

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2019**

Members Present: Chairman Wallace
Vice Chairman Kessler
James Holderfield
Tom Pretz
Jennifer Becker
Peter Vargulich
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Suzanne Melton

Members Absent: Jeff Funke

Also Present: Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Econ. Dev.
Russell Colby, Community Development Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the June 4, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Ms. Purdy and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

4. Election of Officers.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Ms. Purdy to nominate Todd Wallace as Chairman.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Pretz, Becker, Vargulich, Purdy, Melton

Nays: 0

Absent: Funke

Abstain: Wallace

Motion carried 7-0

Motion was made by Ms. Purdy, seconded by Ms. Melton to nominate Tim Kessler as Vice Chair.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, June 18, 2019
Page 2

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Holderfield, Pretz, Becker, Vargulich, Purdy, Melton, Wallace

Nays: 0

Absent: Funke

Abstain: Kessler

Motion carried 7-0

5. St. Charles United Pentecostal Church, 525 S. Tyler Rd. Units M1 & M2 (United Pentecostal Church of Schaumburg, Inc.)

Application for Special Use

a. Public hearing

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

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

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Pretz, Becker, Wallace, Vargulich, Purdy, Melton

Nays: 0

Absent: Funke

Motion carried 8-0

b. Discussion & Recommendation

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the application for Special Use for St. Charles United Pentecostal Church at 525 S. Tyler Rd., Units MI and M2 (United Pentecostal Church of Schaumburg, Inc.), conditional upon two conditions: 1) The maximum number of people at any given church service shall not exceed 49; 2) Services shall not be held before 7pm on weekdays or 12pm on Saturdays.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Pretz, Becker, Wallace, Vargulich, Purdy, Melton

Nays: 0

Absent: Funke

Motion carried 8-0

6. First Street Redevelopment PUD

PUD Preliminary Plans for East Plaza and Riverwalk

Minor Change to PUD for Building #2 Patio—*Information only*

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, June 18, 2019

Page 3

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the PUD Preliminary Plan for East Plaza and Riverwalk, subject to review of comments from the Plan Commission.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Kessler, Holderfield, Pretz, Becker, Wallace, Vargulich, Purdy, Melton

Nays: 0

Absent: Funke

Motion carried 8-0

- 7. Comprehensive Plan Update**
Review of Open House Report & Findings

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

- 8. Weekly Development Report**

- 9. Meeting Announcements**

- a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, July 2, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, July 16, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, August 6, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- b. Planning & Development Committee
Monday, July 8, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, August 12, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

- 11. Public Comment- None.**

- 12. Adjournment at 8:49 p.m.**



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

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church

Date: June 18, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Application for Special Use; :
Property Located at 525 Tyler :
Road, Units M1 and M2 (United :
Pentecostal Church of :
Schaumburg, Inc.) :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, June 18, 2019
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 218466A
Pages: 1 - 23
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

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 United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

7 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

15 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

16 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

17 Development Director

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

MEMBER BECKER: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

MEMBER MELTON: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Next is presentation of
the minutes of the June 4, 2019, meeting of the
Plan Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

5

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
2 seconded. All in favor.

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That motion passes
7 unanimously.

8 Item 4 is election of officers. This was
9 continued last time. Do we know what the
10 attendance will be at the next meeting, if we
11 anticipate any absences?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Didn't you send
13 out a question about who would be attending?

14 MS. JOHNSON: I believe we'll be missing
15 at least two members.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So I guess it's
17 up to the Commission whether -- we had previously
18 continued this because we didn't have everyone in
19 attendance, which had kind of been the practice in
20 the past to have everyone in the present when we
21 elected officers.

22 So I would -- unless there's an objection,
23 I think we should go forward tonight and just
24 complete the item on the agenda so we don't continue

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

6

1 this for the next two months.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yep.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So if there are any
4 nominations, the officers per the rules of the
5 Plan Commission are the chair and vice chairman.
6 It's been suggested in the past that we eliminate
7 sergeant at arms. If anyone wishes to do that, go
8 ahead. But what we have done in the past is we
9 have taken -- we have done elections by motion.
10 So if anyone wishes to make a motion for an officer,
11 then we will vote up or down.

12 So I guess at this time if there's any
13 motions for the office of chairman, we'll take those.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd nominate
15 Todd Wallace to be chair.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I second.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
18 seconded. So what we would do is we would vote on
19 that, and if it's voted down, we would take any
20 additional nominations.

21 Tim, will you call the roll.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

23 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

7

1 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.
3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.
4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.
5 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.
6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.
7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.
9 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Abstain.
12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That motion
14 passes and next would be for the office of vice
15 chairman. Are there any nominations for that
16 office?
17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I nominate
18 Tim Kessler.
19 MEMBER MELTON: I'll second.
20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been nominated and
21 seconded. Are you comfortable calling the roll?
22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.
23 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.
24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

8

1 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.
3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.
4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.
5 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.
6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.
7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.
9 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, abstain.
13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
14 additional nominations for any additional offices?
15 (No response.)
16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No? All right. Then
17 this concludes this item on the agenda.
18 Item 5 on the agenda is St. Charles United
19 Pentecostal Church, 525 South Tyler Road, Units M1
20 and M2 (United Pentecostal Church of Schaumburg
21 Inc.) Application for Special Use. This is on for
22 a public hearing and then after that discussion
23 and recommendation.
24 For those of you who have not been here

1 before, welcome. The St. Charles Plan Commission
2 is appointed by the City Council as volunteers for
3 the purpose of conducting public hearings for
4 certain applications that come before it such as
5 this one.

6 We will conduct the public hearing, and if
7 we have enough evidence to make a recommendation
8 to the City Council, the public hearing will be
9 closed. We'll make a recommendation either for or
10 against the application with whatever conditions
11 we see fit, and then it will move on to the City
12 Council Planning and Development Committee.

13 Any questions on that so far?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So what we will
16 do tonight is we will have a presentation from the
17 applicant regarding the application for special
18 use. After that any members of the Plan Commission
19 will ask questions regarding the application, and
20 then if any member of the audience wants to ask
21 any questions, they can do so, as well. And then
22 if there is anyone that wishes to offer any
23 testimony either for or against the application,
24 they can do so after that.

1 As I said, if we have enough evidence,
2 then a motion to close the public hearing will be
3 in order, and we'll move on to B, which is action
4 on the site.

5 So at this time there is a court reporter
6 that's here in the room, and she's taking down
7 everything that we're saying. So I will ask that
8 if you wish to speak, please wait to be recognized
9 by me and speak from the lectern here at the front.
10 When you get up to speak, if you could state your
11 name, spell your last name for the record, and
12 also state your address.

13 At this time anyone who wishes to offer
14 testimony, including any questions, I'll ask that
15 you be sworn in. If you'll raise your hands,
16 anyone who is going to give any testimony.

17 (Whereupon, four witnesses were thereupon
18 duly sworn.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And before we start
20 with the applicant, staff, is there anything?

21 MS. JOHNSON: No.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is the applicant
23 present? All right. Come on up.

24 MR. BADERTSCHER: I'm Chance Badertscher

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

11

1 from Lavelle Law. Last name is B, as in "bravo,"
2 a-d, as in "delta," -e, as in "echo," -r-t, as in
3 "tango," -s, as in "sierra," -c, as in "Charlie,"
4 -h-e, as in "echo," -r. I've had to spell it once
5 or twice in my life.

6 Thank you so much for having us here. Good
7 evening. I know your time is very valuable, so we
8 really appreciate you taking the time to hear us.

9 As I said, my name is Chance Badertscher
10 from Lavelle Law. United Pentecostal Church of
11 Schaumburg has been here in St. Charles for
12 five years doing business as St. Charles UPC.
13 We're here tonight to apply for a special use
14 permit to establish a place of worship at the
15 Tyler Ridge Business Park.

16 As I said, they've been here for five years
17 already --

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you could just pull
19 the mic up a little more. We're having a little
20 trouble hearing you.

21 MR. BADERTSCHER: So as I said, St. Charles
22 UPC has been in operation for five years here in
23 St. Charles. They're looking to move locations to
24 this new place at Tyler Ridge Business Park, and

1 they'll be providing a spiritual journey for any
2 and all interested residents of St. Charles.

3 They're looking to only have service in
4 the afternoons on Sunday. I know that there's
5 been some talk about maybe the late afternoon/
6 evenings on the weekdays and very late on Saturday,
7 as well. As they have it set up, it won't be
8 interfering with any of the other businesses that
9 are currently at that location. There shouldn't
10 be any issues with parking, and they really think
11 that the Tyler Ridge Business Park is the perfect
12 place for them to relocate.

13 So right now the spot that we're talking
14 about is M-2 Limited Manufacturing District, and
15 we're looking to change that to a place of worship.
16 That's located at 525 South Tyler Road here in
17 St. Charles.

18 Figure 1 here is a site map showing the
19 proposed location. The highlighted section,
20 obviously, right there is where they're looking to
21 move into. It also shows that there is ample
22 parking. We anticipate that there will be no more
23 than 20 people at any given service. I think the
24 current code allows for 49 people to come to

1 service, but as you can see, there are plenty of
2 parking spots, so that shouldn't be an issue.

3 We also have a floor plan showing existing
4 office and storage areas. This area here will be
5 the actual sanctuary. There's two meeting rooms
6 on the second floor upstairs, and right here is
7 another space that's currently occupied.

8 As previously stated, we will be limiting
9 the time of worship to between 11:00 and 1:00 on
10 Sundays. That's the only time the church plans to
11 be using the space. Pastor Boettcher here expects
12 only about 20 people to attend each service,
13 although he does hope that that number grows the
14 longer that they're here.

15 Another point is they don't plan on doing
16 any construction. The space as is perfect for
17 what they plan to use it for. There is a
18 possibility to maybe eliminate a nonload bearing
19 wall in the back, but, again, that's not a load
20 bearing, there would be no actual construction,
21 and the exterior will remain as is.

22 As we stated, we don't expect any negative
23 impact on the current parking that's available
24 there. With only 20 people, I think there's

1 already about 16 spots that would solely be for
2 the church, but, again, at the time they're going
3 to be operating most of the other businesses will
4 not be, so there will be ample overflow if needed.

5 In conclusion, St. Charles UPC has been
6 here in St. Charles for five years. They're
7 looking to move locations, and they think they
8 found the perfect one here at the business park.
9 They're not going to be inhibiting anybody else
10 that's already there. Their hours of operation
11 won't interfere with anybody else in the spot, and
12 we don't see any negative impact whatsoever.

13 This is just the legal description, one PIN.
14 Address, again, is 525 South Tyler Road, Unit M,
15 in St. Charles.

16 This is a list of businesses that are at
17 the park already. As you can see, most everybody
18 is only operating Monday through Friday. There
19 are a couple businesses that are open on Saturdays
20 and just one that's open on Sundays. So our plan
21 to be there between 11:00 and 1:00 on Sundays will
22 not have any negative impact on the existing
23 businesses.

24 We have also offered a letter from the

1 condominium association just stating that they're
2 all for my client moving in there.

3 That's all I have for you today. Do you
4 have any questions for us?

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any questions from
6 members of the Plan Commission?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do. I have a
8 couple.

9 Right now are you over on Walnut Street?
10 Is that your location?

11 MR. BOETTCHER: Yes, sir.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are you renting?

13 MR. BOETTCHER: We own that building and
14 we'll be selling it. It's actually on the
15 market now.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We keep talking
17 about 49 people. How do you know? What do you do
18 if you get more? Move?

19 MR. BOETTCHER: Probably.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: State your name.

21 MR. BOETTCHER: Robert Boettcher,
22 B-o-e-t-t-c-h-e-r. Currently they can seat -- at
23 the current location they can seat about 60 to 70
24 in the building, but we only have about 16 showing

1 up. But it's very difficult. There's only four
2 parking spots on location unless you park in the
3 street, which you have to kind of fight for a
4 parking spot with the people that live in the
5 area. You have to walk about 2 1/2 blocks down
6 the street in the middle of winter. So it's just
7 not really conducive.

8 So what we have been doing is growing the
9 congregation to the extent that we can then take a
10 family or two and start another one somewhere else.
11 So our intention is to be here for a while, and if
12 it fills up at 49, 50, whatever people, then just
13 use that to train people and start at other
14 locations. We've already got six.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Good. My other
16 question is, we have some suggested conditions and
17 I'm curious about them.

18 For this space, for this application that
19 you would set your maximum at that location at 49,
20 and then the second recommended condition would be
21 church services will not be held before 7:00 p.m.
22 on weekdays or before noon on Saturdays.

23 Are those acceptable conditions?

24 MR. BOETTCHER: Yes.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

17

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. That's all
2 the questions I have. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I just have one regarding
6 the space itself. I see that there's a -- it notes
7 on the first floor plan that there's current
8 tenant space in the back. So that's not a part of
9 your area; correct?

10 MR. BOETTCHER: We own that. That's a
11 current tenant for a travel agency, and so we
12 won't be inhabiting that at this time.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As far as ingress/
14 egress then, is there -- what is that space -- the
15 hallway? Is that a common element?

16 MR. BADERTSCHER: Oh, here?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

18 MR. BOETTCHER: I'm looking to see -- okay.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I just see that you
20 have an entrance through the front.

21 MR. BOETTCHER: Yes, we have an entrance
22 through the front, and then I think we actually
23 own the back hallway, as well, that goes past the
24 travel agency.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

18

1 So people could park in the back and walk
2 in that back door but if -- you know, wheelchair
3 access, whatever would be from the front door.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But there's an entry
5 from that front hallway where it's indicated
6 through the door?

7 MR. BOETTCHER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And does that hall go
9 all the way through the dashed line? That's not
10 a wall?

11 MR. BOETTCHER: No, that's not a wall.
12 That's not a wall.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

14 All right. Other questions?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are there any questions
17 or comments from members of the public?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If the Plan
20 Commission feels that they have enough evidence to
21 make a recommendation to the City Council, then a
22 motion to close the public hearing would be in
23 order.

24 MEMBER BECKER: So moved.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

19

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
3 moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion
4 to close the public hearing?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim, roll.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

8 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

18 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. You may be
23 seated. We're going to go on to discussion and
24 recommendation.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

20

1 MR. BADERTSCHER: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a
4 motion to recommend approval of the St. Charles
5 United Pentecostal Church at 525 South Tyler Road,
6 Units M1 and M1 (United Pentecostal Church of
7 Schaumburg, Inc.) Application for Special Use
8 conditional on two conditions: Maximum number of
9 people at any given church service shall not
10 exceed 49. Second condition, church services
11 shall not be held before 7:00 p.m. on weekdays or
12 12:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and then also subject to
13 any outstanding staff comments.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
15 second?

16 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
18 moved and seconded. Discussion on the motion?

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: You said 7:00 p.m.
20 Isn't 5:00 p.m. during the weekdays?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Actually, the
22 staff report recommendation was 7:00 p.m. You're
23 right, in the literature in their application it
24 talked about 5:00 p.m. but staff recommended 7:00.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

21

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: All right.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you see that as an
3 issue, the limitation on church services not being
4 held before 7:00 p.m. on weekdays?

5 MR. BADERTSCHER: Currently the weekday
6 services start at 7:30. So 7:00 p.m. should not
7 be an issue.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any discussion
9 on the motion?

10 MEMBER BECKER: I just wanted to clarify.
11 This 7:00 p.m. doesn't preclude them from using
12 the building for any other customary uses like
13 office uses or anything else?

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, it just says church
15 services.

16 MEMBER BECKER: Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
18 discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

22 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

Transcript of United Pentecostal Church
Conducted on June 18, 2019

22

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.
2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.
4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.
6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.
8 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
13 That concludes Item 5 on our agenda. Thank you,
14 gentlemen.
15 (Off the record at 7:20 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 24th day of June, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment

Date: June 18, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
First Street Redevelopment PUD: :
PUD Preliminary Plans for :
East Plaza and Riverwalk; :
Minor Change to PUD for :
Building #2 Patio. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, June 18, 2019
7:21 p.m.

Job No.: 218466B
Pages: 1 - 53
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 First Street Redevelopment

Conducted on June 18, 2019

3

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

7 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

15 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

16 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

17 Development Director

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on June 18, 2019

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 6 is the
3 First Street Redevelopment PUD, PUD Preliminary
4 Plans for East Plaza and Riverwalk, Minor Change
5 for Building No. 2 patio.

6 MR. COLBY: Good evening everyone, Russell
7 Colby, Community Development Manager, City of
8 St. Charles. I'm presenting two items related to
9 the First Street redevelopment project. The first
10 one is a preliminary plan for the east plaza
11 riverwalk that's been prepared by the City. The
12 second item is a minor change to PUD for the
13 First Street Building No. 2 patio which is --
14 minor change is not typically required to be
15 reviewed by the Plan Commission, but because this
16 application was being proposed at the same time
17 the City was preparing plans for the adjacent
18 riverwalk we decided to have this application for
19 the patio also be presented to the Plan Commission
20 for comments that would be forwarded along when
21 the plans are presented to the planning and
22 development committee in July.

23 So I will initially present the plans for
24 the east plaza riverwalk. We'll discuss that. At

1 the conclusion then we can bring up the plans for
2 the minor change, which would be representatives
3 from the business Alter Brewing that are present
4 that will be able to speak to those plans and
5 answer questions.

6 So the First Street east plaza and
7 riverwalk. Back when the City approved the
8 preliminary plans for Phase 3 of the First Street
9 project back in 2015, there was a requirement that
10 each of the public spaces that plans be prepared
11 and presented to the Plan Commission for
12 recommendation and City Council approval as the
13 project progress. We're now at the stage of the
14 project where the City needs to construct the
15 remaining public spaces, which include the upper
16 riverwalk, lower riverwalk, and east plaza that
17 will connect the existing upper riverwalk that was
18 connected to the south along with Building 3, the
19 Sterling Bank building, and the east plaza will be
20 opposite the existing west plaza on the other side
21 of First Street, so we'll be looking at the public
22 spaces in Phase 3 of the project.

23 There was a concept plan that was presented
24 to the Plan Commission and Planning Development

1 Committee back in October of 2018. Based on comments
2 we received during that concept plan review the City
3 proceeded with having preliminary level engineering
4 drawings prepared by WBK Engineering, and we have
5 Greg Chismark present to answer any questions.

6 Just to walk through some of the significant
7 elements of the design, similar to the existing
8 riverwalk to the south, the primary walking
9 surface of the riverwalk is concrete, and there's
10 brick paver accents that are shown. The walking
11 path is generally 10 to 15 feet wide depending on
12 the location.

13 There's curvilinear planting islands with
14 integrated seating that follows a similar seat
15 bench design to what exists in the west plaza.

16 There's use of the consistent decorative
17 elements, including the pedestrian lighting poles
18 and bollard lighting, and, as I mentioned, the
19 benches that are consistent with the west plaza.

20 Along the lower riverwalk in terms of
21 lighting we're proposing to use a type of lighting
22 that would shine down the wall and then out onto
23 the lower riverwalk surface to light that up.
24 We're still trying to choose the type of fixture.

1 We're looking at some kind of strip fixtures that
2 would both light down and out onto the walkway so
3 there wouldn't be any light poles standing over
4 the riverwalk.

5 The plans show the use of the decorative
6 chevron railing style that exists to the south
7 along Building No. 3. We're including as one of
8 the main design elements in the plaza area a large
9 open space that could be used for events and also
10 an area that could be used for performances, which
11 is this area here.

12 We've identified a potential location for
13 some type of structure, an open pergola structure
14 that could be placed in that performance area just
15 to sort of better define and frame the performance
16 space. One of the questions we'll be asking the
17 Plan Commission is if there's an interest in
18 installing that type of structure now or to wait
19 until potential later phases of the plaza which
20 may involve expansion.

21 There's a central focal point here that is
22 sort of used to define the transition between the
23 riverwalk and east plaza and lower riverwalk. The
24 stairs down to the riverwalk, there's also large

1 stairs and seat walls on both sides of the stairs.

2 We've identified locations for public art
3 with this red star that's shown on the back of the
4 performance area and also identified areas along
5 the lower river wall where items could be attached
6 to the wall. There's also the potential for art
7 installation in these other planters, as well.

8 We've had discussions with the Downtown St. Charles
9 Partnership about how to sort of plan and program
10 for different types of art that may go there.

11 As earlier versions the plan, there's a
12 green buffer that's shown along the northern edge
13 of the plaza. This is really intended to be an
14 interim condition so that depending on what
15 happens with this lot to the north that this area
16 can be completed. This parcel, the former Manor
17 building lot is not owned by the City of St. Charles,
18 so at this time there's no plan for the plaza to
19 be extended there. There is the possibility that
20 exists if the property becomes available for use
21 as a plaza, the plaza could be extended. And if
22 that were to occur, there's other options for how
23 structures may be located in that area or
24 potentially a fountain.

1 So what we tried to do is sort of keep
2 some of those elements of the plan out in hopes
3 that there may be a potential to incorporate those
4 later if the plaza were to expand. There's also
5 the potential that this property -- that there may
6 be a building constructed there, in which case
7 this area would be completed to finish the plaza
8 off, but at this point we don't necessarily know
9 if a building will be there or if it has potential
10 to be an extension of the plaza, but that
11 opportunity does still exist.

12 Probably the most significant change in
13 the design, the layout is fairly similar to what
14 you saw in the concept plan, but there is a
15 significant change with the grading that's occurring
16 at the -- at this area, which is the northeast
17 corner of Building No. 2.

18 You may recall that one of our concerns
19 when we were going through the concept layout was
20 trying to figure out how to deal with a grade
21 transition between the existing upper riverwalk,
22 which was intended to be at the level of this
23 existing river wall that's there today, and that
24 is at a similar level to the floor level of

1 Building 2, and then accommodating a stormwater
2 overflow route through the east plaza and out this
3 direction.

4 We were able to actually lower this area
5 to sort of flatten this entire space, removing
6 sections of the river wall. So what's happening
7 here is the river wall is actually -- portions are
8 being removed for the lower plaza. So this will
9 be relatively flat all the way from the plaza all
10 the way through this circular area all the way up
11 into this private patio area which is the outdoor
12 patio for Alter Brewing.

13 One of the concerns is keeping the access
14 route to the electric transformer which is located
15 back behind Building No. 2. Because we were able
16 to essentially flatten out this area where that
17 route exists we won't have the pinch point that
18 was between the corner of Building 2 and the
19 existing river wall. So that significantly opens
20 up the transition there.

21 There's some elements that we're looking
22 for feedback from the Plan Commission on
23 specifically. One is what surface material to use
24 for the plaza. There's a couple options. One might

1 be to continue this existing paver pattern that
2 exists in the west plaza across First Street, so
3 mirror that on the east plaza. Alternately we've
4 looked at some other alternatives for a different
5 type of paver material, something that might be
6 larger, sort of more scaled to the size of the
7 space, and it will be a little different than what
8 exists in the west plaza.

9 Second, I mentioned the pergola structure
10 that we're proposing could be located here, and
11 there's an image of the potential design included
12 in the packet. We're looking for feedback as to
13 whether the Plan Commission thinks that structure
14 should be installed now or if it might be better
15 to wait and see what happens with the rest of the
16 plaza and have the structure installed later. It
17 may be possible if this is expanded there could be
18 an opportunity for a larger structure that would
19 have more of a significant footprint and be more
20 specifically designed for performances. With this
21 area it will sort of be a little more informal,
22 but having the structure there will sort of help
23 define it more as a focal point. But depending on
24 what happens with the rest of the plaza, we're not

1 sure we want that to be the focal point if the
2 plaza would expand.

3 The third item, as I mentioned, is a water
4 feature or fountain. There's been suggestions
5 that one be included in the east plaza. At this
6 point we're not including a fountain because
7 there's -- as I said, there's some question about
8 how the rest of the space will be utilized, and
9 we're not sure if locating a fountain within the
10 center of the plaza area makes sense until we have
11 a full understanding of how we want to utilize the
12 space, but we're looking for feedback from the
13 Plan Commission on that.

14 And, finally, the lower riverwalk, we're
15 not proposing to include railings in the lower
16 riverwalk section that's shown here. There's a
17 few points to consider. One is that they're
18 generally -- at other locations in downtown there
19 are not railings or guardrails along the riverwalk,
20 river shoreline where it is accessible. There are
21 railings and guardrails where there's an elevation
22 change and there's potential safety issues where
23 one would fall.

24 But in this location we're proposing that

1 the walkway be fairly wide as I mentioned 10 to
2 15 feet in the width, so it's not a situation
3 where there would be limited space to move along
4 the shoreline. There's also the added complexity
5 that once you move out to the edge of this low
6 riverwalk, you're within what's known as the
7 floodway of the Fox River, which would require --
8 which I should say is potentially subject to
9 flooding, both flooding water or objects that
10 might be floating in the river. So placing
11 anything within that floodway requires Illinois
12 Department of Natural Resources approval because
13 it would be an obstruction essentially to the
14 floodway of the river. There's also potential
15 maintenance issues for the City long term dealing
16 with the water, or debris, or other objects when
17 the river is high.

18 So for those reasons we don't think one is
19 absolutely necessary, so we haven't included it,
20 but we're looking for feedback as to whether or
21 not there's interest in putting in a railing. The
22 feedback on this issue will be presented to the
23 Planning and Development Committee when the plan
24 advances for their review.

1 So as I mentioned, there's some options for
2 the surface materials that are included in the
3 packet. There's a photo of the pergola design.
4 And so we're looking for comments on the plan and
5 also feedback on those four items that I mentioned
6 which are summarized in the staff memo, as well.

7 With that I'll take any questions.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I would just like,
9 Russ, clarification on the significant changes in
10 the concept plan. So you're saying that the east
11 plaza is a surface, and the riverwalk and the
12 private patio are all going to be on the same
13 level?

14 MR. COLBY: Yes.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And could you go to
16 the picture that says "Upper and lower riverwalk
17 viewed from Main Street"? And you say something
18 about sections of the existing river wall will be
19 removed?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Can you show that?

22 MR. COLBY: Yes. If you look up at the
23 scene, this length of wall here and this length of
24 wall here will be lowered down. This will be

1 dropped here, and this will be dropped, as well.

2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And the top of the
3 wall will be even with the patio?

4 MR. COLBY: Yes. And I'm going to ask if
5 Greg Chismark can come up and explain a little bit
6 more on how the grading interacts with the wall.

7 MR. CHISMARK: Thank you, Russ.

8 As Russ mentioned, one of the critical
9 points as we looked at the grading of the plan was
10 the corner of the existing building which has a
11 fixed floor and the desire to lower the stairway,
12 I'll say, as you walk from the upper level to the
13 lower level. And what we found was by removing a
14 portion of the wall back -- back in this area,
15 not -- there's a corner right about here if you
16 can see my cursor; I know it's a little bit tough
17 to see. And what we found was we could lower --
18 cut out a portion of the wall here and really drop
19 it and help that grade.

20 At the same time this ramp area here is
21 not finished. What we found was that this wall
22 was constructed higher than it needs to be under
23 the current plan. So while this wall was built
24 with the idea that there would be a building there

1 and that the building would extend, and that's why
2 it's built up at this elevation. You can see how
3 much higher it is from the existing grade.

4 What we found is we really don't need that
5 wall to be up that high any longer. If I could draw
6 a line on here, right about from here the wall is
7 going to be cut down all the way back and even at
8 this end will be cut down about a foot or two.

9 What we think that will do is that will
10 create an open view of the river from the plaza
11 and, again, lower the elevation at this point here.

12 Again, it's a little bit I know hard to
13 visualize, but does that answer your question?

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Kind of. It's tough
15 to visualize it.

16 MR. CHISMARK: So these walls were built
17 with a different plan in mind, and I think Russ
18 put it correctly. I think with this plan we're
19 able to really lower that and open up the plaza
20 area better.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. So the upper
22 river wall, the surface will be flush with the top
23 of the wall; right? You'll have the railing
24 that's going along there?

1 MR. CHISMARK: Generally, yes. I'm going
2 to say generally, yes.

3 Here's -- Russ, maybe go back to the plan.

4 So in this plan here -- and, again, north
5 is oriented up. What's happened, that photo we
6 saw, that was these two walls here. We're actually
7 extending the wall back to get -- to meet ADA
8 requirements so that it's accessible.

9 So we're actually constructing a wall here
10 but this wall -- let me just describe it to you.
11 It is flush. To answer your question, it will be
12 flush, and the height of this wall is relatively
13 short. It's going to be 2 1/2 feet. So this will
14 slope down, and you can kind of turn around and
15 slope down again.

16 So let me just give you a sense of scale.
17 So that's 2 1/2 feet down to here and 2 1/2 feet
18 down to here in very rough terms. So the height
19 of the wall is not -- we're talking a short wall,
20 and really what it does, it allows us to cut this
21 middle wall down again probably around 2 feet and
22 really open up the views.

23 So I think the answer to your question, a
24 long way around to answer your question, it will

1 be flush. And then at this portion here, that
2 will certainly be flush with the plaza and really
3 open up the area, so that as you walk through
4 here, there's different pavement types, so it
5 looks a little confusing, but this will generally
6 be flat and really opens that area up.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: You've answered my
8 question.

9 MR. CHISMARK: Sorry about the long-
10 windedness.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

13 MEMBER BECKER: You answered my question
14 about ADA. I wanted to know if the ramp was an
15 ADA ramp to the bottom level.

16 And I guess my comment would be whatever
17 we choose for the surface would be, of course,
18 ADA accessible because that's pretty much a long
19 way for somebody who has mobility challenges to be
20 traversing to get to the river.

21 And then my other comment was you probably
22 haven't gotten this far into the weeds yet, but
23 will there be a bike infrastructure since the bike
24 trail is a major component of your riverfront?

1 This seems like it's going to be a gathering
2 place, and since you're kind of in the potential
3 bike sharing thing and bike racks and making sure
4 that the river trail is seamless up and down, it
5 would be a good place to have some great maybe even
6 public art/bike infrastructure at this location.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a couple
9 questions.

10 First of all, there's three bump-outs on
11 the lower wall, and I'm curious, do we know what
12 the distance is on the one south of --

13 MR. COLBY: So these are planters that are on
14 the lower wall. Is that what you're referring to?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right. What is
16 the distance on that, the southernmost planter
17 that you're looking at, between that and the edge
18 of the wall?

19 MR. COLBY: Between this and --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Go south because
21 it's even less as you move south.

22 MR. COLBY: Are you talking about the
23 width here?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah.

1 MR. COLBY: This point is about 10 feet.
2 I think that's the narrowest point.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And, you know, I want
4 to comment on the wall. You had a question what
5 do you do about that. You have potential issues
6 with the Army Corps of Engineers, and it seems
7 like there should be something there, some sort of
8 barricade. If that's going to be that pedestrian --
9 that heavily used pedestrian -- I mean, we have
10 them other places. And if it's only pedestrian
11 here -- it's not like at that lower wall; it's not
12 like you can go back on the patio easily. I just
13 feel like there should be some sort of -- some
14 sort of barricade on that wall, that lower wall
15 somehow. So that's my comment.

16 And then on the pergola, that's a pretty
17 simple structure. I'd put it up. You don't know
18 how long it's going to be until somebody takes
19 that space on Main Street. That's easily removed
20 or changed, but you could get use of that plaza
21 immediately by putting that pergola up.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: In the past there was
24 discussion about coming down potentially from the

1 bridge down onto the walkway versus going all the
2 way around. Is that no longer in any future plans?
3 I think about -- thinking about farming out when
4 that lot does get developed or it becomes just
5 parkland.

6 MR. COLBY: It would depend on how that lot
7 is developed. You know, if it does end up being
8 an extension of the plaza, there's the potential
9 of the plaza which is connected directly right
10 from the sidewalk out to the corner on Main Street.
11 There isn't really a connection point to the bridge
12 at this area at sort of the end of the bridge, but
13 it's possible that connection could be made there.
14 It really depends on how the space is used.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. I would -- I guess I
16 keep thinking that -- and I understand what you're
17 saying -- but somehow that we have the type of way
18 that if that lot does get developed or, again, if
19 there's no building we're going to put in, it would
20 be green space, that that walkway could continue
21 then around the border of it and come back out.

22 MR. COLBY: Are you saying on the lower
23 section or the upper section?

24 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, along with that with --

1 you mentioned about potentially being able to go
2 underneath the bridge as far as an extension, and
3 that's part of why I was asking it related to the
4 bridge access coming down.

5 MR. COLBY: Okay. Yeah, that potential
6 would still exist to connect at this lower
7 portion, to be able -- it's something that
8 requires engineering to see how that would work,
9 but the connection point would still exist for
10 that at the end of the lower riverwalk.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. So that point still
12 exists?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. And I'm fine with the
15 pergola whatever we decide to do.

16 I would say concerning the pavers to be used,
17 I would like to see the consistency of material
18 and design from the west being brought over to the
19 east. That would be my personal choice.

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: The lower parking
21 deck -- do you see where it says "Existing parking
22 deck"? Where does that come up? I know there's
23 stairs coming up right there.

24 MR. COLBY: Right at that location are

1 stairs that go down into the lower level, and this
2 is the ramp that goes up to the other level.

3 MEMBER MELTON: All right. And then what
4 is the surface of the Alter Brewery patio?

5 MR. COLBY: I'm not certain. They'll be
6 able to answer questions on that.

7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It's just if we do
8 so many different surfaces on there, it might just
9 get overwhelming. I'm with everyone else, I think
10 that as long as we integrate some of the west
11 plaza pavers -- I mean, I like the look of the
12 larger pavers, but I think that the pavers from
13 the west need to be integrated in there just to
14 make it look consistent in some shape.

15 MR. COLBY: So what we're showing on this
16 plan is the use of those same pavers along the
17 edge of the street, and then the pavers used
18 around the sculpture are the same ones in this --
19 so the paver accent ribbons along the wall, they're
20 all the same as the west plaza, the existing
21 riverwalk section.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And then I'm all
23 for putting the pergola it up so that it could be
24 utilized right away.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other comments, questions
2 from the Plan Commission?

3 MEMBER MELTON: I have one more question.
4 So right behind the existing deck between the
5 two buildings, I know the private patio is for the
6 brewery. Will there be access that people would
7 walk between the buildings to get there, or will
8 that be closed off?

9 MR. COLBY: No, that will be closed off.
10 It is private property that's on the Building 2 lot.
11 There will be some screening done here to block
12 the transformer and also a refuse area behind the
13 building. So this will be more a service corridor
14 to provide access out the back of the building out
15 to the street.

16 MEMBER MELTON: And I'm also for
17 consistency with the pavers from the other side,
18 and the pergola I think there will be a lot of use
19 for that.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Well, I have just a
21 question regarding the Manor site.

22 Some months ago there was an article in
23 the paper that the City had come into agreement
24 with the property owner regarding a proposed

1 building, and I was just wondering what the status
2 of that was.

3 MR. COLBY: At this point I don't believe
4 there's any proposed building there.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: Then the article in the
6 paper was incorrect? I mean, it can happen. But
7 I'm just asking because it said the City had
8 entered into an agreement with the owner.

9 MR. COLBY: I don't believe that's the case.

10 MS. TUNGARE: There is a plan that was
11 approved as part of the planned unit development
12 in 2006. I believe it was amended in 2008. So
13 maybe the newspaper article was referring to the
14 building that had been approved at that time. But
15 we have not seen any recent plans for construction
16 of that building.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. That's helpful.

18 So is there a time limit or any sort of
19 time or schedule with respect to anything the City
20 is thinking about with respect to purchasing that
21 property, i.e., how long are you going to wait for
22 the property owner to come forward?

23 MS. TUNGARE: I do not have any information
24 related to that at this time.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: With respect to Tom's
2 comment about the access underneath the bridge, I
3 think the active river project, one of the
4 outcomes of that is a connection underneath
5 Main Street bridge to the lower riverwalk. Is
6 that still a plan? I'm assuming.

7 MR. COLBY: Yes. That is one potential
8 element of the improvements.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: Right. So with that,
10 assuming that goes forward -- I realize that's
11 still a ways away, but is there takeout for their
12 kayak activities? Is that along the lower
13 riverwalk, or is that further to the south?

14 MR. COLBY: It wasn't anticipated that
15 this lower riverwalk section would be used for
16 kayaks or any kind of recreational boating or
17 other activity along the river just because the
18 access to that lower riverwalk is somewhat limited.
19 It's really intended primarily for pedestrian use,
20 not necessarily river access.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: All right. And then I
22 had some additional questions regarding the approach
23 for some of the things like the drainage, and so
24 maybe you can answer that or maybe WBK can.

1 So as I look at the plans, about half of the
2 plaza, east plaza is pitched towards First Street.

3 MR. CHISMARK: Yes.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: But about half to
5 60 percent is pitched towards the road. So the
6 intention is to just surface drain all that water
7 down the handicap ramp and across the stairs down
8 to the river? Is that -- that's what it looks
9 like you're intending to do, since there's no
10 inlets shown.

11 MR. CHISMARK: That's right. So there's
12 no inlets from about halfway through the plaza.
13 That will flow towards the river. It actually
14 flows a little bit north, as well, at some point.

15 So if you kind of -- maybe the best way to
16 look at it is to say the southerly portion of that
17 half or a quarter would go across the brick area,
18 and then there would be a portion that would, in
19 fact -- that's accurate -- would, in fact, go to
20 the ramp.

21 Now, there is a bit of a landscaped area
22 that's prior to the ramp that will catch some of
23 that, and there's some drainage provisions within
24 those landscaped areas; there are some underdrains

1 in there, as well.

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: So I guess I'm concerned
3 about the surface draining that much water towards
4 the river, not so much during this time of year,
5 but let's say from October through March. People
6 will be walking out there and having surface water
7 being pitched down the stairs, which could turn
8 into ice at any time. Understanding that you can
9 use deicing compounds and things, but life isn't
10 perfect in the way that gets distributed and how
11 that gets done.

12 So there's no concern down the handicap
13 ramp or across those stairs that you're going to
14 surface drain and potentially leave water on those
15 surfaces?

16 MR. CHISMARK: If the question is related
17 to icing and what happens in those conditions, I'm
18 going to say no, only based on I know how well the
19 City maintains the west plaza. They use a lot of
20 deicing materials.

21 The areas we're talking about aren't
22 significant from a wet weather condition. So a
23 heavy rainfall, certainly there will be some
24 surface flow, but that's not a large enough area

1 to raise concern from my viewpoint.

2 I would acknowledge that, yes, in the
3 winter the snow clearing is certainly -- honestly,
4 I think on all the stairways that's an issue to
5 make sure that gets taken care of. Again, I'm
6 going to give the City kudos. From my observations
7 of the west plaza, they do a great job of clearing
8 that and keeping it up for pedestrians.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: But the west plaza also
10 does not have stairways -- right? -- except coming
11 out of the garage. So, again, if this is intended
12 to be an active plaza, and if you're going to have
13 Christmas displays or who knows what the programming
14 would be in the future, you're encouraging hundreds
15 of people or more to come, that's just a concern
16 that weather can create a lot of unsafe conditions
17 at certain times of the year.

18 I'm not sure, given that you're adding the
19 manhole just to the north of where that sculpture
20 is going to be, why there wouldn't be inlets added
21 to collect that water so it doesn't run there.

22 Just something that maybe could be looked
23 at, understanding there's cost to these things
24 without a doubt, but I guess it would just be a

1 concern.

2 MR. CHISMARK: So I think that's a valid
3 point. We can certainly look at the idea of
4 capturing the water and -- creating a low point
5 and trying to capture the water.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: You may not be able to
7 catch all of it, but just as a concern about that.

8 On the Alter patio, right now all of that
9 pavement is being pitched directly to the east
10 into the new plant bed, and understanding that
11 there's potentially underdrains in the bed, that
12 just doesn't seem like the best practice as to why
13 wouldn't we put a curb against the pavement and
14 collect the water on there and tie it into some of
15 these subsurface pipes that are being routed to
16 the new manhole.

17 Again, one is just the long-term health of
18 the plants. It's hard to -- when we have a year
19 like we've had this year, this much rain, it's
20 hard for plants that aren't adapted to that to
21 effectively grow, and so that would just be a
22 concern with respect to how that area is being
23 drained or potentially being picked up.

24 It looks like all the riverwalk is being --

1 upper riverwalk is being pitched to the wall that's
2 existing, and then with the curbed beds being
3 divided and pushed over the wall or allowed to
4 drain over the existing wall down to the lower
5 beds, in effect, you're creating a whole series of
6 rain gardens by surface draining all this water
7 into these beds. Yet the plant mix that's being
8 chosen isn't a rain garden mix. In fact, I looked
9 at multiple resources, Midwest Ground Covers, and
10 only one of those plants are listed as -- you know,
11 can tolerate consistent water being put in the bed
12 with them all the time.

13 So, again, a concern about that and how
14 the plants will react, and, number two, would it
15 be better to get them to put in hundreds of feet
16 of lineal feet of underdrain to tie in some
17 inlets, some small inlets in the pavement that
18 could collect some of that water and route it to
19 the river via the storm sewer pipe that's running
20 through east plaza. So just something to maybe
21 look at.

22 MR. CHISMARK: Sure.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: One question would be
24 for the Alter patio, in looking at their design,

1 they have two gates, one that kind of goes out
2 towards east plaza and the other one that heads
3 out towards the riverwalk. And currently their
4 gate goes out into the plant bed.

5 So I guess the question would be to
6 coordinate with them, could that crescent plant
7 bed be shifted to the north so the end of it meets
8 the corner and then the other gate come out next
9 to the ramp that's already built? So all it would
10 do is shift their gate. It wouldn't eliminate it,
11 understanding that they need to have two ways to
12 get out of that space.

13 Another question would be, could the
14 stairwell or could the stairs in front of the
15 sculpture be moved directly to the south so that
16 the landing area as you come down the stairs is
17 larger? Right now it's in the middle, and it's
18 the narrowest part of that whole space. So it
19 would be a great place for people to interact and
20 decide if they're going up or down. If the stairs
21 were moved to the south, it would just be an area
22 that would be twice the width of what is currently
23 being shown where the stairs are, and then you'd
24 have a continuous set of large steps that would

1 view the river or activities and hopefully the
2 active river if that project ever comes to fruition.

3 I'd also suggest that the center art piece
4 for the art be raised maybe 18 inches, 20 inches,
5 and lighting be integrated in there or at least
6 stubbed into that location if there isn't a choice
7 for now. So that would be a suggestion and a
8 request.

9 On the south stairs which are kind of like
10 the end of this space, the lower set of stairs
11 that are elliptical, there's a 24-inch tread, and
12 I didn't understand why. You come down on
13 two risers, three risers, a 24-inch tread, and
14 then three more risers down. It seems like you
15 could just make those all the same and create more
16 space at the bottom of the landing for people
17 since it is kind of narrow there where the stairs
18 are landing on the riverwalk. And, obviously,
19 we're not moving the wall in the river because of
20 the expense, and DNR process, and all that kind of
21 thing.

22 It seems like that could be more of a
23 problem for people because you kind of get used to
24 walking on a set of stairs that are a certain

1 width and a rhythm, and if all of a sudden it
2 widens out, sometimes that can be a potential
3 tripper, versus where the landing use changes
4 direction, then that's a logical place to see that
5 change.

6 I would ask on some of the plant beds --
7 let's see. Plant Bed 5, which is the one in east
8 plaza, I'd love to see that just be a plant bed.
9 And contrary to some of our Commission members who
10 like the idea of putting a pergola, I don't. I
11 don't think it's a very powerful statement.
12 Understanding this is an example, I don't think
13 it's a very strong statement, and most of the
14 riverwalk and the architecture adjacent to it have
15 a very strong statement, and I think if we're
16 going to build something, it ought to have an
17 equal statement.

18 Right now -- understanding it's a kit
19 product that you buy, but I think something with a
20 much stronger architecture could be done if we're
21 going to do it, or we should wait and see what
22 happens with the north parcel and then whether
23 that expands the plaza, do we do a band shell or
24 something like that.

1 Contrary to some of our Plan Commission
2 members, I would not like to extend the west plaza
3 pavement at all. I like the idea of a larger
4 format paver. I think the tie-in of the darker
5 brick as it's done so far looks very nice, and
6 with a larger scale paver, it could be some
7 banding or something with the darker paver to tie
8 that through.

9 But I think the east plaza standing on its
10 own but integrated with the use of one of the
11 pavers, preferably with the dark paver, could be a
12 very handsome plaza and have its own significance
13 in the city of St. Charles, and especially if it
14 gets expanded to the north to be even a better
15 reason to have a different paver for that area as
16 the primary plaza paver.

17 I would not use -- in Plant Bed No. 8 I
18 would not use the ornamental trees. I think that
19 they'll block the view for people sitting on the
20 Alter plaza or on their patio. So I would either
21 change those to shade trees or eliminate those
22 two serviceberry and just have shrubs and
23 perennials there so that you'd have a great view
24 out to the river. There's a place for them. I

1 just don't think that's the right place for them
2 to allow views.

3 I think that there's a plant bed that
4 might be missing. There's a curved area right
5 where the ramp comes down next to the parking
6 garage. So the ramp switches back down, and just
7 to the south there's a curb that's been put in,
8 but for some reason there's no planting in there.
9 So it seems like a bed was created.

10 MR. CHISMARK: Is this the location?

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes. A bed was created
12 but there's no planting in it.

13 MR. COLBY: That is the location for the
14 electric controller box. So it's possible that
15 there could be some room to plant things around
16 it, but we're not sure exactly how much of a
17 footprint will be left when the box is installed.
18 But there's potential for there to be some
19 landscaping.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would encourage us to
21 try to look for opportunities to install as much
22 as possible. Because as you walk south from east
23 plaza, that is the side of the garage you look at.
24 So if we could introduce some plantings there that

1 could kind of take away from that look or add
2 another dimension to that with some seasonal
3 planting, I think that'll help.

4 Plant Bed No. 11, I would eliminate the
5 locust and just use evergreen trees. I think over
6 time those would crowd together, and the
7 evergreens would lose because they'll be shaded
8 out. So I would just use evergreen trees.

9 I think there's other opportunities to add
10 art. I think that's already been talked about. I
11 think that in Plant Bed 11 would be a great place
12 to add some art, as well as actually Plant Bed
13 No. 8 in front of the Alter patio. So if you have
14 low plantings and a nice piece of art, again, that
15 would be a way to enhance it not only for people
16 on the patio but as people walk up and down those
17 areas.

18 I think that the evergreen tree that's
19 selected, the Canadian hemlock is probably not the
20 hardiest plant that I would choose for our climate
21 in that open area. I would think a spruce or a
22 fir would be a better choice. Penny Canadian
23 hemlocks can be effective, but they usually need a
24 lot more sheltered location, and that's a pretty

1 open location.

2 I think there's a high use of perennials
3 on the project in these beds, and I think that
4 five to six months of the year they're going to
5 look barren, as already is the case for along
6 Building 2 and the riverwalk. If you're down
7 there beyond the growing season, it's a lot of
8 mulch and very uninteresting, and I would
9 encourage you to switch out to 60 to 70 percent
10 shrubs. I don't think we need to add more trees
11 but still have the perennials, and if we're going
12 to do that increase the number of shrubs from five
13 to maybe eight or nine. I mean, there's nothing
14 wrong with the species that are selected for the
15 shrubs, and there's nothing wrong with these
16 perennials; it's just there's a lot of them. So I
17 would just suggest maybe consider some changes
18 there.

19 Overall I like this project, and I hope
20 that we can get it done within all the budget
21 constraints that we have. So thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just want to talk a
24 little bit -- I like the pergola, I like the

1 fountain, but I also like the idea of waiting to
2 see how this develops. I think it's a very tight
3 area. Not knowing what's going to go in the north
4 side and now we see more about this private patio,
5 there's a lot going on there, and I just think of
6 the old phrase less is more, and it would be easier
7 to add to it. It might help if we see what the
8 pergola looks like in relation to the buildings
9 there. This is all visualized in our mind.

10 But I think there's a lot going on. It's a
11 tight area. It's an extension from the west plaza,
12 and I think the view out to the river maybe -- we
13 don't want to encumber that. I like the idea of
14 waiting and seeing how it develops a bit.

15 Then I had just one other question. What
16 about the liability on the lower level with no
17 fence or railing? Have the City attorneys
18 addressed this? Are they comfortable with us not
19 doing that? Where are we at on that?

20 MR. COLBY: Well, we have a similar
21 condition in other locations along the riverfront
22 where there is a walkway that's directly adjacent
23 to the river. So it's consistent with the design
24 used elsewhere.

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Then again, we have
2 an opportunity to put it there and we didn't. I
3 just don't know what legal ramifications are, and
4 I just wanted to bring that up if anybody else is
5 thinking about it. Maybe that's grandfathered in,
6 I don't know. Just a concern of mine. That's all
7 I have to say.

8 MEMBER MELTON: I guess my only other comment
9 to that is because I know that on the other side
10 of the river right out here there's no barrier,
11 but here now we're introducing eating, and drinking,
12 and people, and a lot of people, and it is -- I've
13 been struggling with that. I'm also wondering on
14 the wall, I can't remember if you said there was a
15 rail or not. I don't want kids to be like jumping
16 down to get to the lower level.

17 Just things like that I think about, so
18 I'm with you that it's a little bit troublesome to
19 think that's all going to be one step away from
20 falling in the river. So something to think about.

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: They're still going to
22 go use the same railing across the upper pergola,
23 so there is a railing. I like the idea of not
24 putting a railing on the lower level. I think

1 it's fine. Only if there's a way to integrate
2 into the concrete pour as it meets the cap, if
3 there's a texture or something that could be added
4 to help at some level, even if it's a little more
5 subtly, signal and reinforce for people that
6 there's something else going on so you just don't
7 have one smooth surface running into another
8 smooth surface. Texture can help alert people to
9 that issue.

10 Also, regarding the water feature or
11 fountain, I think a water feature should be added
12 to the east plaza, but I would do it as a series
13 of jets flush with the pavement so that it could
14 be running when we want it to run, but during a
15 large event you turn it off and the whole thing
16 disappears so it's not contained with a curb or a
17 wall or something like that.

18 For the simplest way to describe it, it's
19 like the interactive fountains in play areas that
20 you see for kids at play lots. Obviously, a little
21 more architectural, nothing spraying water, you
22 know, like a fire hydrant or something like that,
23 but they could be done where they're flush with
24 the pavement so they don't interfere with large

1 events. They also can be done within LED lights
2 so they're programmed. So on a regular day there's
3 something going on in the plaza, but then in an
4 event it's turned off a day in advance to be
5 prepared for a large event where you can use the
6 whole space. But that's my suggestion for a water
7 feature if that's foreseen.

8 Thank you.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: I have one last one. In
10 the area -- the City-owned property that is the
11 green space that's going to be adjacent to the
12 Manor property, other than grass -- I kind of
13 missed that. What are we going to do with that in
14 order to kind of buffer it so people don't have to
15 look at the Manor property?

16 MR. COLBY: Well, I think the thought was
17 with this green strip here -- we haven't figured
18 out exactly what to plant there, but something
19 that will form an edge. It might be something
20 like taller ornamental grasses or something that
21 would not necessarily block the view but sort of
22 create an edge before it transitions to grass. We
23 don't want to put in anything there that's too
24 significant or is going to require a lot of

1 maintenance because it may just be temporary, but
2 something easy to remove.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions from
4 the Plan Commission?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does any member of the
7 audience have any questions or wish to make
8 comments?

9 MS. PECK: Just as a walker --

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Why don't you come on up.

11 MS. PECK: I just want to say as a walker,
12 I support having some kind of barrier.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You have to come up,
14 state your name, please.

15 MS. PECK: Carol Peck.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How do you spell your
17 last name?

18 MS. PECK: P-e-c-k.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What's your address.

20 MS. PECK: 504 South Fourth. As a walker,
21 I support having some kind of barrier there
22 because I walk regularly throughout the whole
23 area, and that 10 feet is really narrow. I'm just
24 going to say that. You brought that up. So I

1 don't think it sounds very safe for kids, let
2 alone for older adults that are walking through,
3 especially when it is raining or icy.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

5 Any other questions or comments?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything else?

8 MR. COLBY: No. I was going to ask the
9 individuals from Alter to come up and walk through
10 their plan, whoever would like to.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are we taking these as
12 two different applications that require action?

13 MR. COLBY: So the east plaza riverwalk plan
14 requires a recommendation because it is a
15 preliminary plan. The Alter Brewing patio is
16 really just being presented for information and
17 comments. Because it is a minor change, it doesn't
18 typically require Plan Commission review.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Should we go ahead and
20 take action on the first one?

21 MR. COLBY: Yes, you can.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then give
23 us just a minute. Would anyone like to make a
24 motion regarding planned unit development

1 preliminary plan?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a
3 motion that we recommend approval of the PUD
4 Preliminary Plan for East Plaza and Riverwalk
5 subject to review of comments from Plan Commission.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second that.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
8 moved and seconded. Any discussion on that motion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tim.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

12 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

20 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

22 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
3 concludes the first part of Item 6. Now we have
4 Minor Change to PUD for Building No. 2 Patio.

5 MR. WALKSLER: Thank you, Commissioners.
6 My name is Doug Walksler, W-a-l-k-s-l-e-r,
7 1080 Wexford Court, Wheaton, Illinois.

8 I didn't know I was going to be presenting,
9 so forgive me. I do want to thank the Commissioners
10 for -- and Russell for, you know, blending these
11 presentations. It makes a lot of sense to think
12 of them together.

13 As one of the partners of Alter Brewing
14 Company, we're grateful for the opportunity to
15 work with the City of St. Charles on this really
16 promising project, and we see a great deal of
17 synergy with the east plaza and the riverwalk with
18 what we have in mind for patio improvements.

19 So perhaps, you know, a way to get started
20 would be if I could answer some questions.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Members of the
22 Plan Commission, any questions?

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Could you just
24 explain what the minor changes are?

1 MR. WALKSLER: Sure. The minor changes --

2 MR. COLBY: Just for a little background
3 as to why this is being classified as a minor
4 change, when the preliminary plans were being
5 approved for Building No. 2, there were no
6 improvements shown on the outdoor patio. So there
7 hasn't been a plan approved yet for the use of
8 that space, so that's why this minor change is
9 being submitted.

10 MR. WALKSLER: May I just refer to the
11 application which lists proposed awnings, signage
12 on the north side riverwalk plaza, patio on the
13 east side to include perimeter fence, lighting, a
14 transformer enclosure, a container bar, and a
15 seasonal enclosure use for less than 180 days
16 per year.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you want to just go
18 down through the slide so that everyone can see?
19 We have it on our screens, but just so they can see.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is the upper part of
21 the container open to the public?

22 MR. WALKSLER: It is.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Is there going to
24 be seating in there?

Transcript of First Street Redevelopment
Conducted on June 18, 2019

48

1 MR. WALKSLER: There will be seating,
2 yes, ma'am.

3 MEMBER VARGULICH: It looks like there's
4 stairs up the back, if you will.

5 MR. WALKSLER: Correct.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: That's not an ADA issue?

7 MR. WALKSLER: So we have --

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: I'm just asking.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry. What part are
10 we talking about?

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: On top of the
12 container. You see right now -- there's an upper
13 part and stairs on the back to get there.

14 MR. WALKSLER: If you go to this slide
15 which shows the container bar area which is an
16 8-by-20 structure, and then to the south of that
17 there's a stair that goes up to a landing, and
18 then you can access the top of the container
19 there.

20 So regarding ADA compliance and access, we
21 had a meeting about two weeks ago with Bob Vann.
22 Our project architect led the meeting with Bob Vann
23 and the fire chief, Joe -- I'm sorry; I don't
24 remember his last name. And that got socialized

1 during the meeting.

2 And as far as I know, it was -- the way
3 they discussed it, it would meet -- it would meet
4 the requirement because of the amount of other --
5 the percentage of other seating that's available.

6 MEMBER VARGULICH: I realize that there's
7 some fine lines to those kinds of things. That's
8 why I was asking.

9 MR. WALKSLER: Sure. Thank you.

10 MEMBER VARGULICH: I like it. I like what
11 you're doing.

12 MR. WALKSLER: Thanks.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: I was just going to say
14 there are portions of this that the Preservation
15 Commission didn't review, but they did bring a
16 good percentage. So I'm assuming that some of the
17 recommendations that were made during those
18 discussions are included in here. Am I
19 correct, Russ?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: So the Preservation
22 Commission did have a number of recommendations
23 that they apparently have implemented, but there
24 are other things that they are discussing right

1 now that we would not have had any discussion about.

2 So just some reference to help you.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I do think Peter
4 brought up a really good point, though, that exit
5 exiting on the east side right into the planter bed.

6 MR. WALKSLER: We agree. I actually
7 noticed that when we -- just a couple days ago we
8 got the riverwalk and east plaza drawings, and
9 that came to our attention. We're expecting -- as
10 has been in the past, we're expecting our architect
11 to coordinate those changes and work with Russ to
12 implement whatever they may be.

13 MEMBER VARGULICH: Seems like a pretty
14 minor thing to coordinate to just move the gate
15 and make a slight adjustment.

16 MR. WALKSLER: Sure. Thank you.

17 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yeah, I like this.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Just one more
19 question. Is that a garage door that's going to
20 open up?

21 MR. WALKSLER: Right here?

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right there.

23 MR. WALKSLER: We're not sure if it will
24 be an overhead door or a bifold-style door that

1 folds horizontally rather than sectionally rising,
2 but it will be one or the other.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: It's beautiful.

4 MEMBER BECKER: I have a question. Is the
5 height of that double container bar, does the top
6 of that break the view of the first-floor window,
7 or will it be below the first-floor windows?

8 MR. WALKSLER: Well, it will be above the
9 first-floor windows. So the first-floor windows
10 would be like at this level right here.

11 MEMBER BECKER: Oh, I'm sorry, I mean --
12 maybe it's the second floor. The second-floor
13 windows. So the tenants in those spaces might
14 have their view obscured by this particular thing?
15 And that will be a permanent structure? It will
16 not it be taken down?

17 MR. WALKSLER: Well, it's modular, but it
18 wouldn't be seasonal -- it would be used seasonally,
19 but the intention would not be to put it up and
20 take it down every year, but it is a modular
21 structure, so it could be removed.

22 And I'm going to say I trust the rendering
23 here to establish the scale and the elevations to
24 show that the second-floor windows are above the

1 top of the container bar.

2 MEMBER MELTON: I love it, I just want to
3 say that, I don't even drink beer. I love the
4 direction you're heading with the high-top tables
5 and community tables toward the back so if people
6 are there they can see the river, and I encourage
7 the use of those big community tables. I think
8 more and more people go out in groups, and we're
9 always moving tables together. So I like the mix.
10 So I just want to say I like the direction you're
11 headed.

12 MR. WALKSLER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
14 questions, comments, anything from members of the
15 audience?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. This isn't
18 on the agenda for action. It's just for
19 information only.

20 All right. Thank you.

21 (Off the record at 8:27 p.m.)

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 24th day of June, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update

Date: June 18, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Comprehensive Plan Update: :
Review of Open House Report :
and Findings. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, June 18, 2019
8:28 p.m.

Job No.: 218466C
Pages: 1 - 21
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 Comprehensive Plan Update
Conducted on June 18, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

6 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

7 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

8 TOM PRETZ, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

13 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

14 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

15 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

16 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

17 Development Director

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update
Conducted on June 18, 2019

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then Item 7
3 on the agenda is Comprehensive Plan Update:
4 Review of Open House Report and Findings.

5 MR. COLBY: So as part of the process to
6 update the comprehensive plan for a portion of
7 downtown, we held an open house on April 24th, and
8 there's a report of all of the information that
9 was submitted during the open house that was
10 included in the meeting packet.

11 What we did was we kind of compile that
12 based on each activity and tried to sort of put
13 the information in an order where some sense could
14 be made of it so you could sort of see some of the
15 patterns and what the comments were specific to
16 individual locations.

17 What I tried to do and will present briefly
18 here is just sort of a summary of what we thought
19 were consistent themes of the information that was
20 included. I'm going to walk through that.

21 So, again, the study we're looking at as
22 shown here is generally the area north of Main Street
23 south of the railroad trestle between and North
24 Fourth Street. And all the activities at the open

1 house were specifically geared towards this area
2 and within these boundaries.

3 So the first activity, we called this
4 development visioning. This was the exercise
5 where individuals were putting stickers on aerial
6 maps and providing comments that corresponded with
7 those stickers, and there were three different
8 maps, items to be preserved, items changed or
9 otherwise. We just wanted people to comment.

10 So within the report you can see what we
11 tried to do is take all of the comments for all of
12 the locations and list them by locations, and you
13 can see what comments were provided for each
14 location.

15 Here's sort of a summary of some consistent
16 comments. I will say that, you know, the
17 information you see in these types of events that
18 there's a fair number of conflicting sort of
19 opposite comments made, but there seem to be more
20 consistent comments on what's listed here.

21 So preserving City Hall building,
22 redeveloping the police station site, a lot of
23 references to taking advantage of the riverfront
24 recreational or business use. Specific ideas that

1 were offered included restaurant, hotel, mixed-use
2 residential. There were a number of comments about
3 the Salerno's property and that it might be an
4 opportunity for redevelopment with a restaurant
5 being at the site, potential for recreation
6 connections on that site.

7 A lot of comments on green space along the
8 river. A number of comments about the importance
9 of parking on the west riverfront, and this is
10 primarily based on the use of that parking and its
11 accessibility. There were a number of residents
12 of Carroll Tower that had some concern about
13 parking.

14 There were a lot of comments about trails,
15 sidewalks, riverwalk connections, the fact that on
16 the west side of the river a lot of those
17 connections are missing or incomplete. There were
18 some references to removing the railroad trestle.

19 Regarding parking, a lot of the comments
20 were about either surface parking or parking decks
21 being located on the interior blocks away from the
22 river. There were references to preserving the
23 historic buildings, the residential buildings that
24 exist on fringes of the study area, and a number

1 of comments on not being overdeveloped and wanting
2 to stay consistent with the character of downtown.

3 Another activity, the visual preference
4 survey. This is where different categories -- we
5 were looking for feedback on photos presented and
6 asking people to rank them on which they would
7 like to see most in the study area and also got
8 some comments.

9 You can see in the responses which photos
10 were ranked highest among the list. They're in
11 there from highest to lowest in terms of preference.
12 but some general feedback from each of these
13 categories. With the residential there were
14 comments about how valuable it is to have traffic
15 downtown. In terms of building height, something
16 midscale seemed to be most desirable, which might
17 be around three stories. And there's an interest
18 in keeping multilevel buildings set back from the
19 river.

20 Comments for commercial and mixed-use were
21 pretty similar. With respect to the commercial
22 lower storefront there were a lot of comments
23 about the accessible riverfront and commercial
24 uses being right adjacent to it, so a preference

1 for the pictures that showed active storefronts,
2 comments on mixed use bringing economic activity
3 to the area. Again, similar scale building
4 preferred, three-story, and, again, there were
5 some concerns with buildings too close to the
6 river. So there were some mixed comments.

7 The open space category, the preference
8 seemed to be for open accessible waterfront and
9 greenscape areas rather than hardscape and
10 preference for walking paths. Streetscape the
11 consensus would be the ones that seem to be most
12 visually active, had a lot of plants, colors,
13 textures, and seating were the most interesting
14 and most preferred.

15 With respect to parking, there were comments
16 that parking decks really should be incorporated
17 because we need to limit the footprint of parking
18 within the study area that's going to be redeveloped,
19 but the design and appearance of those structures is
20 important and also the preference to locate them
21 away from the riverwalk.

22 The land use mapping activity, this is
23 where we asked people to sort of color in an
24 aerial photo and show what their preferred land

1 uses are. They're all the ones that were received
2 and are included in the report.

3 So some of the maps were only partially
4 completed, so it's difficult to access what everyone
5 was thinking, but there are similar themes in the
6 maps as to what we heard in the other activities.
7 Some of the more typical land use patterns, as you
8 can see, is open space along the river, transition
9 to mixed-use and commercial uses adjacent to it,
10 parking to be located in garages or lots on interior
11 blocks away from the river and transition to
12 residential neighborhoods. There were also a
13 number of people who showed extending the street
14 grid on the west side of north State Street.

15 So some overall themes. There were a
16 number of comments about the area sort of being a
17 transition from the core center of downtown to the
18 parks or recreational areas that exist to the north.
19 That sort of was guided by responses received.
20 One of them is seeing the riverfront being open,
21 green and accessible mixed-use commercial fronting
22 on open space, and connections to recreation
23 activities, trails, boating sort of connecting
24 businesses to those open spaces and those

1 activities. Building height, the three-story
2 range is most preferred.

3 Some important considerations based on
4 some of the comments that were provided, there are
5 a number of comments that were contrasting what
6 people like to see in this study area versus what
7 exists in First Street, sort of a preference of a
8 less urban environment than exists on First Street.

9 The active river project, if that project
10 were to be constructed in some form, that would
11 really change the scope of the riverfront
12 improvements that are there, so that has some
13 impact on the space that might exist along the
14 riverfront to the extent that that was incorporated.
15 Also, there were a number of comments, as I
16 mentioned earlier, with respect to parking. So,
17 obviously, those would need to be addressed in
18 some manner.

19 So this is really just a summary. We
20 provided the whole report to the Plan Commission
21 for you to review and sort of reach your own
22 conclusions. As I said, this summary is not
23 exactly everything that was provided in the
24 comments, but it sort of gives you sort of the

1 overall picture of what seemed to be the most
2 common themes that were presented consistently in
3 the feedback.

4 With that I'd be open if anyone has any
5 comments from what they observed either at the
6 open house or in the report.

7 MEMBER PRETZ: I had a question. What's
8 the next step then for us in the process?

9 MR. COLBY: So in upcoming meetings we'll
10 start talking about specific land uses and
11 development forms for the site area. So we'll
12 start one meeting on the east side, one meeting on
13 the west side, and look at a more detailed plan.
14 And we'll put together some concept sort of based
15 on the feedback we've heard, and what we know
16 about the existing conditions of the area, and
17 what the limitations are for development, which
18 sites have development potential and which ones
19 maybe are limited, present that information, and
20 we'd like that to be sort of an interactive
21 discussion with the Plan Commission is the form it
22 might take.

23 MEMBER VARGULICH: Russ, the question I
24 had for you and maybe Rita, where do things stand

1 with the active river project since that can have
2 a significant influence on how we might think of
3 land uses related to that? Is the edge of the
4 river the edge of the river, or is the edge of the
5 river moving in with the active river project?
6 Because I think that their project, something
7 similar to what they're proposing, actually the
8 bank of the river moves towards the center in
9 those cases.

10 So do we know where we're at?

11 MR. COLBY: I would say first that our
12 approach with this is that the comprehensive plan
13 recommendations need to sort of stand on their own
14 because we can't necessarily guarantee that the
15 project will be constructed in the form it's been
16 shown or what the timing will be. So our assumption
17 is we're working with the existing shoreline where
18 it's at and that the increase in shoreline would
19 likely be used for open space and not necessarily
20 incorporated as developable land.

21 MS. TUNGARE: At this time there's no
22 commitment on the part of the City to fund the
23 active river project. The City Council has given
24 us no further direction, so I believe Russ'

1 direction is accurate. Let's let the
2 comprehensive plan stand on its own while having
3 an awareness of the active river project.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: And the reason in part
5 I ask that is currently there's floodplain on the
6 east and west sides of the river, and in previous
7 conversations there was an acknowledgement that
8 while there hasn't been a complete study done that
9 certainly the floodplain would be significantly
10 reduced, if not eliminated out of those areas with
11 the active river project because of the change in
12 the grade that's going to happen.

13 So with that in mind then we'd plan that
14 there's floodplain on those sites.

15 MR. COLBY: I think that makes a
16 potentially significant difference on the west
17 side of the river primarily where the floodplain
18 is a little more extensive. So that is something
19 we're going to need to consider because that does
20 place a limitation on development of some of those
21 parcels.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. Fair.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So you say the
24 next step for us is that we will go through this

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update
Conducted on June 18, 2019

14

1 and identify potential land uses?

2 MR. COLBY: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So I would save my
4 comments for that.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions,
6 comments?

7 MEMBER VARGULICH: I would just want to
8 reiterate that I thought that the open house came
9 off very well. Thank you to you and everyone else
10 from the staff who was involved with doing that.
11 I thought that the event was well attended and
12 came off very well. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any questions
16 from members of the audience?

17 (No response.)

18 MS. PECK: Can I come back?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

20 MS. PECK: Several of us are here from
21 Carroll Tower. Do you need my name again?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

23 MS. PECK: Carol Peck and I've worked at
24 Carroll Tower 27 years. And so we just -- seven of

1 us came over just to say how important the north
2 lot is to our building. Because we don't have
3 enough parking for our building; we're short 10 to
4 20 spots easily. We have 108 apartments. That
5 north lot, which is the municipal lot, which is
6 just beyond our property's lot is used by
7 residents, families, visitors, caregivers,
8 physicians, everyone that comes in. It's also
9 filled on Friday night, Saturday night. You can't
10 even get a spot in there anyway because of the
11 activity in the restaurants and all around.

12 So we just wanted to say how important that
13 is as you consider what to do up there because,
14 otherwise, our residents are not able to safely
15 cross the street. You know, I park across the
16 street all these years, but I can also walk. But
17 I park across the street, and the folks don't slow
18 down as you cross, and a lot of our people have
19 mobility issues, some have oxygen that they're
20 carrying with them, and they need a safe place on
21 the building side of the river -- I mean of 31,
22 the east side of 31 to park.

23 So it's really critical from our point of
24 view, so that's why we came tonight.

1 MR. CLARK: I'm David Clark. I live at
2 Carroll Tower.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How do you spell your
4 last name?

5 MR. CLARK: Clark, C-l-a-r-k.

6 I totally agree with everything Carol said.
7 To have more parking on the east side of 31 is
8 absolutely critical to the people that live there.
9 They're old-aged; they are struggling. You have
10 to be over 62 just to get into the building. So
11 everyone is old, and they do struggle, and we do
12 need more parking. So any change that you guys
13 have that takes away that parking space would hurt
14 us. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

16 Any other questions, comments?

17 Sir.

18 MR. KELPY: Larry Kelpy, K-e-l-p-y. I'm a
19 past director of the Fox Valley Tourism
20 Association, the Restoration of Kane County
21 Historic Board, and a number of other community
22 things, so I've been around town a lot. And doing
23 historic research around the community, St. Charles
24 was actually one of the original recreation spots

1 for Chicago, and to see where that can be a goal
2 to bring back. That was based on the cottages
3 that were built north of town mostly, maybe some
4 south of town, but they were rumbling cottages by
5 after World War II. And whether there were
6 beaches around for people to play on I don't know,
7 and the water quality of the river to swim in,
8 well, we know that's changed with the industrial
9 revolution. It's gone up. It's a lot better to
10 swim in there now than in 1955 when I did in
11 Aurora. But I'm not sure how well the use of the
12 river as a public recreation thing is if you got
13 out in the water itself, and that would be a good
14 thing to study.

15 I can see the point of moving the big dam
16 back to the railroad tracks to reduce the
17 floodplain area. There were problems with the
18 floodplain in downtown. Route 31 gets flooded
19 very often during heavy storms. We see 1 foot of
20 water, cars trying to drive through it, and you
21 don't walk down the sidewalk on those days.

22 But definitely parking is the first
23 priority that I would see as a possibility, and I
24 would encourage the concept of the VFW lot which

1 was recently recovered from the VFW, as well as
2 the other public lot as the anchor points for a
3 large complex much like we have on the First
4 Street deck. You could do multiple sides with
5 retail on those, as well as enough parking and
6 maybe even have a second level crossover like they
7 have in Chicago or in Rosemont to get access to
8 the parking deck somehow or another. There's been
9 talk about that. It's easiest enough to do.

10 But yeah, if the building stays and Trump
11 doesn't kill us all, we need -- I think the housing
12 study I participated in a few years ago we
13 recommended 500 housing units in the St. Charles
14 area for senior citizens. At this point there's
15 108 there; there's 50 units being built out near
16 the Jewel now. We're not going to be able to move
17 into 50 units, and the other 300 people that are
18 looking for housing now that's on the two-year
19 waiting list, they need to have housing, too. So
20 if the thing goes through and we move, the building
21 gets another use, we need housing. And we need a
22 place that has a parking deck anyway because, like
23 my friend says, there's no place to park within
24 three blocks. I've parked in every public parking

1 lot on this town on Friday nights and walked
2 across town.

3 But that's it for me.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

5 MR. DAVIS: Good evening, folks, Steven
6 Davis, D-a-v-i-s. I'm a resident of Carroll Tower,
7 fairly new here. My daughter and my son-in-law
8 have lived here for quite a while.

9 I'd like to just say if parking has to be
10 eliminated in the north lot, which is important to
11 us, if they build something like a double decker
12 garage across the street from us, it's definitely
13 a dangerous area to try to cross there, and a
14 streetlight would be a fantastic idea because a
15 lot of us don't move very fast.

16 Thank you. Appreciate it.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
18 Any other comments, questions?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Russ,
21 anything else?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then I believe
24 that that concludes Item 7 on the agenda.

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update
Conducted on June 18, 2019

20

1 Item 8 is the development report.

2 Item 9 is upcoming meetings, and we do
3 have items for January 2nd --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: July.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: July 2nd.

6 MR. COLBY: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And we have the
8 upcoming planning and development committee
9 meetings.

10 Any public comment?

11 (No response.)

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

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

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

18 (Ayes heard.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: City of St. Charles
22 Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

23 (Off the record at 8:49 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 24th day of June, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois