
18 his philosophy of why he made the decisions he did.

19 I looked at the plan it relationship to the
20 outside and it's getting there. The interior is
21 very functional, it's very open on the first floor,
22 and you've got some great opportunity there. I'm
23 not there yet for the exterior.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jeff, which of the design

1 standards do you think that it doesn't meet
2 specifically, the 360-degree architecture?

3 MEMBER FUNKE: I just think that if you were
4 to model this building in three dimensions, you're
5 going to see that it becomes very flat. On the
6 south elevation you put a piece of Hardie board, and
7 how does that wrap that corner?

8 So if you're looking on the front elevation,
9 west elevation, you know, you're going to see a change
10 in materials, but it's not really wrapping around the
11 corner. So the idea of wrapping around the corner --
12 I think materials need to wrap around the corner.
13 Especially in modern architecture materials wrap
14 around the corner.

15 Right now you're literally looking at it in
16 two dimensions, and you're presenting it in
17 two dimensions, and I think it's hurting you.

18 Does that answer that question?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I do applaud you for doing
21 something different. This is going to be the first
22 of its kind, so why not do something great. You can
23 still do it under budget.

24 MR. EVANS: Yes, you can do it under budget,

1 but sacrifices have to be made internally to the
2 home which we're not prepared to make.

3 Our earlier designs did have the front of
4 the house sticking out, and the rear of the home is
5 where the master is, and we were planning on having
6 a master deck out there and all that stuff but
7 couldn't get that into the budget, so we condensed.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think the portion that
9 has been talked about is specifically regarding
10 materials on the exterior of the house because
11 that's the portion that's within -- I mean, that was
12 part of the reason for denial was the materials.
13 And I'm not advocating any specific position, but I
14 am saying that, you know, if Plan Commission feels
15 that that's the issue, then I think he needs to know
16 that that could be something that would change the
17 position.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I don't want
19 to go off course here, and I want to make sure that
20 we stay focused on the purpose of our discussion
21 right this minute is to give the applicant -- the
22 appellant -- he's not presenting a plan to us for
23 approval. He's coming to us so that we can make a
24 decision based on the denial because of the standard.

1 I think what we're trying to let him know is
2 if we believe that that standard stands and if that
3 is -- if we agree that it should be denied based on
4 that standard. We're not going to vote on it, but
5 if he knows that and he knows that he could perhaps
6 come back to us with some other design that would
7 meet that standard, then we want to give him that
8 opportunity.

9 If we don't make -- and that's the point. The
10 point is we don't have to make this decision tonight.
11 If we all agree that you don't meet that standard
12 based on that standard, then you have an opportunity
13 to come back to us.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I would suggest
15 procedurally that we take a vote on -- well, I think
16 we take a vote whether to overturn the denial.
17 Because if that vote is in the affirmative, then
18 we're done. And if that vote doesn't pass, then we
19 can discuss if there are certain things that he
20 could come back with.

21 So at this point I would entertain a motion
22 to --

23 MR. EVANS: Do I get to vote?

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, sorry.

1 At this point I would entertain a motion to
2 reverse -- hold on a second -- I'm sorry.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: To uphold what they
4 have done?

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Reverse the
6 denial. So if you aren't in favor of that, vote no.
7 If this vote passes, then we're done. If it doesn't,
8 then we have to make another motion.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So by reversing the denial --

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It would be approve it.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Approve it as it is.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As it is. So I think we
13 should get that out of the way first.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: If we deny it, he has the
15 opportunity if he wants to come back with
16 changes -- no?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I would say if we
18 reverse the denial, because it was the administrative
19 denial, then he's allowed to go forward with his
20 building permit.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There's been a
22 decision made to deny this by Plan Commission, and
23 that's what we're here for today is decide if we're
24 going to uphold the denial or we're going to reverse

1 the denial.

2 So what we want to do is do a procedural
3 vote to see is if somebody will make a motion to
4 reverse the denial and say, staff, we don't agree,
5 go ahead and build it.

6 So is there a motion to reverse the denial?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on one second.

8 Ma'am, did you have a question.

9 MS. J. STOPKA: I do. I'm really confused.

10 Was this the team that put together for the zoning?

11 Is this the team that put together the standards for
12 the zoning for the RT-2 traditional single-family home?

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The City Council passes
14 the ordinances.

15 MS. J. STOPKA: Okay. And it's pretty much
16 your job, basically, to make sure that these standards
17 are met whenever something is built or something has
18 burned down and they're rebuilding something else so
19 that these are followed? Am I correct in
20 assuming that?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. That's an
22 administrative task.

23 MS. J. STOPKA: And they've denied it.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And they've only denied

1 it based on one thing and that is the 360 architecture
2 that is our Ordinance No. 17.06.060.E.1. That was
3 the only thing that it was denied on. So whether --
4 anything else?

5 MS. J. STOPKA: Whether it doesn't fit in
6 with the neighborhood because it's modern and it's
7 supposed to be traditional, it doesn't matter?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's irrelevant to what
9 we're doing here tonight. It's just regarding -- I
10 didn't write the law. That's what our purpose is
11 tonight. We are a board of appeals. That's what we're
12 doing tonight. It's only regarding the 360-degree
13 architecture. If we went beyond that, if we considered
14 anything else, then we open ourselves up to liability
15 from the appellant because we're going beyond what
16 the law allows us to do.

17 So at this point what I would suggest we do
18 is go ahead, and I will entertain a motion to reverse
19 the administrative denial for the -- of the design
20 review decision for 828 South 3rd Street.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: To reverse?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: To reverse the denial.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Can you clarify? By reversing
24 the denial, that does what?

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Then it would effectively
2 be approval of their design review application.

3 MS. TUNGARE: As it's presented.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As it's presented.

5 MS. TUNGARE: They can go straight for
6 building permit and construct the house.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct. And if you
8 don't agree with that, then vote no. And possibly
9 nobody is in favor of it and nobody is going to make
10 the motion.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm not going to
12 make that motion.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. No. All right.

14 Then in that case we have the ability to --
15 I think the decision should probably be the
16 applicant's as to whether he wants us to go ahead
17 and vote tonight based on the fact that nobody has
18 made the motion, possibly he doesn't want us to, but
19 ask us to continue this meeting and ask for direction
20 on what types of things should be presented at the
21 continued hearing.

22 MS. TUNGARE: Mr. Chairman, the only reason
23 the Plan Commission should not make a decision tonight
24 would be if the applicant is agreeable to investigating

1 other options. Otherwise, the Plan Commission is
2 required to make a decision in a timely manner.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yep. So it is up to the
4 applicant if you would like for us to vote to make a
5 decision tonight or to continue.

6 MR. EVANS: We will investigate other options.
7 So we will continue on revising the drawing.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So based on
9 the applicant's suggestion, I think that there would
10 be a motion to continue in order, but I do think
11 that we need to -- do you feel that you've been
12 provided with enough information to be able to come
13 back with other information?

14 MR. EVANS: Somewhat. You know, the whole
15 360-degree architecture I'm a little hazy on, but
16 I'll bring it up with my architect, and we'll do the
17 best we can and submit drawings to Ellen as quickly
18 as possible.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Would you like some
20 more direction from this group, or do you feel you
21 have enough information from us?

22 MR. EVANS: I think I have enough from you
23 guys. So I think I know which way to go here.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Does anyone on the

1 Plan Commission have any other information that they
2 feel would be helpful? I know, Jeff, you had asked
3 about the presence of the architect.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: That would be great just to --

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't know if that's a
6 possibility and that's up to you. We're not requiring
7 it, but that is something that was brought up.

8 Okay. Anything else?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then let's
11 just talk about the dates. Do we have something
12 else on the May 16th agenda?

13 MR. COLBY: No.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I do -- I'm just thinking
15 out loud. I do believe that -- I agree with Rita we
16 need to make a timely decision on this. Would there
17 be any objection to continuing it to that May 16th
18 meeting, any objection from staff?

19 MR. COLBY: No.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does that date work for
21 you, May 16th?

22 MR. EVANS: It does.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Then I would make a
24 motion to continue this item to May 16th at 7:00 p.m.

1 based on the comments contained in the record.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the motion on the
5 table is to continue this to May 16th. Is there any
6 discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
23 concludes Item 5. Thank you all for your time and
24 patience.

1 If you -- well, we just have a couple other
2 items. Any additional business from Plan Commission
3 members, staff?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. We have the
6 weekly development report.

7 Announcements are contained in the agenda.
8 So we will be having a meeting on May 16th. Any
9 future -- any other meeting dates that may or may
10 not be canceled?

11 MR. COLBY: I don't think we have anything
12 else scheduled.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: And I won't be here for -- I
14 will miss the June 6th meeting.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: So will I.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I'm glad we
17 didn't continue it to then.

18 All right. Public comment?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: None. Is there a motion
21 to adjourn?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and

1 seconded. All in favor.

2 (Ayes heard.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
6 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

7 (Off the record at 8:26 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 8th day of May, 2017.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois