

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2022**

Members Present: Peter Vargulich
Laurel Moad
Karen Hibel
Jeff Funke
Colleen Wiese
Zachary Ewoldt
Dave Rosenberg
Gary Gruber
Chris Studebaker

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Russell Colby, Director of Community Development
Derek Conley, Director of Economic Development
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

Chairman Vargulich called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the May 3, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission

Motion was made by Ms. Moad, seconded by Ms. Hibel and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2022 Plan Commission meeting.

5. Election of Officers

Motion was made by Ms. Moad, seconded by Ms. Wiese and unanimously passed by voice vote to elect Peter Vargulich as Chairman.

Motion was made by Ms. Wiese, seconded by Mr. Ewoldt and unanimously passed by voice vote to elect Jeff Funke as Vice Chairman.

- 6. 2600 E. Main St., Foxfield Commons PUD (Eric G. Dams, Troutman & Dams)**
Application for Special Use
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 Mr. Funke and seconded by Ms. Moad to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Moad, Hibel, Funke, Wiese, Ewoldt, Rosenberg, Gruber, Studebaker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried 9-0

- 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 Mr. Funke and seconded by Ms. Moad to recommend approval of applications for Special Use and PUD Preliminary Plan for 2600 E. Main St., Foxfield Commons PUD, subject to resolution of staff comments.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Moad, Hibel, Funke, Wiese, Ewoldt, Rosenberg, Gruber, Studebaker, Vargulich

Nays:

Absent:

Motion carried 9-0

- 7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None**

- 8. Weekly Development Report**

- 9. Meeting Announcements**

- a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, June 21, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Wednesday, July 6, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, July 19, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

- b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, June 13, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, July 11, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

10. Public Comment - None

11. Adjournment at 7:35 p.m.



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

Transcript of 2600 West Main Street, Foxfield Commons PUD

Date: June 7, 2022

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----X
In Re: 2600 West Main Street, :
Foxfield Commons PUD (Eric G. :
Dams, Troutman & Dams) :
Application for Special Use, :
PUD Preliminary Hearing :
-----X

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, June 7, 2022
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 412178
Pages 1 - 37
Reported by: Kristine Wesner, CVR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location
2 of:

3

4 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

5 2 East Main Street

6 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

7 630.377.4400

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 Pursuant to agreement, before Kristine

23 Wesner, Certified Verbatim Reporter, and Notary

24 Public in and for the State of Illinois.

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

PRESENT:

- PETER VARGULICH, Chairman
- DAVID ROSENBERG, Commissioner
- CHRIS STUDEBAKER, Commissioner
- ZACHARY EWOLDT, Commissioner
- LAUREL MOAD, Commissioner
- KAREN HIBEL, Commissioner
- COLLEEN WIESE, Commissioner
- JEFFREY FUNKE, Commissioner
- GARY GRUBER, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

- Ellen Johnson, Planner
- Rachel Hitzemann, Planner
- Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
- Russell Colby, Director of Community
Development

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: All right. Good evening, everybody. I'd like to call the St. Charles Plan Commission to order.

Roll call. Laurel Moad?

COMMISSIONER MOAD: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese?

COMMISSIONER WIESE: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke?

COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Yep.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zack Ewoldt?

COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Dave Rosenberg?

COMMISSIONER ROSENBERG: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber?

COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Chris Studebaker?

COMMISSIONER STUDEBAKER: Here.

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you.

1 All right. Item 4, presentation of the
2 meeting minutes from our May 3rd meeting. Is
3 there a motion to approve?

4 COMMISSIONER MOAD: I move that we
5 approve the minutes.

6 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: A second.

8 All in favor?

9 (Chorus of ayes.)

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Opposed?

11 Motion passes.

12 All right. Before we start with our
13 election of the officers, I just want to introduce
14 our three new Plan Commission members: Dave
15 Rosenberg, Gary Gruber, and Chris Studebaker.

16 Thank you for volunteering, and thank
17 you for contributing to our community. Thank you
18 very much.

19 All right. So Item 5 of the agenda is
20 Election of Officers for our Plan Commission; this
21 is for chair and vice chair, and we're supposed to
22 do this at the beginning of every fiscal year, as
23 I'm being reminded -- thank you so much. And I
24 will entertain a motion to nominate the chair,

1 please.

2 COMMISSIONER MOAD: I move that we
3 nominate Peter Vargulich as the chair of the
4 commission.

5 COMMISSIONER WIESE: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. We have a
7 second. All right.

8 All in favor?

9 (Chorus of ayes.)

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion passes. No
11 opposes -- any oppose? All good. All right.

12 So now we entertain a motion to
13 nominate a vice chair. Is there a motion?

14 COMMISSIONER WIESE: I move to nominate
15 Jeff Funke as vice chair.

16 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I'll second.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Motion
18 and a second.

19 All in favor?

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Motion
22 carries.

23 Thank you, Mr. Funke. Thank you.

24 All right. Item 6, 2600 West Main

1 Street, Foxfield Commons PUD, application for
2 special use and PUD Preliminary Plan, submitted by
3 Eric Dams of Troutman & Dams.

4 All right. This is -- we're going to
5 start with a public hearing. The role of the Plan
6 Commission is to conduct public hearings on zoning
7 applications that are filed with the city. All
8 testimony and evidence, both for and against this
9 application, should be given under oath.

10 Regarding our procedure: First, we'll have a
11 presentation, then we'll take questions from the
12 Commission, followed by questions and comments
13 from members of the public or anyone wishing to
14 present testimony.

15 And do we have Zoom still or --

16 MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So you'll
18 just let me know if we have anybody from Zoom?

19 MS. HITZEMANN: Uh-huh.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Perfect. Thank
21 you.

22 All right. So when the commission
23 feels it has gathered enough evidence in making a
24 recommendation to the Planning and Development

1 Committee of the City Council, we'll close the
2 public hearing. The Plan Commission will, then,
3 discuss the evidence, gathered relative to the
4 findings of the facts, which are in our reports,
5 and will vote on a recommendation. The
6 applications will, then, go before the Planning
7 and Development Committee of the City Council.

8 Before we begin, anyone who wishes to
9 offer testimony, including questions or providing
10 comments, will be sworn in.

11 So if you're going to -- gentlemen,
12 please stand. Do you swear that the testimony you
13 will provide tonight will be the truth? If so say
14 I do.

15 MR. DAMS: I do.

16 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Thank you. When
17 you're speaking, if you could please come to the
18 lectern, state your name, spell your last name,
19 and state your address for the record -- if the
20 applicant is ready to make a presentation. Thank
21 you.

22 MR. DAMS: Hello. Good evening. My
23 name is Eric Dams, D-A-M-S, the applicant -- the
24 property owner and developer. Thank you for

1 hearing our proposal tonight on our PUD amendment.
2 Our main presenter was unable to attend tonight,
3 so bear with me. I'll give it my best shot.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

5 MR. DAMS: He's got a sick daughter in
6 the hospital, but I know a little bit about the
7 property and a little more about what we're
8 proposing. I think staff did -- you guys all have
9 the staff report -- a great job of going through
10 the plans, and providing a fair summation, so I'm
11 not going to give a grandiose -- I'll just give a
12 brief overview on what we're doing.

13 We are the property owner. Currently,
14 there is an antiquated, obsolete bank facility on
15 the property, which has been vacant, I think, six
16 or seven years -- maybe more. We, fortunately,
17 through our marketing efforts -- going on for
18 probably over a year now -- we're able to find and
19 land two viable tenants, which we are planning on
20 doing -- build the suits for, subdividing the
21 property. On the west half of the property, it's
22 a Physicians Immediate Care -- about 4,300 square
23 feet -- and on the east half, Andy's Frozen
24 Custard. And those would be developed at the same

1 time if we're successful with our PUD amendment
2 that we're currently seeking.

3 As I said, the Physicians Immediate
4 Care is on the left; the Andy's Frozen Custard is
5 on the right. We need an amendment for the PUD
6 for the special use for the drive-through for
7 Andy's Frozen Custard. I believe our plans, or at
8 least the intent of our plans, are to comply with
9 all the city codes, setbacks, landscaping,
10 building materials, et cetera.

11 I know there were some comments that
12 were suggested by staff and we are more than
13 willing to continue to work with staff to meet
14 those requests; a little more landscaping along
15 Main Street as long as we're still able to
16 maintain visibility; a little more landscaping in
17 the back to provide a buffer for our neighbors to
18 the north.

19 The current property has a couple of
20 access easements, curb cuts to the north. We need
21 to reconfigure those. The one to the east stays.
22 I've talked to the property owner, presented our
23 plan. They are on board with the plan and fully
24 supportive of it.

1 This is the subdivision where we need
2 to divide it from one lot into two. There's an
3 appendage that sticks out into North Avenue, and
4 that'll be dedicated to the Department of
5 Transportation, and they're willing to take it.

6 This is the survey of the existing
7 building. As you can see, we've done studies
8 there. We are currently donating the building to
9 the fire department, both here locally and -- I
10 believe they're working with several other fire
11 departments around the greater area to do training
12 exercises in there. We've also offered it to the
13 police department to use before we demolish it and
14 make way for our proposed, new plan.

15 The civil engineering -- and with me
16 tonight is Taylor from Kimley-Horn, our civil
17 engineering consultant, very familiar with the
18 property -- have done everything, you know, as far
19 as the grading, the drainage, the landscaping,
20 utilities. I'm not going to get into that level
21 of detail, unless anybody wants to, and at that
22 point, he's certainly better to field those
23 requests than I am.

24 All I can say is -- is, to the best of

1 my knowledge, it meets all the code requirements
2 as far as drainage, stormwater, setbacks, and as I
3 said, landscaping to a large extent and we're
4 going to continue to work with staff on that.

5 I will get to the building elevations.
6 These are the masonry buildings, brick all four
7 sides. I know there's a couple of comments on
8 some further articulation, I believe, on the west
9 side of Physicians Immediate Care, on the east
10 side of Andy's. We'll work with them to do that.
11 Both of them are receptive to working with the
12 city and being responsive to those comments.

13 We did not show on our plan, initially,
14 monument signs, but each user will be wanting --
15 requesting a monument sign that will comply with
16 city code, one for each lot. Also we'll come back
17 with a revised submittal for the building signage.
18 We've already gotten some feedback on Andy's to
19 remove one of their signs; they're fine with that.
20 There was some question as to whether the Andy's
21 drive-through canopy encroached into the rear
22 setback. I don't think it does, but we'll verify
23 that.

24 And we can provide evidence that, in

1 fact, we don't -- you know, what I would say in
2 these businesses, their normal hours of operation,
3 if you have specific questions on how many
4 employees, hours of operation, peak, you know,
5 times through the drive-through -- I can answer
6 most of those, and certainly, if I can't answer
7 them, I certainly know who to ask to get those
8 answers.

9 And that's all I have.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. DAMS: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right. Some
14 questions from commissioners. Anyone? Please.
15 Just jump in.

16 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yes. I have a
17 question about the overall site plan. You know,
18 it looks like the Physicians express building has
19 a lot of excess green space. Is there any way to
20 enhance your landscape plan to possibly add some
21 tree coverage? Unless there's future plans to
22 expand that building, I'm just kind of curious why
23 to the north end of the building, it seems to be
24 just open space.

1 MR. DAMS: And I believe that was one
2 of the comments from staff as well. There's no
3 plans to expand the building, but I think there is
4 some sufficient area to the north of the building
5 to add some clustered groupings -- things that
6 we'll work with staff on to enhance landscaping,
7 but we still want to preserve their viability --
8 visibility for these to be viable businesses, as
9 I'm sure you do as well, and I think we can
10 achieve both of those.

11 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Thank you.

12 MR. DAMS: You're welcome.

13 Oh, one other thing -- I'm sorry.
14 Towards that, staff had recommended to reduce a
15 couple parking spaces in front of Physicians and
16 add a couple landscape islands per code, which I
17 think is one for every ten spaces, and we'll be
18 able to do that.

19 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: I've got a couple
20 questions. With the Physicians building, it seems
21 like it's some of the staff comments were
22 articulation. You guys going to come back and
23 present another iteration for the design, or how
24 do you guys --

1 MR. DAMS: Yeah. I think there was one
2 comment that, on the west façade, there need to be
3 some more articulation. We can achieve that by
4 either different building materials, an awning,
5 perhaps more windows, and they're receptive to
6 that.

7 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: And maybe what you
8 can do is you can recess the brick to kind of
9 emulate what, you know, the front façade seems --
10 assuming you're going to have the signage on the
11 south façade -- it'd be nice to kind of articulate
12 the same (indiscernible) facing on the left and
13 the south?

14 MR. DAMS: Correct. And they're open
15 to that. It does look a little stark, but when
16 the building signs are added, that'll help with
17 the articulation. And, yeah, it's -- it's a
18 relatively small building to introduce a couple
19 more of those architectonics -- it's certainly
20 reasonable.

21 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: What's the height
22 of the parapet wall, you know, in relation to
23 the -- I assume you have rooftop units that you
24 guys are going to be --

1 MR. DAMS: Yeah. The rooftop units
2 will be fully screened, and I think the top
3 where -- I can't read it -- might have been
4 21 feet.

5 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: So what's the
6 height of the roof? I know the parapet's at 21 --
7 what's the height of the roof?

8 MR. DAMS: So the roof would be, like,
9 four and a half feet less than that.

10 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Okay.

11 MR. DAMS: And so -- and it's a
12 relatively small building so we don't have to
13 worry about having too much slope or one of the
14 ends that'll be above the top of the parapet, so
15 the units will be fully screened.

16 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Okay. Great. And
17 then I guess the last question is, is the -- the
18 trash closures -- I mean, just curious, is it
19 going to be the same materials as the buildings
20 involved (indiscernible)?

21 MR. DAMS: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Okay. Great.
23 Okay. I appreciate the fact that you guys are
24 redeveloping this, and I think this is actually

1 going to activate that area, so thank you.

2 MR. DAMS: Thank you for saying that.

3 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: I'm trying to
4 recall the staff report. Was there a bike rack
5 put in at Andy's to kind of get that connection
6 going from the walkways -- from the sidewalks, you
7 know, people coming from the neighborhoods?

8 MR. DAMS: I don't recall that being a
9 comment, but we're happy to do that.

10 MS. HITZEMANN: I think there was one
11 on the plan.

12 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: There is one on
13 the plan?

14 MS. HITZEMANN: I believe so.

15 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Okay. Great,
16 because I think that would be nice to have there.

17 My other question is just on the
18 Immediate Care building, the location of the
19 handicap accessible spots --

20 MR. DAMS: Uh-huh.

21 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: -- you know, just
22 being slightly further from the door, is the
23 intent, you know, I'm just more questioning why?
24 Shorter distance --

1 MR. DAMS: Taylor may be able to answer
2 that better, but I think it needs to be, you know,
3 the shortest distance, and I think their entrance
4 is on that west side, so let him address that.

5 MR. ESCHBACH: Hi, Taylor Eschenbach --
6 Kimley-Horn. So I think the intent was to have
7 those face as close to the door as possible.
8 There's a grading challenge on the west side of
9 the building, where there's a super slope there.
10 So I think maybe we can shift them a couple spaces
11 to the west from where they are now.

12 There's also a comment about adding
13 additional spaces, I believe, due to the use of
14 the building, so maybe we can fill in those couple
15 spaces to the west of where they're shown now and
16 provide that -- that four-space -- I'm not sure
17 exactly how much 10 percent works out to be off
18 the top of my head, but divide those into the
19 spaces directly adjacent to the door. Is that
20 what you're asking?

21 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Mmhmm. Were there
22 44 spots, currently?

23 MR. ESCHBACH: Let me check the table.
24 Sorry. I know the staff report has it tabulated,

1 too.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I believe both
3 sites have 44 spaces.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yep.

5 MR. ESCHBACH: So 44 spaces per use, so
6 yeah -- four spaces. So we can add additional ADA
7 spaces to the west of those.

8 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I just had a
10 couple of questions for either of you. The
11 parking is two and a half times what's required.
12 Can you give us some background as to why you're
13 doing that? Seems excessive.

14 MR. DAMS: This is probably a rare case
15 where the footprints of the buildings are less
16 than what they could have been, you know, all the
17 times, we can get about 10,000 square feet out of
18 an acre. But because of these uses at the time,
19 it's what they got based -- certainly on Andy's.
20 They have peak business hours at this time of
21 year. They find that they use all the spaces,
22 they use some for employees. I don't think we
23 want to restrict their ability to do business by
24 not having enough parking. We have cross-access

1 with the neighbor; we don't have cross-parking.

2 So we want them to be self-sufficient.

3 As far as Physicians Immediate Care as
4 well, sometimes they have their peak hour -- as
5 we've seen over the past couple of years,
6 unfortunately, there really is that demand.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And why construct
8 parallel spaces? I mean, those are the most
9 challenging for people to park, whether you live
10 in the city or live in the suburbs, so why would
11 we do that?

12 MR. DAMS: We didn't have that to begin
13 with --

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: I'm sorry?

15 MR. DAMS: We did not have them there
16 to begin with on our initial site plan, and then
17 Physicians asked that we add that back in because
18 they thought that those would be good for their
19 employees to park in.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.

21 MR. DAMS: And I didn't really want to
22 add a row of perpendicular spaces along that whole
23 side so we have more landscaping buffer so that's
24 the genesis anyway.

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So you have a
2 cross-access easement in the northwest corner and
3 in making this connection to the northwest corner,
4 you've eliminated four existing spaces.

5 MR. DAMS: Mmhmm.

6 Can staff up -- does that violate their
7 PUD to the north, or does there need to be an
8 agreement that they can lose those four spaces?

9 MS. HITZEMANN: So those spaces are
10 not, technically, required by code. The shopping
11 center, it's in excess of the required spaces
12 already, so the loss of those spaces is not
13 necessarily -- they don't necessarily need those
14 spaces to meet the code requirement. It could
15 potentially require a minor change to the PUD, but
16 that's something you'd want to discuss.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Well, I guess not
18 so much -- I mean, I guess when dotting the I's
19 and crossing the T's, if that's necessary, sure.
20 But it was more that they acknowledge that they --
21 that they're aware that they're losing the four
22 spaces so it doesn't become a conversation
23 later -- not because they need them, but because
24 they weren't paying attention to when you guys

1 were signing your cross-access agreements, and
2 they're, like, oh, you took away four spaces.
3 Now, there's this or there's that problem, and if
4 you could just have them as part of whatever
5 agreements they're coming to, identify that so
6 it's clear to the city that both parties agreed
7 that the loss of the four spaces is not a problem.

8 MS. HITZEMANN: Sure.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

10 MR. DAMS: I've contacted them and
11 submitted this plan and they fully supported --
12 are delighted to have something potentially be
13 developed here.

14 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Excellent. That's
15 great to hear. I have a -- there was some
16 comments regarding staff report related to the
17 lighting plan -- the site lighting plan not
18 coordinating with the latest version of the site
19 plan, and when you look at the two, they're
20 definitely different. I guess I would take that
21 one further and note that a number of the poles
22 are in the same islands that you have proposed
23 trees in. And I think that would be beneficial
24 for all -- everybody involved, especially as you

1 guys look at long-term growth of the trees, that
2 you don't end up with the issue of the trees
3 impacting the efficiency of those pole lights to
4 the point where, you know, you have a dark spot on
5 the pavement or, you know, a dark area in the
6 pavement not meeting, you know, what would be
7 standard photometric requirements.

8 So I think that as you're working on
9 updating that as part of the staff comment, if you
10 can coordinate with whatever the final landscape
11 plan is to make sure that those trees are not
12 going to impact the performance of those pole
13 lights. I think that would be a good thing, if
14 you could.

15 I think there was some comments from
16 engineering and, you know, I thought those were
17 all solid comments and you seem to be amenable to
18 the staff's comments --

19 MR. DAMS: Absolutely.

20 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: -- you know, as
21 far as the report so far.

22 MR. DAMS: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

24 MR. DAMS: Yes. I didn't see anything

1 that was -- caused us any angst or was
2 insurmountable, and I do agree with your comment
3 on the site lighting. Once we revise the
4 landscaping plan, we'll have to revise the
5 photometric plan to make sure there's no conflicts
6 with landscaping and/or site utilities.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: And then I have a
8 question regarding some of the bolt standards,
9 which you commented to and eluded to earlier,
10 related to this canopy that goes over the
11 drive-through, kind of on the back of the
12 building. But more so in relationship to, there
13 was a plan that was submitted that showed the
14 stacking for the drive-through so that it met the
15 city standards related to that, but that site plan
16 is different than the rest of the plans in the
17 set.

18 And so has staff looked at whether
19 they'll meet the 15 stacking requirements?
20 Because they've moved the drive-through in most of
21 the drawings closer to the building to address the
22 setback.

23 MS. HITZEMANN: Yeah. So the one that
24 shows the 15 stacking spaces was actually

1 submitted after all of the other plans as an
2 amendment to make sure that they met the stacking
3 spaces. So really those other ones that don't
4 show that 15 are the ones that will need to be
5 redone to accommodate those, so that one was
6 actually submitted middle of last week. So any
7 other ones were submitted a while ago.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

9 MS. HITZEMANN: Does that answer your
10 question?

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Yeah. I mean --
12 but more so -- I guess, then how does the topic of
13 the setback of the canopy relate to all this?

14 MS. HITZEMANN: So that was a
15 comment -- so I actually was able to review the
16 new plan and that's the comment that stemmed from
17 that new plan (indiscernible) drive by backwards,
18 closer to that plotline, and that's where that
19 question stems from. If it was with the old plan,
20 the drive-through was shorter so we can't be
21 outside of that 10-foot range and now it's moved
22 more north. There's a question of whether it
23 needs that 10-foot setback. And it might just --
24 it might already do that, just to be sure on

1 plans.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. So the
3 setback for the drive-through canopy has to be
4 10 feet from the rear?

5 MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Thank you.
7 That helps.

8 In the landscape comments from staff,
9 you know, I think are great with respect to, you
10 know, things that need to be updated and taking
11 out some landscaping where you have the walk-up
12 location and some coordination, things like that.
13 Is the -- you mentioned earlier that you weren't
14 going to expand -- or there's no plans currently
15 to expand the building, but does the current
16 interior layout of the building allow for an
17 expansion -- two years? Five years from now? I
18 mean, obviously they need to see how things
19 progress here and, you know, are they doing well,
20 but if they -- if they were, would they be able to
21 expand the building, given the current
22 configuration of the interior?

23 MR. DAMS: You know, here's the floor
24 plan layout --

1 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Right.

2 MR. DAMS: -- and they have exam rooms
3 around most of the perimeter, and then, you know,
4 administrative and those in the middle, so --
5 could it be expanded? Yeah -- you know, it'd be
6 really tough from a cost perspective, with masonry
7 walls and the outside are going to be load-bearing
8 walls and just to wall over a little bit is a
9 pretty costly endeavor, so there's no plans to do
10 that. It was not designed that way.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay.

12 MR. DAMS: Could it be done? Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Okay. Just
14 curious.

15 Any further questions by --

16 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: I have one more
17 question.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Sure.

19 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: The landscape
20 island's on the east side, kind of where you start
21 sharing -- I guess -- your parking or just going
22 to the shopping center, it looks like. Will those
23 islands be reconstructed on completely or is it
24 kind of just getting to spruce up the landscaping?

1 I'm just trying to get an idea of those --

2 MR. DAMS: You're referring to --

3 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yes.

4 MR. DAMS: -- couple of islands here?

5 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yes.

6 MR. DAMS: So I mean, on our site,
7 they're going to be new, but they're going to have
8 to, you know, somehow tie in to what the existing
9 is, and I'm sure that's going to be a field
10 condition that we have to work through, make sure
11 that the grades meet. It's nice that we have the
12 cooperation of the neighbor next door, so I can't
13 see that being a hindrance.

14 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Okay. Because I
15 think it'd be, you know, nice if, you know, since
16 it's technically two different properties, it'd be
17 nice, at least, if the landscaping on those would
18 be homogenous -- you know, the whole thing.

19 MR. DAMS: And I'm happy to reach out
20 to them and see if they're, you know, willing to
21 do that and support that, you know, there's a cost
22 to them, but it's not -- it's not going to be a
23 deal breaker.

24 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yeah. So I mean,

1 I'd appreciate it if you did reach out --

2 MR. DAMS: Sure. It's a fair comment.

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Any other
4 comments? Questions?

5 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: One question
6 about the drive-through.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Please.

8 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: How many cars can
9 be accommodated through the drive-through lane?

10 MR. DAMS: Well, right now, we can
11 apply it -- so we went from 12 stacking spaces, or
12 13, to 15, which is required per code. In most of
13 their locations, they seem to think that 10 to 12
14 are sufficient. They have over a hundred
15 locations in the country -- not nationwide, but in
16 the country.

17 Their average time from order to pick
18 up to 60 to 90 seconds, so they're pretty
19 efficient. They only serve custard, so it's -- it
20 goes pretty quickly, whereas they're not, you
21 know, custard plus burgers and fries, and, you
22 know, moves along pretty quickly from what I
23 understand. I'm anxious to try it myself.

24 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: They haven't

1 asked (indiscernible) during peak time how many
2 cars are stacking?

3 MR. DAMS: They base it on the
4 information they have from other locations.
5 Peak-hour stacking -- 8-9 cars.

6 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. DAMS: There's a little variable,
8 but that's based on -- okay.

9 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: This capacity.

10 MR. DAMS: They have -- you didn't ask,
11 but I want to throw that in there -- number of
12 employees for Andy's is about 25, so that'll be
13 25 new jobs there. Maximum employees at one peak
14 time is about 12.

15 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Thank you.

16 MR. DAMS: You're welcome.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Anything else for
18 us at this point? Okay. Thanks.

19 And do we have any -- since we don't
20 have anybody in attendance, do we have anybody on
21 Zoom that we need to address from a public
22 standpoint?

23 MS. HITZEMANN: We do not.

24 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. Great. All

1 right.

2 All right. So if the Plan Commission
3 feels they have enough information to make a
4 recommendation to the Planning and Development
5 Committee of the City Council, a motion to close
6 the public hearing would be in order.

7 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: I motion to close.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

9 COMMISSIONER MOAD: I'll second.

10 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Motion and second.

11 MR. DAMS: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

13 Roll call. Jeff Funke?

14 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Laurel Moad?

16 COMMISSIONER MOAD: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

18 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese?

20 COMMISSIONER WIESE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zack Ewoldt?

22 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Rosenberg?

24 I'm sorry -- Gary Gruber? Sorry.

1 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Dave Rosenberg?

3 COMMISSIONER ROSENBERG: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Chris Studebaker?

5 COMMISSIONER STUDEBAKER: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself? Yes.

7 All right. Item 6B, our discussion and
8 recommendations. This is the opportunity for the
9 Plan Commission to discuss any information that we
10 have gathered as far as the finding of facts and
11 to add those thoughts, with respect to our
12 recommendations, and that all six findings of the
13 special use should be made in the affirmative to
14 make a recommendation for approval of the
15 drive-through. Is there anything further from
16 staff? Rachel?

17 MS. HITZEMANN: I don't have anything.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. And I have
19 a quick question related to engineering, I'm
20 assuming, that we have -- we've ended up with more
21 pervious area on this project than was there
22 before, if I remember seeing the data.

23 MS. HAWK: I believe it was actually a
24 reduction in impervious area from what's there,

1 existing today than there will be.

2 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: So there is less
3 impervious --

4 MS. HAWK: There will be less, yeah.
5 And I'm seeing a head nod from the design
6 engineer, so yes, it'll be less impervious than it
7 is today.

8 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
9 So from a stormwater standpoint, there's nothing
10 really needs to be done with respect to that?

11 MS. HAWK: There's nothing additional.

12 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Perfect. Okay.
13 Thank you.

14 All right. So we have the floor open
15 for any further discussion, now that we've closed
16 the public hearing, or anything that we'd like to
17 toss around --

18 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: I'd just like to
19 say, I appreciate you guys coming forward and this
20 is actually great use of the site. The fact that
21 both businesses are working at different times
22 actually is, you know, great for that corner. So
23 yeah, I like the architecture for the custard
24 stand. I think the -- I know you guys are going

1 to work on the architecture related to the medical
2 building, so, you know, I appreciate the site plan
3 and the opportunity you guys are bringing to
4 St. Charles, so thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER WIESE: Yeah. I have to
6 say I concur with Commissioner Funke. I also
7 think it's going to bring some vitality to the
8 area that's desperately needed. I'm familiar with
9 Andy's that's on Randall. I love the look of it.
10 I think it's great. It's fun, and I agree with
11 the timing. I think that it works, that they're
12 compatible in that way.

13 So as long as, obviously, the
14 conditions of all of staff requirements, it sounds
15 like you guys are working and you're amendable to
16 everything that they're saying. I think it's --
17 it's a good addition to the city.

18 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.
19 Anything further from anybody? No?

20 All right. So is there a motion on
21 this application?

22 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Yeah. I'll make a
23 motion for approval for 2600 West Main Street,
24 Foxfield Commons PUD application for special use,

1 the application for PUD Preliminary Plan with
2 staff comments and suggestions brought --

3 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

4 COMMISSIONER MOAD: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: A motion and a
6 second. Any discussion on the motion? No?

7 All right. Roll call. Laurel Moad?

8 COMMISSIONER MOAD: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

10 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Jeff Funke?

12 COMMISSIONER FUNKE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese?

14 COMMISSIONER WIESE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Zack Ewoldt?

16 COMMISSIONER EWOLDT: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Dave Rosenberg?

18 COMMISSIONER ROSENBERG: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Gary Gruber?

20 COMMISSIONER GRUBER: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Chris Studebaker?

22 COMMISSIONER STUDEBAKER: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Myself? Yes.

24 All right. That concludes Item 6.

1 Thank you, gentlemen.

2 Additional business? Staff? Do we
3 have anything? Will we have a meeting?

4 MS. JOHNSON: We don't have any for the
5 next agenda, so we'll likely be canceling that
6 meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: Okay. All right.
8 Fair enough. Thank you.

9 Everybody's -- I'm sure -- seen their
10 weekly development reports. Our next meeting
11 doesn't sound like it's going to be June 21st --
12 could be July something. No public comment.

13 So if there's a motion to adjourn?

14 COMMISSIONER HIBEL: I'll motion to
15 adjourn.

16 COMMISSIONER WIESE: I'll second.

17 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: We have a motion
18 and a second.

19 All in favor?

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 CHAIRMAN VARGULICH: All right.

22 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 7:35.

23 Thank you, and good night.

24 (Off the record at 7:35 p.m.)

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 REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Kristine Wesner, CVR, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the testimony given; that said testimony was taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that reading and signing was not requested; 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 12th day of June, 2022.

Kt w



My Commission Expires: July 02, 2025