

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2024**

---

Members Present: Peter Vargulich  
Laurel Moad  
Gina Lawson  
Colleen Wiese  
Zachary Ewoldt  
Dave Rosenberg  
Gary Gruber  
John Fitzgerald

Members Absent: Jeffrey Funke

Also Present: Ellen Johnson, Planner  
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner  
Russ Colby, Director of Community Development  
Derek Conley, Director of Economic Development  
Bruce Sylvester, Assistant Director CD-Planning & Engineering  
Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

Chair Vargulich called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Chair Vargulich called the roll. A quorum was present.

**3. Pledge of Allegiance**

**4. Presentation of minutes of the May 7, 2024 meeting of the Plan Commission**

**Motion was made by Ms. Moad, seconded by Ms. Wiese and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the May 7, 2024 Plan Commission meeting.**

**5. Election of Officers**

**Motion was made by Ms. Moad and seconded by multiple members and unanimously passed by voice vote to elect Peter Vargulich as Chairman.**

**Motion was made by Ms. Moad and seconded by multiple members and unanimously passed by voice vote to elect Jeffrey Funke as Vice Chairman.**

Chair Vargulich asked to reverse the order of items 6 & 7 on the agenda. Unanimously agreed to by members.

**7. 407 S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street Easement Vacation (Zach Derrico)**

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

**Motion was made by Ms. Wiese and seconded by Mr. Ewoldt to recommend approval of 407 S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street Easement Vacation.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Moad, Lawson, Wiese, Ewoldt, Rosenberg, Gruber, Fitzgerald, Vargulich**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: Funke**

**Motion carried: 8-0**

**6. Fox Haven Square, Stuart's Crossing PUD Lot 4 (Greco Investment Management LLC)**  
Application for Special Use (PUD Amendment)  
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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. Wiese and seconded by Mr. Fitzgerald to close the public hearing.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Moad, Lawson, Wiese, Ewoldt, Rosenberg, Gruber, Fitzgerald, Vargulich**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: Funke**

**Motion carried: 8-0**

b. Discussion and Recommendation

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

**Motion was made by Ms. Wiese and seconded by Ms. Moad to recommend approval of an Application for Special Use (PUD Amendment) and an Application for PUD Preliminary Plan for Fox Haven Square, Stuart's Crossing PUD Lot 4, subject to resolution of all staff comments.**

**Roll call vote:**

**Ayes: Moad, Lawson, Wiese, Ewoldt, Rosenberg, Gruber, Fitzgerald, Vargulich**

**Nays: None**

**Absent: Funke**

**Motion carried: 8-0**

**Plan Commission**

**June 4, 2024**

**Page 3**

- 8. Public Comment - None**
- 9. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None**
- 10. Weekly Development Report**
- 11. Meeting Announcements**
  - a. Plan Commission
    - Tuesday, June 18, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
    - Tuesday, July 2, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
    - Tuesday, July 16, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
  - b. Planning & Development Committee
    - Monday, June 10, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
    - Monday, July 8, 2024 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- 12. Adjournment at 8:37 p.m.**



**Planet Depos**<sup>®</sup>  
We Make It *Happen*<sup>™</sup>

---

# Transcript of Hearing - 407 S. 5th Street Easement

**Date:** June 4, 2024

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888-433-3767

**Fax:** 888-503-3767

**Email:** [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto: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: :  
Easement Vacation :  
(Zach Derrico); :  
Property Located at :  
407 South 5th Street. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, June 4, 2024  
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 514870A  
Pages: 1 - 10  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 PETER VARGULICH, Chairman

3 ZACHARY EWOLDT, Member

4 JOHN FITZGERALD, Member

5 GARY GRUBER, Member

6 GINA LAWSON, Member

7 LAUREL MOAD, Member

8 DAVE ROSENBERG, Member

9 COLLEEN WIESE, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Director of Community Development

13 BRUCE SYLVESTER, Assistant Director of

14 Community Development

15 DEREK CONLEY, Director of Economic Development

16 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

17 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Good evening everyone.  
The meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission is  
called to order. Roll call.

Laurel Moad.

MEMBER MOAD: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gina Lawson.

MEMBER LAWSON: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

MEMBER WIESE: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

MEMBER EWOLDT: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Dave Rosenberg.

MEMBER ROSENBERG: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber.

MEMBER GRUBER: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald.

MEMBER FITZGERALD: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'd like to welcome our  
new Commissioner Gina Lawson. She is taking over  
the seat that was previously held by Karen Hibel.

(Applause.)



1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Look forward to  
2 having you here. Thank you.

3 We'd like to say the Pledge of Allegiance,  
4 please.

5 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

7 Item 4, presentation of our meeting  
8 minutes from our May 7th meeting. Is there a  
9 motion to approve?

10 MEMBER MOAD: So moved.

11 MEMBER WIESE: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We have a motion to  
13 approve and a second. All in favor.

14 (Ayes heard.)

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Opposed.

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. It passes.

18 Item 5, favorite thing, election of our  
19 officers. Plan Commission chair and vice chair  
20 are elected at the beginning of each fiscal year.  
21 So can we entertain a motion to nominate a chair?

22 MEMBER MOAD: I nominate Peter Vargulich  
23 to continue in the role of chair and Jeffrey Funke  
24 to continue in the role of vice chair.

1           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Technically you have  
2 to do them in separate votes.

3           MEMBER MOAD: One at a time.

4           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Appreciate your  
5 enthusiasm.

6           So right now we have a motion for myself  
7 to remain as chair. Is there a second?

8           MULTIPLE MEMBERS: Second.

9           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Excellent. Of  
10 course. All those in favor.

11          (Ayes heard.)

12          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Opposed.

13          (No response.)

14          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion passes. And  
15 now we're going to entertain our vice chair.

16          MEMBER MOAD: I move that we nominate  
17 Jeffrey Funke to be the vice chair for 2024.

18          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Nominating Jeff Funke,  
19 is there a second?

20          MULTIPLE MEMBERS: Second.

21          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Again the chorus line,  
22 love it.

23          All those in favor.

24          (Ayes heard.)

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion passes.

2 So I'm going to ask if the Plan Commission  
3 would be okay if we reverse the order 6 and 7 since  
4 7 seems a pretty straightforward item, the easement  
5 vacation, but we do have to vote on that. Is there  
6 anyone opposed to switching the order tonight?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So all those in  
9 favor, aye.

10 (Ayes heard.)

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Unanimous.

12 Item 7, easement vacation at 407 South  
13 5th Street filed by Zach Derrico. This is not a  
14 public hearing.

15 Staff, could you provide your report,  
16 please.

17 MS. HITZEMANN: Yes. I'm presenting on  
18 behalf of Petitioner Mr. Derrico. Basically, what  
19 he is requesting is a vacation of 3 feet of the  
20 utility easement.

21 So there's a 10-foot utility easement here  
22 that was created when the plat was resubdivided.  
23 This is Parcel 1 and this is Parcel 2. Originally,  
24 it was one parcel that they subdivided into two.

1 When that happens, we require a 10-foot rear yard  
2 utility easement along both parcels. He is  
3 requesting to vacate 3 feet of that for a detached  
4 garage addition.

5 This is in the Historic District. And  
6 Historic District has reviewed the garage plans  
7 and has approved them. And garages -- typically  
8 detached garages are allowed 3 feet from the lot  
9 line.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Is there  
11 any questions from the Commissioners?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is there a motion?

14 MEMBER WIESE: I'll make a motion to  
15 approve 407 South 5th Street easement vacation  
16 (Zach Derrico).

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is there a second?

18 MEMBER EWOLDT: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion and second.

20 So the motion has been made and seconded to  
21 approve easement vacation for 407 South 5th Street  
22 filed by Zach Derrico. Any discussion on the  
23 motion?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Roll call.  
2 Laurel Moad.  
3 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.  
4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gina Lawson.  
5 MEMBER LAWSON: Yes.  
6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.  
7 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.  
8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.  
9 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.  
10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Dave Rosenberg.  
11 MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.  
12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber.  
13 MEMBER GRUBER: Yes.  
14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald.  
15 MEMBER FITZGERALD: Yes.  
16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes.  
17 That passes.  
18 (Off the record at 7:05 p.m.)  
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 10th day of June, 2024.

My commission expires: October 16, 2025



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois



**Planet Depos**<sup>®</sup>  
We Make It *Happen*<sup>™</sup>

---

# Transcript of Hearing - Fox Haven Square

**Date:** June 4, 2024

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888-433-3767

**Fax:** 888-503-3767

**Email:** [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto: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 :  
Application for PUD :  
Preliminary Plan; :  
Fox Haven Square, Stuart's :  
Crossing PUD Lot 4 (Greco :  
Investment Management LLC) :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, June 4, 2024  
7:05 p.m.

Job No.: 514870B  
Pages: 1 - 77  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR



1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 PETER VARGULICH, Chairman

3 ZACHARY EWOLDT, Member

4 JOHN FITZGERALD, Member

5 GARY GRUBER, Member

6 GINA LAWSON, Member

7 LAUREL MOAD, Member

8 DAVE ROSENBERG, Member

9 COLLEEN WIESE, Member

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12 RUSS COLBY, Director of Community Development

13 BRUCE SYLVESTER, Assistant Director of

14 Community Development

15 DEREK CONLEY, Director of Economic Development

16 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

17 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Item 6, there's  
3 two parts to this, and we'll start with -- this is  
4 a special use PUD amendment and an application for  
5 PUD preliminary plan for Stuart's Crossing Lot 4  
6 filed by Greco Investment Management LLC.

7 So a public hearing is required for an  
8 application like this. The goal of the Plan  
9 Commission is to conduct all public hearings on  
10 zoning applications that are filed within the city.

11 So our procedure will be staff will provide  
12 a summary of the application; then the applicant  
13 will make a presentation; then we'll take questions  
14 and comments from the Commissioners, then members  
15 of the public and anybody else wishing to provide  
16 testimony. When the Plan Commission feels they've  
17 gathered enough evidence to make a recommendation,  
18 we will close the public hearing. The Plan  
19 Commission will then move to Item 6B, which would  
20 be the evidence gathered in the PUD -- in  
21 discussing it against the PUD criteria and vote  
22 for recommendation to the Planning and Development  
23 Committee.

24 Before we begin, anyone who wishes to

1 offer testimony, including questions or providing  
2 comments for or against the application, you need  
3 to be sworn in. So all witnesses tonight, if  
4 you're talking on this topic, please stand.

5 (Whereupon, the witnesses were thereupon  
6 duly sworn.)

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you very much.

8 I will just note that the official meeting  
9 packet was posted on the City's website, so all of  
10 that information is part of the public hearing and  
11 part of the record.

12 If staff could please summarize the  
13 application. Thank you.

14 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Fox Haven Square  
15 is a proposed commercial development near the  
16 northeast corner of Main and Kirk Road. The  
17 subject property is 7 1/2 acres and encompasses  
18 Lot 4 and a portion of Lot 3 in Stuart's Crossing  
19 PUD. The PUD covers several properties situated  
20 around the northeast and southwest corners of Main  
21 and Kirk. The PUD was primarily built out in the  
22 early 2000s with the exception of the subject  
23 property which has remained vacant.

24 The property is accessed from two shared

1 drives, from the south off Main Street which  
2 connects north to the Jewel property and from the  
3 west off Kirk Road which is a shared access with  
4 Jewel.

5 The underlying zoning of the property is  
6 BR, Regional Business, and the Comprehensive Plan  
7 land use designation is Corridor or Regional  
8 Commercial.

9 Greco Investment Management is proposing  
10 to develop the subject property. The proposal  
11 includes three restaurants/retail buildings  
12 clustered around a plaza on the east end of the  
13 site, a pickleball facility at the south end,  
14 parking in front along Kirk Road, access from the  
15 existing drives off Main and Kirk, a new cross-  
16 access connection to the mall property from the  
17 Kirk Road entrance, and sidewalk along Kirk Road,  
18 as well.

19 The plan is similar to a concept plan  
20 reviewed back in the fall. The most significant  
21 change is that Building 4, the southern building,  
22 is now a proposed pickleball facility with a  
23 restaurant. It was previously proposed as an  
24 office/retail use. The new Building 4 also has a

1 different architectural style than the buildings  
2 clustered around the plaza.

3 Zoning applications have been submitted to  
4 facilitate the development. The first is an  
5 application for special use requesting to amend  
6 the Stuart's Crossing PUD to allow for certain  
7 deviations from the existing PUD ordinance and the  
8 zoning ordinance standards. Second, application  
9 for PUD preliminary plan to approve the site  
10 layout, landscaping, building elevations, and  
11 preliminary engineering plans for the development.

12 Deviations or departures from current  
13 zoning and PUD standards are requested in order to  
14 allow the development as they're proposing.

15 One is that outdoor dining would be  
16 permitted as an accessory use to restaurants.  
17 Outdoor dining now in the PUD is considered a  
18 special use.

19 The PUD also requires a 50-foot setback  
20 from Kirk Road, and they're proposing a 40-foot  
21 setback for parking and Building 4.

22 Also proposed is a reduction of parking.  
23 The PUD requires a total of 747 parking spaces  
24 based on the proposed uses. The current zoning

1 ordinance standard is a little lower; it would  
2 result in 565 spaces required. They're proposing  
3 434 spaces. They're also intending on shared  
4 parking with the Jewel property and the small  
5 shops building to the north.

6 They're also requesting deviations from  
7 building foundation landscaping requirements.  
8 Buildings 1, 2, and 3 do not meet the foundation  
9 bed planting requirement. There are planters  
10 provided within the plaza between buildings in  
11 lieu of foundation landscaping in some areas.

12 Deviations have been requested from several  
13 building design standards, including a requirement  
14 that facades over 100 feet long shall incorporate  
15 projections or recesses over 20 percent of the  
16 facade. This is not met for Buildings 1 to 4.

17 Facades facing a street must have at least  
18 two architectural features which are listed in the  
19 ordinance, and that is not met for Building 1.

20 Roof lines should be varied with a change  
21 of height or focal feature every 100 feet, and  
22 this is not met for Building 4.

23 Certain exterior building materials are  
24 prohibited, including prefabricated steel panels

1 of the type used in farm industrial buildings, and  
2 this is the proposed material for Building 4.

3           Deviations have also been requested from  
4 the PUD sign regulations to allow a total of  
5 four freestanding signs. There would be two column  
6 signs at the site entrances off of Kirk and the  
7 Charlestown Mall which would be 28 feet tall; a  
8 multitenant shopping center sign off-site at  
9 Foxfield and Kirk which would be 31 feet tall;  
10 another multitenant sign off-site at Main and Kirk  
11 at 34 feet tall. And then just as a note, the  
12 zoning ordinance allows a maximum sign height of  
13 30 feet for shopping center signs and 15 feet for  
14 other signs, so these signs would be generally  
15 taller than permitted otherwise underlying zoning.

16           So staff does have a number of outstanding  
17 comments that need to be addressed on a revised  
18 plan submittal prior to any sort of City Council  
19 action. The staff comments are listed in the  
20 staff report, and those have been provided to the  
21 applicant, as well. Just wanted to highlight a  
22 couple of more significant items.

23           The cross-access easement is needed with  
24 the Charlestown Mall property owner to allow the



1 east/west cross-access, so this will need to be  
2 documented.

3 A shared parking agreement or easement  
4 agreement is needed to memorialize the shared  
5 parking on the adjacent Jewel property and  
6 identify how many spaces are included within that  
7 shared parking agreement and where exactly the  
8 spaces are located.

9 Staff has a number of suggestions on the  
10 design of Building 4 which are aimed at enhancing  
11 the appearance of the building due to its  
12 visibility based on its location near the corner  
13 of Main and Kirk and also due to its size. The  
14 building footprint is 20,000 square feet, and the  
15 building is 39 feet high, which is just 1 foot  
16 under the maximum allotted in this district. The  
17 material, as I said, is the prefabricated metal  
18 panels.

19 So staff suggests enhancing the building  
20 entrance with awnings and lighting, taller windows  
21 within consistent proportions around the building,  
22 maybe a higher-pitched roof, additional detailing,  
23 things like that, suggestions for the applicant to  
24 consider.

1           And just to note, if the Plan Commission  
2 is ready, a recommendation will be needed on both  
3 the special use and the PUD preliminary plan  
4 applications. For the special use application  
5 there is one finding that the Plan Commission  
6 needs to make in order to recommend approval, and  
7 that is that the special use is in the public  
8 interest. So in this case a special use is all of  
9 those deviations to the PUD that I just did.

10           There are five criteria that are to be  
11 considered in reaching this determination of  
12 public interest, and those are listed in the staff  
13 report, and the applicant has provided their  
14 responses as part of their application materials.

15           And with that I can turn it over to the  
16 applicant for their presentation.

17           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you, Ellen.

18           Does anybody have any questions of Ellen  
19 while she's here?

20           (No response.)

21           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

22           MR. GOLUB: Good evening, my name is  
23 Jason Golub with Ware Malcomb. I'm the architect  
24 overseeing the project, and with me is John Grzywa,

1 who is the civil engineer overseeing the site  
2 civil and landscape portion of the project. So  
3 I'm sure he'll get up and speak.

4 First of all, thank you to Bruce, Ellen,  
5 Russell, Derek, Simona -- I'm sure I've forgotten  
6 somebody else -- but they have been amazing to work  
7 with through this whole process, and I don't think  
8 we would have gotten here without their tireless  
9 help and guidance on this. So thank you all.

10 We're excited about this project. I think  
11 it's a great opportunity to expand the downtown  
12 area of St. Charles into this wonderful destination  
13 retail/restaurant complex that we have designed.

14 As Ellen said -- and hopefully I won't  
15 repeat everything she said -- you know, to bring  
16 and draw people to this retail center was the goal  
17 of the project from the get-go. So we've got  
18 four new buildings on 7-plus acres of site,  
19 restaurant, retail, and Ellen just spoke about the  
20 entertainment facility in Building 4.

21 The big component that drove this whole  
22 vision through the Greco team here was this large  
23 outdoor plaza in the central kind of component of  
24 the site. So I'll just kind of roll through some

1 of the renderings we put together so you can kind  
2 of get an overall sense of what this development  
3 looks like.

4 We used brick, stone, some dark storefront,  
5 lots of glass. We have canopies over the main  
6 entrances, some awnings, and I'll keep going here.  
7 You can see sort of the central plaza. We've got  
8 a valet drive-up lane here. And I know some of  
9 this was shared with you, I can't believe it was  
10 back in September, but you had only seen the  
11 overall conceptual site plan. So hopefully this  
12 paints a different picture in your minds so this  
13 gives you a good sense of what this development  
14 will look like as we're proposing it.

15 So on the left here is Building 1, in the  
16 center is Building 2, and in the foreground is  
17 Building 3. Again, a lot of brick coursing, some  
18 coping, some aluminum details just to kind of give  
19 it some depth and texture throughout the site.

20 This is a view of the valet drive-up lane,  
21 Uber lane, whatever you want to call it, the  
22 drop-off zone. We've got bollards along there for  
23 safety. You can see some of the proposed central  
24 artwork in the plaza, trees and tree grates, some

1 of the outdoor seating kind of there on Building 1.

2           There's some connectivity. The plaza is  
3 open right now, but the idea is to have various  
4 activities throughout the year, whether it's live  
5 music or pumpkin carving. We explained that back  
6 in September, but, you know, snowman building  
7 contests, all the things that the Greco envision  
8 we have planned for with turf area, stamped  
9 concrete, pavers, things like that.

10           Here's some outdoor seating with the  
11 planters, trying to keep the development flexible  
12 for -- I know one of the decisions was foundation  
13 planters. As we work with the Greco team to bring  
14 restaurant tenants in and working with those teams  
15 on front doors, entrances, side doors, these cafe  
16 kind of areas, it gives us a little bit more  
17 flexibility to have these movable planters and  
18 trees and tree grates out on the plaza surrounding.

19           This is the back side of Building 1. So  
20 you kind of get an idea of what the -- all four  
21 sides of these buildings look like. We didn't  
22 leave one side blank, so it has some architectural  
23 features and characters on all four sides. Same  
24 with Building 3 here, tried to add some awnings,

1 canopies, openings that -- you know, the sliding  
2 doors, things you see in a more urban downtown  
3 environment we've tried to add in to add some  
4 character.

5           Here's right now what our design is showing  
6 for the two-story pickleball facility working with  
7 that tenant right now. As we move forward, they  
8 are wanting more glass, more visibility. They  
9 want it to look active; they want to have people  
10 walk and drive by seeing the active sport inside  
11 and drawing people in, so we'll work with staff on  
12 getting some of those comments implemented in the  
13 design there.

14           This is a view as you enter the development  
15 off of Main, and then we threw in some of the  
16 signage that's being proposed. I don't know if  
17 that was in the full packet earlier. But just  
18 sort of the gateways into the development, what  
19 we've been working on with the Greco team, new  
20 monument signs where the old Jewel signs were,  
21 giving it a more modern take with the same brick  
22 and aluminum and kind of colors to match the  
23 buildings, similar design there.

24           And then these I think are just the --

1       sorry if I'm going too fast. I've been going over  
2       this for a few months now. But these are the 2D  
3       elevations. Again, this is Building 1.  
4       Building 2 you can see similar character,  
5       materials, architectural geometries, things like  
6       that. Building 3 and then this is the proposed  
7       two-story pickleball facility Building 4.

8               I'll pause there. John is going to talk  
9       about the site landscaping, parking, all that  
10       stuff if that's okay.

11               CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure.

12               MR. GRZYWA: Good evening everyone, my  
13       name is John Grzywa. I'm also with Ware Malcomb.  
14       I'm the civil engineer drawing the civil side of  
15       things.

16               So, you know, as a civil engineer I don't  
17       have a lot of nice renderings and pretty pictures  
18       like Jason did, but I did want to touch on a few  
19       things Ellen mentioned in her staff report and  
20       also just some updates and explain a couple of  
21       reasons for the deviations.

22               Probably the biggest one I want to start with  
23       is the reduction in the building setback along  
24       Kirk for Building 4. This really comes down to

1 it's a 10-foot reduction to go from 50 feet to  
2 40 feet for the building. It's also for the  
3 parking, but it's primarily driven by the building  
4 location. And based on the size, we were able to  
5 show that building with a 50-foot setback, but it  
6 really starts pushing the east face of that  
7 building pretty close to this drive as you come in  
8 off of North Avenue. So the thought was let's get  
9 a little bit more separation, not have a concern  
10 about people as they're trying to leave the site  
11 clipping the corner of that building. We have it  
12 protected with the bollards but just to make sure  
13 we've got enough room. So that's really the  
14 driving factor behind the reduction in the setback.

15 Ellen also mentioned cross-access with  
16 Charlestown Mall. My understanding is they  
17 already -- the Greco team has already exchanged  
18 two different draft easement agreements with the  
19 mall, so they are working actively with the mall  
20 to secure that cross-access disagreement with them  
21 and will continue to work with staff and provide  
22 them updates and provide them with the easement  
23 agreement language, exhibits, everything that goes  
24 along with that when it's finalized.



1           The third thing I wanted to touch on is  
2 parking. So one of the requests is for the  
3 reduction in parking for the site, and as Ellen  
4 mentioned, there's the PUD standards and then  
5 there's underlying code standards and code  
6 requirements for the site. And really this  
7 project doesn't work without the Greco team  
8 acquiring the Jewel property to the north. So  
9 they are very close to closing on at that  
10 property, at which point they'll own the entire  
11 center. They'll own Jewel; they'll own the small  
12 shops to the south of Jewel; they'll control that  
13 parking lot, and then the center as a whole will  
14 be overparked.

15           So we're happy to work with staff to  
16 provide that documentation as they close on that  
17 property, but really the intent is this is going  
18 to be whatever else a busy area, a very busy  
19 destination. There's going to be a lot of cars,  
20 but they're going to have that opportunity for the  
21 overflow parking to use at night when Jewel is not  
22 as busy. There is something to be said for when  
23 Fox Haven Square is really active is not going to  
24 be at the same time during the day that Jewel is

1 going to be active, during the morning time,  
2 during the day, during the day on the weekends is  
3 not when Fox Haven Square is going to be active.

4 I think the only other thing I wanted to  
5 touch on, and Jason already mentioned it, is I'd  
6 like to go back to the renderings especially in  
7 the plaza area. Just to touch on the landscaping,  
8 as Jason mentioned, I know one of the asks is not  
9 having the required foundation plantings around  
10 Buildings 1, 2 and 3. The Greco team is not  
11 interested in trying to not do landscaping.  
12 They're going to do landscaping. We just want to  
13 make sure it's in the right place that works for  
14 the outdoor seating that we're proposing that a  
15 lot of the potential tenants that they've been  
16 talking to are really excited about. So the  
17 thought is we'll find places around those buildings  
18 for the foundation plantings, but we really want  
19 to have movable planters that are going to frame  
20 out the seating areas or are going to be around  
21 the common areas, not right up against the building.

22 So there's going to be significant  
23 landscaping in this plaza area; it's just not  
24 going to be the foundation plantings that are

1 required.

2 So I think that was it on site-related  
3 issues, but I'm happy to answer questions as they  
4 come up.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you. We're  
6 going to take public comment after the Plan  
7 Commissioners have had a chance. Thank you, guys,  
8 appreciate the presentation.

9 So if there's anyone who would like to  
10 start with some questions, comments, thoughts.

11 John.

12 MEMBER FITZGERALD: Just on the civil side,  
13 you said it's going to be proposed for restaurant,  
14 retail, pickleball, et cetera, which is going to  
15 be an increase in traffic. Has a traffic study  
16 been considered, and how is that going to impact  
17 overall lanes on Kirk and 64?

18 MR. GRZYWA: So a traffic study has not  
19 been performed, and I don't have history of -- and  
20 I'm going to defer maybe back to Ellen, but I  
21 don't know if a traffic study was performed when  
22 the original PUD was done based on those proposed  
23 uses. I know they were not the same.

24 MS. JOHNSON: It's possible that there was

1 a traffic study at that point. This property has  
2 been planned for commercial development, and the  
3 proposed uses are within the allowable uses of  
4 this underlying zoning, so we did not request a  
5 new parking study -- I'm sorry; a new traffic  
6 study. If the Plan Commission does have concerns  
7 about traffic, you have the ability to request  
8 additional information.

9 MEMBER FITZGERALD: Thanks, Ellen.

10 MEMBER GRUBER: Just a point of  
11 clarification. So there is no modification to the  
12 entrances from Kirk Road or the Main?

13 MS. JOHNSON: No, they're proposing to  
14 stay the same.

15 MEMBER GRUBER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other questions  
17 from the Commissioners?

18 MEMBER EWOLDT: I have some questions  
19 regarding the material on Building 4. Staff noted  
20 that currently the material is prohibited  
21 underneath the code, you know, from a metal  
22 standpoint. You had hinted that the pickleball  
23 entity is seeking some modifications, but what  
24 would you be proposing? I mean, from -- just say

1 one windows, two windows, that's what I'm trying  
2 to understand.

3 MR. GOLUB: I guess my response would be I  
4 think right now with the 20,000 square feet we  
5 need to lay out the restaurant space, which is  
6 roughly 7,000 square feet I want to say on the  
7 first floor and see where that aligns. They want  
8 to have visibility into the bar area, the seating  
9 area. And then he is very -- he wants to make  
10 sure that the activity that's happening inside  
11 that building is visible from Kirk Road. So he  
12 wants glass along Kirk; he wants bigger windows,  
13 taller windows. He wants to people to know it's a  
14 pickleball facility.

15 I don't know what that means yet because  
16 we haven't put pencils to paper. The materials  
17 that we're showing right now are the cast stone  
18 and metal, and we've heard the comments, received  
19 the comments, and we hopefully will work through  
20 what is approval material for you guys.

21 MEMBER EWOLDT: From the floor plan in the  
22 packet -- so I'm trying to understand. So it's  
23 two floors or two floors and a mezzanine?

24 MR. GOLUB: Two floors.

1           MEMBER EWOLDT: Are there balconies or are  
2 those aesthetic?

3           MR. GOLUB: The idea is to have the top  
4 level open. So maybe some glass up there for  
5 outdoor courts so the balls aren't flying off the  
6 roof and things like that, but it gives the sense  
7 of openness to the people playing and people  
8 watching.

9           MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay. So I guess where  
10 the roof elements change, that area would be a  
11 second -- that is a second floor?

12          MR. GOLUB: Yes, this is kind of the  
13 levels over here.

14          MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay.

15          MR. GOLUB: So this is just glass  
16 potentially, maybe netting, maybe a combination of  
17 both. Something attractive.

18          MEMBER EWOLDT: Okay. I was trying to  
19 understand.

20          MR. GOLUB: But the safety, making sure  
21 balls aren't falling off the roof.

22          MEMBER EWOLDT: And just the overall color  
23 choice, the white in contrast to what's out there,  
24 the other buildings being proposed, the other

1 buildings are more of a brick material with black.

2 MR. GOLUB: Neutral colors.

3 MEMBER EWOLDT: This kind of contrast  
4 that's being proposed in the development, is there  
5 a reason for that particularly?

6 MR. GOLUB: I think that was the tenant's  
7 preference. We're trying to satisfy the tenant  
8 that is going into this endeavor, not having done  
9 a pickleball facility before, but he has done  
10 quite a few restaurants in the Chicagoland area.  
11 This was his preference and I would say the design  
12 is not a hundred percent fully baked at this  
13 point. So we'll look for opportunities to push  
14 and pull if we need to add more materials if we can.

15 MEMBER MOAD: You mentioned that there  
16 were discussions to purchase all of the property,  
17 Jewel and the property. Would that include the  
18 Beyond the Border location, as well?

19 MR. GOLUB: I believe that's a separate  
20 parcel. They're saying no, that is not part of  
21 the deal right now.

22 MEMBER WIESE: I like that there was the  
23 addition of the sidewalk. This may seem trivial  
24 but I think it's important in a lot of the

1 conversations we're having throughout the city. I  
2 didn't see any opportunity for like bike parking.  
3 I just want to make sure it's both bike friendly  
4 and walk friendly.

5 MR. GOLUB: We have bike racks. I don't  
6 remember the quantities. They're disbursed  
7 throughout the building so people riding bikes  
8 from the neighboring residential communities can  
9 get there and park and have a place to leave  
10 their bikes.

11 MEMBER WIESE: Okay. I think staff did an  
12 excellent job with a lot of information in the  
13 packet providing you guys a ton of feedback.

14 What I find interesting with Building 4 is  
15 I actually think -- well, one, I think it's great.  
16 Thank you for bringing the concept. I've been  
17 here 20 years, and this has been a vacant parcel.  
18 So I do think it brings a sense of vitality to the  
19 east side.

20 I actually think Building 4 does a good  
21 job of mimicking the structure that was kept at  
22 the corner of Kirk with the gas station, so I'm  
23 actually not opposed to the white. And I know  
24 staff will work with you through the materials,



1 but I actually think it kind of brings some  
2 cohesiveness -- it may not be exactly what you're  
3 proposing here, but when I drove by there, I could  
4 envision it because I do think that mimics that  
5 very well. And I love the idea of a pickleball  
6 court because it's interesting. It's a different  
7 type of entertainment, so I appreciate that, and I  
8 appreciate the diversity of what this could bring.

9 I also think with the -- you know, with the  
10 idea that this is going to go through with owning  
11 the Jewel, it eases my concern with any parking  
12 problems. I wouldn't want this to turn into  
13 one giant parking lot anyway, so if that does go  
14 through, I think that's going to ease a  
15 significant amount of concerns just to make sure  
16 there are no problems and people are enjoying it  
17 and not having problems.

18 And it looks like there is -- in addition  
19 to the retail, do you anticipate that there's  
20 going to be retail in there that's going to have  
21 different hours than what the restaurants are, or  
22 is this primarily all like retail and office?

23 MR. GOLUB: No -- I mean, I know the  
24 leasing team has talked to several tenants. It's

1 not all restaurants.

2 MEMBER WIESE: So there's going to be a shift  
3 in how the buildings are used throughout the day?

4 MR. GOLUB: Again, this valet drop-off  
5 zone is -- there would be shared valet. That's  
6 part of the agreement to have a shared valet that  
7 would then park cars up by the Jewel lot. So that  
8 would free up even more spots during operating  
9 hours for the restaurants.

10 MEMBER WIESE: Thank you.

11 MR. GOLUB: And then I would just say we  
12 did look at the gas station, this structure here.  
13 We did recognize that when this design was getting  
14 put together, and we didn't think it was too far  
15 off -- don't want to call it set the precedence,  
16 but we thought it was similar in nature to what is  
17 in this area.

18 MEMBER WIESE: I was glad to hear that the  
19 tenant wants to see more windows because I do  
20 think that would bring much more air and vitality  
21 to that whole building, and I thought staff had  
22 some really good recommendations regarding that  
23 brings, but yeah, I thought it was an interesting  
24 concept.

1 MR. GOLUB: As an architect we want to  
2 make it interesting, trust me, we're going to do  
3 our best. We'll add some flare to it, I promise.

4 MEMBER WIESE: Thank you.

5 MEMBER MOAD: One more thing, I noticed  
6 you have EV parking at the far north end of the  
7 development. Would you consider adding additional  
8 EV to the south end? It's a long way if you're  
9 charging a vehicle and you're going to play  
10 pickleball.

11 MR. GOLUB: I think that's a good question.  
12 We were trying to be proactive and add the EV,  
13 which was suggested to the ownership team, and we  
14 were happy to see that they agreed to it as part  
15 of the development. I'd say we would bring that  
16 up with the pickleball owner and see if we could  
17 get them to add some, too. I don't think that's a  
18 bad idea at all.

19 MEMBER GRUBER: The businesses that are  
20 south of Jewel, I think it's Rosati's, AAA office  
21 or something like that, are they included in that  
22 purchase?

23 MR. GOLUB: It's included, yes.

24 MEMBER GRUBER: Thank you.

1           MEMBER EWOLDT: I have a question for staff  
2 regarding just the Building 4 design. With this  
3 approval we'd be in theory granting relief to  
4 allow the steel material to be used. And then if  
5 it moves forward, ultimately the design would be  
6 staff's approval, or they would have to go back  
7 through this process, correct, to get design  
8 approval of Building 4?

9           MS. JOHNSON: Building 4 architecture would  
10 be approved as part of this PUD preliminary plan.

11           MEMBER EWOLDT: So essentially in theory  
12 if they're going to make changes, you know, the  
13 Plan Commission or City Council would not see any  
14 of those changes unless it was a part of the  
15 process?

16           MS. JOHNSON: Right. Like, for example,  
17 if Plan Commission were to recommend approval  
18 subject to resolution of staff comments, then it  
19 would be staff's discretion to make sure that the  
20 changes they made to the building kind of follow  
21 what we're trying to do. But yeah, the Plan  
22 Commission wouldn't go back and see those changes  
23 unless you were to continue the hearing.

24           MEMBER EWOLDT: Thank you.

1           MEMBER GRUBER: One point of clarification.  
2 Before you made a reference to cross-access with  
3 Charlestown Mall. Where is that represented?  
4 Would that be on the south side?

5           MR. GOLUB: Yeah, can you see where my  
6 mouse is right here? So right now it stops here.  
7 So we would be adding this to the mall road.

8           MEMBER GRUBER: Thank you.

9           MR. GOLUB: That's for pedestrians, people  
10 on bikes, cars, other things.

11          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: If you end up closing  
12 on the property to the north with Jewel, will you  
13 be extending the sidewalk all the way up to  
14 Foxfield Drive?

15          MR. GRZYWA: That's not currently proposed.

16          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm asking. I know  
17 it's not proposed.

18          MR. GRZYWA: We would discuss with ownership,  
19 and we would work with staff.

20          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That's not an answer.  
21 Well, here. It seems weird that you would go to  
22 the level of buying this property to get cross-  
23 access easements for parking, and you have a  
24 pedestrian sidewalk that's isolated right now. It

1 can't go across Main Street; it only runs across  
2 your frontage currently on Kirk Road. And there's  
3 a sidewalk that runs east/west on Foxfield Drive,  
4 and yet you would own the property and wouldn't  
5 connect the sidewalk up to that sidewalk.

6 From a pedestrian connectivity standpoint  
7 those are the things that our sidewalk and  
8 pedestrian plans have asked for and have pursued  
9 at a lot of high levels. Seems like a simple  
10 thing but --

11 MR. GRZYWA: I understand the question and  
12 understand that at first glance it might seem like  
13 a simple thing. However, we've reached out to  
14 Kane County Department of Transportation with our  
15 preliminary routing shown on here -- so typically  
16 sidewalks are 1 foot off of the right-of-way in  
17 the public right-of-way. KDOT's initial comment  
18 to us is that this sidewalk needs to be located on  
19 private property, which creates a situation where  
20 then granted easements, we're trying to obtain  
21 easements from off-site property owners, we have  
22 existing landscaping that's located on private  
23 property, we're talking about regrading, we're  
24 talking about -- I don't know what sort of

1 utilities are in that area.

2 So that's the only reason that I'm giving  
3 a vague answer is your question is certainly noted  
4 and understandable. I clearly understand the  
5 intent of creating pedestrian connectivity  
6 especially up to that sidewalk off Foxfield. It's  
7 just something that we haven't examined.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. I guess I would  
9 ask of staff, is it normal that the Kane County  
10 DOT does not want the City to have sidewalks that  
11 connect along their streets? Is that a normal  
12 response?

13 MS. JOHNSON: I don't believe they -- it's  
14 not that they don't want sidewalks; it's that they  
15 don't want sidewalks within their own right-of-way.  
16 And we spoke to KDOT this morning about these  
17 comments because elsewhere in the city there is  
18 public sidewalk within KDOT right-of-way, so we're  
19 interested to learn more about that policy and  
20 kind of where that comment is coming from since it  
21 seems a little inconsistent. So we just learned  
22 of this today, as well.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah, I mean, when you  
24 look at Randall Road, the sidewalks along Randall

1 Road are within the right-of-way. They are not on  
2 private property.

3 So I just -- I understand you received a  
4 comment, fair enough, but I'm just like, okay,  
5 well, then where did all this policy change, if  
6 you will, from KDOT's standpoint. None of these  
7 parties control, understandably, but it just seems  
8 like a weird response especially given our bike  
9 plan and pedestrian movement plan which they were  
10 a part of looking at and seeing when it was all  
11 being vetted. It just seems like an odd response.

12 Okay. So that just needs some more  
13 research, if you will?

14 MR. GRZYWA: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: No problem.

16 All right. I want to just ask some questions  
17 that maybe back up to September. When you came in  
18 for a concept plan, there were 472 parking spaces.  
19 There was a statement in the application that there  
20 will be minor departures from current zoning and  
21 PUD requirements. It was 71,000 square feet with  
22 buildings at 20 to 23 feet high. And I would say  
23 that this plan is significantly different than  
24 that plan on those factors.



1           It's not that there's more buildings;  
2 we're just talking about a lot more building.  
3 12 percent more, your base building is 28 or 29 feet  
4 high, not 22 to 23 feet high, and you're asking  
5 for a 40-foot building metal siding that doesn't  
6 even become part of our zoning ordinance for the  
7 zoning district.

8           So I would say that there's quite a bit of  
9 departure from the concept plan to today, and I  
10 would ask an explanation of that.

11           MR. GOLUB: I would probably respond by  
12 saying yeah, we look at the site plan and say yes,  
13 there's four buildings and the footprints are very  
14 similar to what you had seen before. Even though  
15 Building 4 increased a little, it shifted a little  
16 in the area that it was previously in, and we  
17 added a second floor, I agree.

18           The concept is still the same, I would say.  
19 The retail, the restaurant, the entertainment draw  
20 to the area to this development is still the  
21 ultimate goal. We still have the outdoor plaza in  
22 the middle. Parking has been refined based on  
23 surveys that we got after the fact. Some easements  
24 that are down around On the Border created some

1 parking differences, I would say. And then we  
2 added the EV parking, some more handicap stalls,  
3 things like that, we relocated trash enclosures,  
4 which all -- I mean, those are all the little  
5 things that added to a rearrangement of some of  
6 the character of the development.

7 We went from concept, to more design  
8 development, to kind of this final layout and  
9 these renderings and the drawings that we're  
10 working on now. You know, the leasing team has  
11 been working with retail tenants, been working  
12 with restaurant tenants to get them what they  
13 want. So things have pushed and pulled, and we  
14 have tried to stay true to that plan that you saw  
15 in September, and I don't think we're too far off.  
16 I hear your comment but I think we're close.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, you had  
18 472 parking spaces, and assuming the other things  
19 go through, you're only proposing 434, so you went  
20 in the other direction from a parking standpoint.

21 MR. GOLUB: I'll let Eddie talk in a  
22 second, but I will just add also that at the time  
23 in September that we came in with the concept the  
24 Jewel property was not even in the discussion.

1 And after that meeting and after the preliminary  
2 City Council meeting, they had discussions about  
3 purchasing that, which in our eyes freed up some  
4 of that parking requirement.

5 MR. GRECO: Going back to your comment --

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry; if you  
7 could state your name.

8 MR. GRECO: Eddie Greco. Going back to  
9 your comment, a lot of what we originally came in  
10 with was a concept and an idea of what we wanted  
11 to do on the east side. We've been true to that,  
12 but as you start dealing with tenants -- because  
13 we're dealing with these tenants that we want to  
14 bring to St. Charles.

15 So that first Building 4, that's Hampton  
16 Social, very astute, good operators, they kind of  
17 dictated it. As we went to the building, I don't  
18 think we were ever at 23 feet, but we learned in  
19 dealing with tenants of structure -- stature that  
20 30 feet was good for their restaurants due to  
21 opening of windows, the outdoor patio, and having  
22 that access.

23 So as the process went, we worked with  
24 those tenants on what their requirements were,

1 whether they were at Old Orchard, Libertyville, so  
2 they kind of dictated to us what they need. The  
3 buildings actually shrunk. The three buildings  
4 were over 80-something thousand when we first put  
5 it together. Due to whether it was parking,  
6 access changes we had to shrink it a little bit  
7 down to 71,000 square feet to make it work.

8 And as we got into parking, we have a  
9 shared agreement with Old Second, who is financing  
10 the project for us, and then we ended up needing  
11 the Jewel in order -- because originally it was  
12 going to be all restaurants. We have these  
13 relationships. The concepts that we're bringing  
14 here are one of the best, out of the city coming  
15 to the burbs, Parlor Group, the Bayless Group,  
16 Parker Group. So these are big groups that  
17 dictate to us. So we were forced to go in and buy  
18 Jewel, but now it gives us the ability to add  
19 whatever it is, 890 spots, plus 32 spots that we  
20 have a shared agreement with Old Second.

21 And to answer your question, we have  
22 a bid right now on On the Border. So it's a  
23 back-and-forth right now, but we have put an offer  
24 in on On the Border to complete the concept. And

1 the Jewel will be closing in one week. It took a  
2 long time. We were dealing with corporate to get  
3 through a lot of things with them, and they have  
4 resigned for an additional -- they're 10 years now.  
5 So we got them to sign up for another 10 years.

6 There's been a lot of moving parts in this  
7 thing and a lot of changes as we've gone, but I  
8 think we learned a lot. Like we were going to put  
9 all restaurants in there, and when we started  
10 talking to some of these guys, they didn't want  
11 all restaurants. So now we're about 26,000 square  
12 feet, and we hired a major group out of Chicago  
13 called the Canvas Group, and they'll start filling  
14 it in with whether it's a Pure Barre, yoga, we'll  
15 start getting the right mix in there.

16 But we hand selected these operators to be  
17 there for a reason. Because we want the project  
18 to be successful. We're not sellers, our family;  
19 we're keepers and this is going to be a monument  
20 for our family.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just a quick question.  
22 You said -- in the application and on the plan it  
23 says 40,000 square feet of restaurants, but you're  
24 saying it's --

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think it was up to 40,  
2 up to.

3           MR. GRECO: The mix of customers, tenants,  
4 that's enough. So it has a Mexican concept, the  
5 Bayless Group, Hampton Social, which they're going  
6 to name it something else, that's the pickleball,  
7 Parlor Group out of the Chicago, and we're close  
8 with Burger Local, and then they've got a complete  
9 mix in there.

10          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The staff comments  
11 covered a lot of different areas that came up to  
12 almost like two pages of just staff comments  
13 broken up into areas, but that's a lot of comments  
14 as far as this body sees. When we get an  
15 application at a preliminary level, I mean, most  
16 of the time the whole project has maybe a half  
17 page of comments, but we have two pages of comments.  
18 So I'm a little concerned with that, that there's  
19 been a ton of stuff not really ironed out.

20                You submitted a landscape plan that didn't  
21 meet the requirements of the application. It says  
22 you're supposed to identify all the plants on the  
23 plan individually and what quantities. You're  
24 supposed to have the grading on the plan, and the

1 plan had neither of those.

2 So from a review standpoint it makes it  
3 difficult to provide commentary for staff to do  
4 their job. So I'm just trying to understand as  
5 far as how do we as a body, you know, provide  
6 feedback that is meaningful to them. If we have  
7 recommendations to staff that get passed along to  
8 planning and development, how are we supposed to  
9 do that?

10 MR. GRZYWA: Well, I mean, it's a fair  
11 question, Mr. Chairman. I would say we've worked  
12 with staff throughout this process, and we are  
13 committed to continuing to work with staff to  
14 ensure that their comments are addressed.

15 As far as the information that's on the  
16 landscape plan that staff has reviewed, and  
17 understanding the requirements of the submittal  
18 and what's on the landscape plan doesn't meet  
19 those requirements, but to my earlier point about  
20 what the Greco team is committed to doing, it's  
21 not cutting corners, it's not trying to avoid  
22 plantings; it is really accentuating this plaza  
23 area, providing foundation plantings where we can  
24 provide them, making a beautiful site, and in

1 addition to that, making sure that the proposed  
2 grading and the information that's required on the  
3 landscape items is included in the submittal.

4 But it's not a situation in which we're  
5 providing incomplete information with the hopes  
6 that we could do less, not provide what's required  
7 and not have any grading for the project.

8 MR. GRECO: I think part of the answer  
9 would be -- and staff knows we've been pushing to  
10 meet a deadline on commitments we made to some of  
11 these tenants that want to be in by September of  
12 '25, and in order to do that, it's kind of a work  
13 in process. So this PUD is much more than our  
14 family ever undertook. You can see what we're  
15 doing at Pheasant Run, those warehouses, they look  
16 better than most homes.

17 So we're committed to doing it right, but  
18 I think the answer to your question is we're  
19 trying to push this process through maybe too fast,  
20 let's just say that, but there's a reason for  
21 that. We have some good operators that are  
22 willing to come to the burbs, and we don't want  
23 this project to be taken away. Now, we have  
24 leases signed, so we have some good commitment,



1 but we made some commitments to get this done, so  
2 we've been pushing the process. When we got our  
3 first feedback, I think it was 17 pages, oh, my  
4 God. So we worked diligently to get there.

5 But our commitment is to make it beautiful.  
6 I'm sure you guys have heard that before, but we  
7 live in town, been here 25 years, are committed.  
8 We bought Royal Fox in 2017, the country club, and  
9 it's more beautiful than it's ever been. We put  
10 an extreme amount of money into it, raised the  
11 membership to its full. That's the kind of work  
12 we do. I'm not here to brag about us, we're  
13 humble people, but this is what we believe in.

14 That's the answer to your question; we're  
15 trying to speed this process. And I think we've  
16 hired one of the notorious -- these guys aren't  
17 Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck; these guys are for  
18 real; they're going to produce it.

19 But that's the answer to your question, we  
20 are trying to move this process along to meet  
21 commitments, meet commitments we shouldn't have  
22 made, but some of them we had to.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I think that something  
24 that would be helpful for staff to help with their

1 comparisons and to finish what they're doing, you  
2 know, in this review process is things like where  
3 you're going to eliminate foundation plantings,  
4 there's a requirement for certain -- you know, the  
5 bed is a certain width and a certain distance, and  
6 it's all part of the ordinance. So that generates  
7 per building X amount of square feet a bed. You  
8 made a comment that you want to do -- you're not  
9 opposed to the idea of the foundation landscaping  
10 but understanding that patios and restaurant  
11 spaces kind of are in conflict with that. You see  
12 that many places. But in an effort to equalize  
13 that, it might be helpful that these beds that are  
14 floating, if you will, they can provide some  
15 square footage relationships to those to say,  
16 okay, if we combine Buildings 1, 2 and 3 in the  
17 areas where we're not, we would owe you X amount  
18 of square feet of bed, so now we're going to put  
19 them in these floating areas to compensate for that.

20 And I think that would help them to kind  
21 of see where those tradeoffs, if you will, from  
22 the reality of your users -- understandable -- but  
23 as a way to meet the ordinance, that that's how it  
24 goes. But that may be helpful to share with staff

1 and have your landscape architect do that to  
2 address that comment, and I think that would go a  
3 long way to help people isolate these things.

4 MR. GRECO: Again, going back to your  
5 comment, we had to speed this process up, and the  
6 commitments we made, I want to make sure staff  
7 understands, these are relationships that are  
8 bringing these people here. Sterling sat on that  
9 property for I don't know how many years. We had  
10 to make a huge commitment financially to get them  
11 out here. So it's important, you know, this  
12 process that we're going through, and us as family  
13 members are making sure we deliver upon expectation,  
14 meet the guidelines.

15 So this isn't -- so it's really important  
16 the urgency that we've been talking to staff about.  
17 We want to follow the rules and go by the  
18 guidelines, but we're making every effort, they're  
19 working diligently to get stuff back to staff, and  
20 it's just the process of the commitments we made  
21 where no one could make a commitment on that  
22 property all these years. Now we finally have a  
23 chance to get it done, so I want staff to know  
24 we're working hard to beautify not only the

1 village but, of course, ourselves, no doubt about  
2 it, but it took a lot of work we're going though  
3 to get it done.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Just a question on  
5 the architecture. Again, looking at ways to resolve  
6 things like the metal siding, which for that type  
7 of structure is really allowed in this zoning  
8 district, is there a way to use the reference of  
9 the smaller scale building across the street at  
10 the Mobil, but they used materials that weren't  
11 metal siding. So they were using Hardie board or  
12 Hardie panels or things like that. And not that  
13 that's the ultimate solution that you guys should  
14 do, but is there a way to get beyond the metal  
15 siding so that that doesn't become a stumbling  
16 block to resolving the architecture and not feeling  
17 like it was not what everybody would want within  
18 the district, and for something that becomes --  
19 understanding it's a PUD, but it becomes something  
20 that people will potentially use as a precedent  
21 for somewhere else.

22 Because that building is a pretty sizable  
23 structure at 40 feet, and compared to the bank  
24 that's in the foreground if you're at Kirk and

1 Main Street, it's 3 to 4 times the footprint and  
2 2 1/2 times the height. So you're going to see a  
3 lot of -- whatever it is, you're going to see a  
4 lot of it from the corner.

5 And I think that there's ways to potentially  
6 do that. And understanding that everything has a  
7 dollar square footage cost to it, glazing being  
8 probably the highest of those. And while I  
9 appreciate that they want to have more windows,  
10 that also starts to push the numbers for the skin  
11 of the building in a higher direction. So I  
12 understand that, but it would be helpful if you  
13 could use material or a series of materials that  
14 could be used that could be efficient but maybe  
15 not be unsightly.

16 MR. GOLUB: I know what you're saying,  
17 look for ways to break up the scale of the mass.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah, it's going to  
19 be a lot of facade to see from Kirk and Main. So  
20 I think those would be things that I would ask for.

21 Parking count I think is a big thing, and  
22 if that can be resolved with the purchase, then  
23 obviously that opens the doors.

24 A question on the access with the mall and

1 the easement. If that doesn't get done, will the  
2 driveway along the north side still be built so  
3 that it comes back and connects to basically the  
4 service drive on your east side?

5 MR. GRZYWA: Yeah, it will. So it would  
6 be between Building 1 and the small shops south of  
7 Jewel. So that would still be built.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Still be built?

9 MR. GRZYWA: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So at least if for  
11 some reason it's delayed from an easement, so you  
12 can't make that connection, it still could maybe  
13 be done in the future as long as that driveway  
14 comes and Ts into that point, and then it can be  
15 extended through when the easement is achieved.

16 MR. GRZYWA: Because that will connect to  
17 the service access behind the small shops at  
18 Jewel, and also, there's a row of parking that's  
19 at the back side of these buildings that's really  
20 intended for service access, so it provides a way  
21 into those parking stalls and we'll call it a  
22 service access drive.

23 MEMBER GRUBER: Can I ask a question about --  
24 you mentioned some commitments and timelines in

1 September and so forth. By the way, I thought  
2 your answer was very genuine and forthcoming, so  
3 thank you for that. It explains a lot of the  
4 logic behind maybe some of the shortcomings and so  
5 forth, and I thought that was great.

6 What do you need to make sure that there's  
7 not risk especially with the timeline and the  
8 commitments that you think that are set up for  
9 September?

10 MR. GRECO: I think staff is working with  
11 us. We're in good shape if we get on the next --  
12 we have some stuff to get to them. We're working  
13 diligently, so I think our timeline would be fine.  
14 We're hoping that we can get into the ground, move  
15 some dirt there, clean it up and be prepared.

16 We'd love to get the signs out there. The  
17 signs that are there now are covered by trees. In  
18 order to make this project successful, it's all  
19 got to tie in, whether it's access, signage for  
20 the building.

21 But staff is working with us. We feel  
22 real comfortable with the timeline. Our original  
23 thought was June, be there by June so they could  
24 have a full summer, but this new process, this

1 whole process that we have to go through which  
2 takes about 120 days, we didn't anticipate that  
3 when we first bought the land or were in the midst  
4 of closing on the land that it would take this  
5 time. We feel we're in good shape now.

6 MEMBER GRUBER: Great, thank you.

7 MR. GRECO: We have our own construction  
8 company, so we feel really good about it. I think  
9 Brad Parker is willing to work with us on the  
10 building, on recommendations and stuff. He's  
11 given us a layout because he's went to a third  
12 party to build his building, but if we add bigger  
13 windows, more stone, I don't think he's opposed --  
14 he's now in the midst of engaging Ware Malcolmb so  
15 he coincides with us architecturally. So really  
16 excited about that. I don't know if you guys have  
17 made the deal yet or not. He's been in their  
18 office working with them and we're pushing for  
19 that so we've got continuity and harmony. That  
20 will speed the process along.

21 So we feel we're in really good shape here  
22 provided we get staff what they need.

23 MEMBER GRUBER: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I saw there was a



1 small comment or concern about Building 4 related  
2 to the placement of a refuse container. It's  
3 right now on the southwest end of the building,  
4 but that would require a cross-access easement  
5 with the bank, and it seemed like it was being  
6 proposed for the east end of the building. Is  
7 that correct?

8 MR. GRZYWA: Correct. This is the old  
9 landscape plan that has not been updated. So the  
10 original thought was that it could be located here  
11 and accessed through the bank. That's not a  
12 possibility anymore. So yeah, this trash  
13 enclosure is going to get rotated over here and  
14 accessed from the east.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Is there any  
16 possibility to see how well it could be -- a sense  
17 of inboarding it, you know, into the building?  
18 Because I mean, that's a tight place for somebody  
19 to pick up containers that isn't interfering with  
20 the north/south traffic. So that would be my only  
21 concern about that east end.

22 Where it was before made perfect sense  
23 because it didn't really interrupt anybody from a  
24 traffic flow, but now it's basically right next to

1 the main drive coming in off of Main Street.

2 MR. GRZYWA: So the latest plan does have  
3 it -- it's actually right in line with that drive.  
4 So the thought was a garbage truck could pull in  
5 facing west, pull up and temporarily block that  
6 north/south drive, but garbage pickup happens  
7 early in the morning, so it would be before things  
8 are really happening in this development.

9 I think we could work with Building 4 tenant  
10 as far as -- I'm not sure being part of the  
11 building, but instead of right up against that  
12 drive maybe set back a little bit closer and just  
13 have a concrete apron that feeds out into that  
14 drive where they could access the dumpsters.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah, it just seems  
16 like there's an issue with the access and  
17 minimizing blocking and all that kind of stuff.

18 MR. GRZYWA: Yeah, it's always a challenge  
19 finding a location for the trash enclosures  
20 because there's never a good place for them, they  
21 tend to take up parking space, as you know,  
22 whether being accessed temporarily, any drive is  
23 going to be impacted whenever there's garbage trucks.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The other ones on the

1 back make perfect sense.

2 Just a question or request for the plaza.  
3 Would you consider using synthetic turf instead of  
4 natural turf for those turf areas?

5 MR. GRECO: Natural meaning grass?

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yes.

7 MR. GRECO: I thought it was synthetic.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The plans say grass.

9 MR. GRECO: We've always understood  
10 synthetic.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It just seems like  
12 that would be more oriented towards usability with  
13 people sitting down and there's chemical  
14 applications and things. So the turf looks good  
15 if you could go with synthetic turf. If it was an  
16 impervious area, you could put open-grade stone  
17 underneath it or something like that to help with  
18 your impervious calculation. I just think would  
19 be a lot simpler to maintain.

20 MR. GOLUB: That was our intent. So we'll  
21 update those notes; sorry for that.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: People bring dogs or  
23 any of that.

24 MR. GOLUB: It's messy.

1           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Any other --  
2 oh, I had a question regarding the signage. So  
3 it's a pretty robust signage package, and I guess,  
4 is there any sense of too much signage, too big in  
5 scale? Because you're asking for a larger scale  
6 than what we allow.

7           I mean, you have Main Street signage, you  
8 have Kirk Road -- and I'm not talking about the  
9 replacement of the Jewel sign. If you guys could  
10 get that pulled off, that would be great because I  
11 think that sign could use an upgrade, so that's a  
12 positive.

13          MR. GRECO: Going back to the signs, what  
14 would you change? Make it smaller? Like this is  
15 the one on -- this would be the one on North Avenue.

16          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So I didn't see where  
17 those would be located on North Avenue.

18          MR. GRECO: I think where the existing  
19 one is now, and it would be kind of like -- you  
20 know, you would see it.

21          MEMBER EWOLDT: It's a little small but  
22 that would be on the far north end of Kirk  
23 replacing the Jewel one today.

24          MR. GRECO: Exactly. And the other

1 one would be off of Kirk going into --

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: The one at North  
3 Avenue and Kirk would be either in the right-of-way  
4 or on the bank's property.

5 MR. GOLUB: So it's replacing the one that's  
6 over here, right.

7 MR. GRECO: I don't know if that's in the  
8 right-of-way or whose property it is.

9 MR. GOLUB: They're replacing the signs  
10 that are there. They're all replacements.

11 MR. GRECO: With the exception of the one on  
12 the entrance coming in -- no, we don't have a sign  
13 there. The other side is going into -- right  
14 there, that would be a new one.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That's a  
16 right-in/right-out off of Kirk Road, but the  
17 location you were showing for the corner of Kirk  
18 and Main is --

19 MR. GRECO: Where the existing one is.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: There's no sign there.

21 MR. GRECO: Yeah, there is. You can't  
22 see it.

23 MEMBER EWOLDT: It's a center sign for  
24 Jewel that's there.

1 MS. JOHNSON: That sign is on the bank  
2 property, and I've noted one of the staff comments  
3 is I think that existing sign is a little bit  
4 further back. This proposed sign will also need  
5 to be shifted back because right now it's within  
6 the sight triangle, so it needs to be shifted back  
7 for visibility purposes for traffic.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. And then  
9 you're looking to replace the one at Kirk and  
10 Foxfield?

11 MR. GRECO: Correct. But there is one new  
12 one going into that right --

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right-in/right-out.

14 MR. GRECO: If we want to eliminate that,  
15 my thought was getting the exposure of the tenants  
16 that are in the Haven, having that visibility.

17 MEMBER EWOLDT: Can you show the sign for  
18 that right-in/right-out, which sign that would be?

19 MR. GRECO: That's the second one, and  
20 that's what it would look like. So we thought  
21 identifying parking, promoting how much parking  
22 we've got there.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's the  
24 right-in/right-out.

1           MEMBER EWOLDT: So this would be at the  
2 right-in/right-out and at -- if you got the  
3 easement access to the former mall?

4           MR. GOLUB: Red dot here, red dot. I know  
5 it's hard to see.

6           MEMBER EWOLDT: Got it.

7           MR. GOLUB: This is the one up north along  
8 Kirk.

9           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: That would be a  
10 positive if you guys could get that -- because in  
11 my opinion, that sign is kind of --

12          MR. GOLUB: It's buried with trees, yeah.  
13 I don't even think it's illuminated at this point.

14          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: It can definitely use  
15 an upgrade.

16          MEMBER EWOLDT: I have one question just  
17 for clarification. On the renderings the crosswalks  
18 are going to be a different material. Is that  
19 going to be the case, or are you looking to do like  
20 a paint on the pavement? Like are you looking for  
21 a change in materials, or is it going to be a  
22 standard material?

23          MR. GRZYWA: That's really just conceptual  
24 in nature. I think the intent is it will just be

1 painted striping. I say that. There may be an  
2 opportunity to do a little more decorative material.  
3 Part of the stormwater management design is going  
4 to involve permeable pavers, so there may be a way  
5 to incorporate that into those crosswalks, but  
6 we'll take a look at that.

7 MEMBER EWOLDT: Even if it's not a change  
8 of physical material but maybe a nice stencil with  
9 a change of color even if it is brick. Just my  
10 two cents.

11 MR. GOLUB: Agreed.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other questions  
13 or comments from the Commission? Because then  
14 we'd like to hear from our public. Is that okay?

15 Thank you guys very much. We'll open it  
16 up to public comments. So, sir, if you still  
17 would like to speak.

18 MR. KATES: I think most of -- Peter Kates  
19 with Giordano's in St. Charles here. I've been  
20 there about 24 years. I think most of my questions  
21 were answered. I just have -- because of the  
22 nature of my business, I just wanted to know if  
23 any of the prospective tenants are pizzerias.

24 MR. GRECO: Wood burning, no traditional.



1           MR. KATES: Okay. That was my biggest  
2 question.

3           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

4           Questions from the audience. Sir, you? I  
5 don't know if you're good.

6           AUDIENCE MEMBER: All good.

7           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I know it's a limited  
8 audience but just want to make sure.

9           So if the Plan Commission feels it has  
10 enough information to make a recommendation to the  
11 Planning and Development Committee, a motion to  
12 close the public hearing would be in order. I  
13 guess that's the question, so if you feel we have  
14 enough -- one option also is to continue the  
15 hearing. If there's things we feel we'd like to  
16 see, we could come back, but the initial question  
17 is to close the public hearing.

18          MEMBER WIESE: I make a motion to close  
19 the public hearing for Fox Haven Square, Stuart's  
20 Crossing PUD Lot 4 Greco Investment Management LLC.

21          MEMBER FITZGERALD: I would second.

22          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any discussion on the  
23 motion.

24          (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So roll call.  
2 Laurel Moad.

3 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gina Lawson.

5 MEMBER LAWSON: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

7 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

9 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: David Rosenberg.

11 MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber.

13 MEMBER GRUBER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald.

15 MEMBER FITZGERALD: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes.

17 So that completes Item 6A, and so now we  
18 go to Item 6B, discussion and recommendation.

19 So this is an opportunity for the Plan  
20 Commission to discuss the information that has  
21 been gathered in relation to the PUD and discuss  
22 our thoughts on this recommendation.

23 Is there anything from staff before we  
24 begin?

1 MS. JOHNSON: No.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Commissioners, in  
3 your packet and Ellen mentioned that our process  
4 of making a recommendation to move forward is  
5 related to the PUD and special use criteria. So  
6 if you have any thoughts or discussions.

7 MEMBER WIESE: Well, I mean, I'll start.  
8 I think that -- I think that staff has done a very  
9 thorough job. We obviously did receive -- there's  
10 a ton of notes in here, but now getting a better  
11 understanding of the process it makes more sense.  
12 It's something we're not used to seeing, but I  
13 also don't think this would have come before the  
14 Plan Commission if staff wasn't in a position to  
15 think this can -- you know, they're willing to  
16 work with Greco and continue this process going  
17 forward. I don't think it would have come before  
18 us if staff wasn't comfortable with the comments  
19 and the relationship that they had working with  
20 this team.

21 I think that the entire proposal  
22 absolutely diversifies the economic vitality of  
23 the location. I understand there's some concerns  
24 about Building 4, but there's a plan in place to

1 address it, it sounds like you're working with the  
2 team that would be coming into the building.

3 I think that what it is is an interesting  
4 concept. It's something that the city doesn't  
5 have; it's something that's catching fire  
6 everywhere. I want it to come to the city. It  
7 diversifies the space, offers something different  
8 to the public.

9 I know there's -- and I think Commissioner --  
10 Peter did an excellent -- I thought the suggestion  
11 in terms of how to help staff when it comes to the  
12 landscaping and alleviating some concerns, I think  
13 there's a lot of things that you guys are doing in  
14 keeping the lines of communication open. I  
15 certainly think that there's a vested interest if  
16 you want this to succeed.

17 I also have lived in the city for 20 years.  
18 It's a vacant property. This obviously is going  
19 to contribute to the vitality of the east side,  
20 which I think is very important. Particularly,  
21 it's going to offer an attractive area sitting  
22 right next to the mall, so it could also implement  
23 and speed something up there, too. I mean, who  
24 knows what that could bring.

1           So I appreciate your commitment in bringing  
2 this idea to us. It's very ambitious but I know  
3 that staff has been working with you, it's very  
4 clear in the notes, very meticulous. So I do not  
5 have concerns that something is going to fall  
6 through the cracks. I think staff has done an  
7 impeccable job in literally outlining everything.

8           So I think this is a really exciting  
9 project. I think there's things that need to be  
10 addressed, but if we make the recommendation, it's  
11 going to be subject to the approval of and working  
12 through all staff comments. So that alleviates  
13 many of my concerns. I thought you brought up  
14 some excellent points, Peter, but I think there's  
15 clearly a line of communication that's going on.  
16 So that's kind of where I stand.

17           MEMBER FITZGERALD: I echo Colleen's  
18 comments. I think it's an overall great project.  
19 When I read through everything, yes, there are a  
20 lot of staff comments. I haven't been doing this  
21 that long so look at things differently, but I  
22 think, as Mr. Greco pointed out, you're doing  
23 things in parallel and multiple, multiple things  
24 in parallel. In a perfect world you're going to

1 do it in a series, and it's going to take a long  
2 time. And if we can help the City improve that  
3 area, and I realize it's the gateway onto the east  
4 side, this is certainly a tremendous force.

5 MEMBER GRUBER: I would agree with the  
6 comments. You always want to have things happen  
7 in the sequential order of events, but in reality  
8 it doesn't work that way, and it sounds like we're  
9 trying to accelerate some things and that's fine.  
10 It sounds like the packet that was put together by  
11 staff was one of the better packets I've seen  
12 during my time being on this committee. It reflects  
13 a working relationship, and the intent of what  
14 we're trying to accomplish I think is very visible,  
15 very well done.

16 One question I forgot to ask is if there  
17 are studies of other communities, other countries  
18 that have made investments in pickleball facilities  
19 that have failed where the trend for pickleball  
20 has gone south in some of those communities. So I  
21 didn't know if there's a dual-use component to the  
22 design. I'd be curious if it's built for anything  
23 like that, or is it just pickleball only, so if  
24 seven years from now, eight years from now that

1 trend goes sideways we're stuck with something we  
2 can't use. That would be the only concern I have.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, you can ask it  
4 now. We don't have to be shy. I'm sure he'll  
5 come up.

6 MEMBER GRUBER: Just curious, is it  
7 designed for any kind of dual use flexibility?

8 MR. GOLUB: Our firm is looking at these  
9 pickleball facilities, we're doing a bunch of  
10 those indoor settings in Bed Bath & Beyond,  
11 ex-Walmarts that have closed. I think this is  
12 different because it has an outdoor atmosphere.  
13 It's more like a Topgolf in my mind, and I think  
14 that will create longevity, and with the Parker  
15 Group as the backer, as the restaurateur, it's not  
16 going to fail.

17 MR. GRECO: So we worked diligently with  
18 Brad Parker on what he was going to put there. So  
19 the head of the Pickleball Association is an  
20 ex-Northwestern athletic director. My son went to  
21 Northwestern, wrestled for Northwestern. We  
22 reached out to him and had a meeting with him to  
23 find the success of a pickleball opening. We're  
24 talking about for today, five years down the road.

1 The ones that have failed are the ones that don't  
2 have the food and the whole entertainment.

3 Brad is known as an entertainer. His  
4 concepts are the Hispanic concept in the city, the  
5 Hampton he brought a whole new element to  
6 Barrington and these other suburbs that he's gone  
7 into. So he's going to put 7,000 square foot of  
8 restaurants there. He's going to be able to  
9 attract -- what we're going to do with these  
10 buildings is no different than any other buildings  
11 we have is we're going to build it, and if it's  
12 not, one day how do we subdivide it. We had a big  
13 parcel in Naperville. We had to figure out how to  
14 take 26,000 and break it up after this business  
15 failed, and we figured out how to resection it and  
16 get it all leased.

17 So we're hoping that this isn't a fad. We  
18 can play it up to 60, 70. Racquetball lasted a  
19 long time. So we don't know how long it is, but  
20 the good thing is if you talk to people within the  
21 industry, people that are running the association  
22 right now at a high level, they said the chances  
23 of success are good when you have food and beverage  
24 with it. He's taking it to a whole new level.



1 Hopefully he'll put gaming in there.

2 MEMBER GRUBER: Thank you. By the way, I  
3 love the design. The whole concept is a great  
4 upgrade to that space of our community. If it's  
5 an empty lot, it's not a hard upgrade, but it's a  
6 heck of a great looking facility design.

7 MR. GRECO: Especially Brad, he pushes it  
8 but he's made it work. But you can also talk to  
9 him, and he's an understandable guy. Our thing is  
10 we want to bring it to St. Charles. So there's a  
11 certain element to St. Charles and how it looks.  
12 It's got that old warehouse look. That's what  
13 we're trying to bring here. We're going to have  
14 to transfer a little bit of that over. We're  
15 going to work with him, and I think he's going to  
16 work with us.

17 MEMBER GRUBER: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I echo those comments  
19 and thoughts and a bit of a concern, because nothing  
20 lasts forever, about the adaptability going forward.  
21 So I think the more -- I mean, I think the three  
22 real Buildings 1, 2, and 3 have that ability. But  
23 if those things change, I think those buildings by  
24 the nature of their appearance will stand the test

1 of time and still be interesting for a number of  
2 different uses that could adapt in the future.

3 I think the current design of Building 4  
4 doesn't lend itself so much for that adaptability  
5 from an outward standpoint. Sure, you can always  
6 change the interior, but what does it take to  
7 reskin it to meet the market 10 or 20 years from  
8 now. But I think the more it feels like it's part  
9 of the other three buildings or has a lot of  
10 similarities to it will then probably address a  
11 number of staff concerns and comments. I think it  
12 will go a long way to not only today but that  
13 point in the future. If you're holding, it as you  
14 said you would, for a long time, I think that  
15 would mean a lot to how the reuse happens at some  
16 point in the future.

17 MEMBER LAWSON: I'm looking forward to the  
18 east side getting recognition. We have so much  
19 downtown that it will be nice for development to  
20 start going on on the east side just to bring more  
21 life to the city.

22 MEMBER MOAD: I would just echo what  
23 everyone else said but would also add that I'm  
24 excited about the concept of having outdoor space

1 and a plaza on the east side and another gathering  
2 space for the community in general. I envision it  
3 bringing not just economic development but social  
4 development, as well, for the city.

5 MEMBER ROSENBERG: I can add to all those  
6 comments. I'm very excited to have those businesses  
7 coming to the east side. My only slight concern  
8 would be the potential for increased traffic.  
9 Kirk Road going north from 64, I mean, to get out  
10 and things like that during rush hour, it's tight  
11 already. I would anticipate everyone is going to  
12 want to go, and it's going to be tight.

13 Do we need a traffic study? What am I  
14 missing as far as cars getting in and out? On  
15 Friday night at 7:00 p.m., you have a ton of  
16 people that are going to be there from the high  
17 school, and all of us are going to want to go there.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, I think it's a  
19 very reasonable concern. I guess in any submittal  
20 to Kane County or IDOT, have they provided any  
21 concerns or questions to either the City or to the  
22 applicant related to the expanded use?

23 Even though the property was originally  
24 planned for these types of uses, there's a period

1 of time that's elapsed since the original property  
2 was approved; there's changes in the ADDs on both  
3 of those roads. Is there a traffic study that  
4 would be meaningful -- not just to do one for fun  
5 and spend the applicant's money, but is there a  
6 concern that there could be a meaningful traffic  
7 study?

8 MS. JOHNSON: I don't believe IDOT has  
9 reviewed this proposal. I don't believe they will  
10 need an IDOT permit unless they're going to be  
11 working the right-of-way. So IDOT has not  
12 commented on that. KDOT commented in relation to  
13 the sidewalk.

14 MR. GRZYWA: IDOT doesn't need to review  
15 this; we're not proposing any work within the  
16 right-of-way. But as Ellen just said, KDOT has  
17 reviewed it. We provided them the site plan that  
18 showed that sidewalk extension, and their only  
19 comment was on the location of that sidewalk.  
20 They didn't comment on the proposed use or  
21 anything like --

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: A traffic study?

23 MR. GRZYWA: Correct.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I realize they have

1 through lanes, and they have right turn lanes, and  
2 a lot of that stuff is already built on Kirk Road  
3 there currently, and there's a right-turn lane even  
4 for IDOT on 64 to get into the right-in/right-out.

5 So maybe the lack of request should help  
6 alleviate that concern, if you will, because  
7 usually, those organizations are very conservative,  
8 and they're not afraid -- if they want a study or  
9 want you to prove that up, it's not going to be a  
10 problem that they'd say okay, we'd like you to  
11 hire somebody and provide that to us. If they  
12 haven't made that comment so far, then it's likely  
13 from their perspective not a real topic to them.

14 MEMBER EWOLDT: If they get the immediate  
15 cross-access to the shopping mall, there's  
16 right-in/right-out by Cooper's Hawk, you know that  
17 way, that would be -- people would change their  
18 patterns and exit out the easiest way, so that's  
19 something that would help alleviate --

20 MR. GRZYWA: Great point. You've got  
21 multiple ingress and egress points to the development  
22 that are all existing. There's familiarity with  
23 the site for people, how people are going to get  
24 into the site, be it from Route 64, Kirk Road, be

1 it from Foxfield, from the mall development.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Or even from Stuarts  
3 Drive because that feeds directly into the common  
4 driveway to Jewel that runs across the face of the  
5 building and runs north/south, and you're  
6 extending or committing -- it's already there, but  
7 you're memorializing that. So worst case you  
8 could -- if you can't get the small connection to  
9 the mall that's being requested, I mean, you can  
10 always go all the way down north and then come  
11 round, go out to the other lights or come in that  
12 way anyway.

13 MEMBER EWOLDT: Which I often do.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Because those already  
15 exist, so there's no permission beyond what's  
16 already approved between those properties.

17 MEMBER EWOLDT: Only thing I would add to  
18 this whole conversation was just to continue that  
19 conversation with KDOT possibly on the sidewalks.  
20 That's my only comment to add.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I appreciate your  
22 continued efforts from the beginning, since  
23 September. It's been -- a big body of work, and I  
24 can appreciate the complexity of, if you will,

1 having multiple bosses as tenants that want to  
2 drive certain things for you and that you can't  
3 just pretend that they don't ask. And I respect  
4 that; it's not a simple thing.

5 I think that there's a lot of comments  
6 that are needing to be addressed and certainly  
7 would be part of any recommendation. I would  
8 reinforce one of my initial requests to look at  
9 extending the sidewalk and working with staff to  
10 the greatest extent and with KDOT to figure out  
11 what their policy shift is. Considering they have  
12 bike paths on Randall Road that are in their  
13 right-of-way, it seems kind of an odd thing for  
14 them to say on the east side of town, well, we  
15 don't want sidewalks in our right-of-way. But be  
16 that as it may, I think as far as a connection to  
17 Foxfield going north up towards the high school  
18 there's a bike path that runs on the west side of  
19 Kirk road. So being able to shift over at that  
20 light to come down a sidewalk to come into the  
21 property rather than having to kind of like go  
22 into Jewel and work your way down along the  
23 frontage of stores if you are a pedestrian or  
24 cyclist to me makes a lot of sense, and hopefully

1 that can be something that can be resolved without  
2 a whole lot of angst from KDOT, but they're their  
3 own party. I think that those are all positive  
4 things.

5 I think that it's exciting to see this  
6 level of development, and I appreciate all of the  
7 effort that that takes and, if you will, personal  
8 efforts by the applicant with respect to bringing  
9 some top flight tenants, hopefully you're  
10 resolving all those thing and getting through all  
11 the lease arrangements and all that. I've been to  
12 a Hampton Social, I've been to those things  
13 downtown, love the concept, the whole presentation  
14 there, so to see that they have -- obviously, it  
15 won't be a duplication of that, but love to see  
16 what they're going to do with this.

17 And I hope that there can be a lot of  
18 meaningful effort, as I'm sure you guys are  
19 committed to do, to address the architectural  
20 concerns that have been brought up here by staff.  
21 I just think it will help the whole thing feel a  
22 little more -- not that I think everything should  
23 look exactly the same, and I think the three  
24 buildings that you've designed, while there's



1 a strong vocabulary of masonry, they aren't all  
2 cookie cutters of each other. So I think that's  
3 an important thing. I don't think that everything  
4 being homogenous is a good architectural solution,  
5 so I think if some more of that could transfer  
6 over to Building 4, that would be great. Even if  
7 it isn't all from a materiality standpoint, I  
8 think that the color pallet could start to feel  
9 like they relate. I think even if it comes to  
10 materials that work better on that facade from a  
11 cost standpoint, I think a color pallet would help  
12 a lot, too. Because it will be a very visible  
13 building at Kirk and Main given the scale and  
14 given everything there.

15 So if we have no other comments, we could  
16 entertain a motion for this project, and we can  
17 make it contingent on staff comments but other  
18 things that we feel are important. So anyone?

19 MEMBER WIESE: I would make a motion to  
20 approve Fox Haven Stuart's Crossing PUD Lot 4  
21 Greco Investment Management LLC's application for  
22 special use PUD amendment -- and do I get to do  
23 those together? -- and application for PUD  
24 preliminary plan subject to the resolution of all

1 staff's comments.

2 MEMBER MOAD: I'll second.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. We have a  
4 motion and a second for the application for PUD  
5 and special use to be approved subject to all  
6 staff comments. Is there any additional comment  
7 we need to add?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Roll call.  
10 Laurel Moad.

11 MEMBER MOAD: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gina Lawson.

13 MEMBER LAWSON: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese.

15 MEMBER WIESE: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zach Ewoldt.

17 MEMBER EWOLDT: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: David Rosenberg.

19 MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber.

21 MEMBER GRUBER: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: John Fitzgerald.

23 MEMBER FITZGERALD: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself, yes.

1           Okay. That concludes Item 6B. We've  
2 already done 7. Any public comment, no. Any  
3 other business from staff?

4           MS. JOHNSON: No.

5           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Will we have another  
6 meeting in June?

7           MS. JOHNSON: Potentially. We'll let  
8 you know.

9           CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Stay tuned. Is there  
10 motion for adjournment.

11          MEMBER WIESE: So moved.

12          MEMBER EWOLDT: Second.

13          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All in favor.

14          (Ayes heard.)

15          CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: St. Charles Plan  
16 Commission adjourned at 8:37. Thank you very much.

17          (Off the record at 8:37 p.m.)

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 10th day of June, 2024.

My commission expires: October 16, 2025



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois