

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 16, 2019**

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

Members Absent: Suzanne Melton

Also Present: Ellen Johnson, Planner
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the July 2, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Ms. Purdy and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2019 Plan Commission meeting. Mr. Pretz abstained.

**4. Riverview Townhomes of St. Charles (Brian Hogan, Hogan Design & Construction)
Application for Concept Plan**

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

5. Weekly Development Report

6. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, August 6, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, August 20, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, September 3, 2019 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

Page 2

- b. Planning & Development Committee
 - Monday, August 12, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
 - Monday, September 9, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

- 7. **Public Comment-** Mr. Pretz suggested starting the meetings with The Pledge of Allegiance. Vice Chair Kessler stated that he would like to do some research and discuss further at the August 6th meeting.

- 8. **Adjournment at 8:08 p.m.**



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

Transcript of Riverview Townhomes

Date: July 16, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: Riverview :
Townhomes of St. Charles, :
Application for Concept :
Plan :
-----x

MEETING
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, July 16, 2019
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 218468
Pages: 1 - 58
Reported by: Joanne E. Ely, CSR, RPR

1 HEARING, held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 Before Joanne E. Ely, a Certified Shorthand
14 Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
15 of Illinois.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Riverview Townhomes
Conducted on July 16, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

9 PETER VARGULICH, Member

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

12 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

13 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Riverview Townhomes

Conducted on July 16, 2019

4

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

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

4 Tim, roll call.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

6 MEMBER BECKER: Here.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

14 MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

16 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler here.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item No. 3 is the
21 presentation of the minutes of the July 2nd, 2019,
22 meeting of the Plan Commission.

23 Is there a motion to approve?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

Transcript of Riverview Townhomes

Conducted on July 16, 2019

5

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm going to abstain.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. That motion
6 passes.

7 Item 4 is the Riverview Townhomes of
8 St. Charles, Brian Hogan, Hogan Design &
9 Construction, application for concept plan.

10 Good evening, everyone. What's here
11 before us tonight is a concept plan review, and
12 the purpose of a concept plan review is for the
13 Plan Commission to provide feedback to an
14 applicant before they go through the expense of
15 filing an application for a change, for a zoning
16 change or special use.

17 That's what we're doing tonight. It's not
18 here before us for any type of action. It's just
19 here for feedback; and based on what we say, the
20 applicant will decide whether to make a formal
21 application or not; but there won't be any other
22 action that will be taken after tonight on the
23 City's part. It's up to the applicant how to
24 proceed.

1 The way that we'll conduct this hearing or
2 this meeting is we will -- the applicant will make
3 a presentation, and the Plan Commission will ask
4 questions.

5 Members of the audience will have a chance
6 to ask questions; and then if there are any
7 comments -- well, what we'll do at the end is we
8 will poll the Plan Commission and ask for feedback
9 positive and negative for the applicants to take
10 away.

11 Are there any questions regarding our
12 procedure?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. We have a court
15 reporter here, and so everything is being taken
16 down. Because of that only one person may speak
17 at a time, and I would ask that you be recognized
18 by me prior to speaking.

19 Whenever anyone speaks, if you will come
20 up to the front of the room, to the lectern, and
21 speak clearly, giving your name and your address
22 for the record.

23 And I think that we should be ready to go.

24 Is there anything from staff?

Transcript of Riverview Townhomes

Conducted on July 16, 2019

7

1 MS. JOHNSON: No.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is the applicant
3 ready? Take it away.

4 MR. GREEN: Good evening, ladies and
5 gentlemen. My name is Jon Green, J-o-n G-r-e-e-n.
6 I'm with Engineering Resource Associates located
7 at 3 South 701 West Avenue in Warrenville,
8 Illinois. I'm a civil engineer, and I'm
9 representing the applicant, Brian Hogan, of Hogan
10 Design & Construction on this conceptual
11 presentation this evening.

12 The subject property currently contains an
13 existing duplex with an extensive asphalt area to
14 the south of the existing building. The subject
15 property is on the southeast corner of South
16 Avenue and South 3rd Avenue.

17 The property is at the southern end of the
18 RT-4 existing zoning district which is a zoning
19 district that allows up to two units, detached
20 single-family dwellings.

21 The neighborhood consists of a mix of
22 duplexes and single-family homes to the north. To
23 the east across the river are townhomes.
24 Predominantly to the east and to the south are

1 single family homes. I'll note that there's a
2 legally nonconforming commercial office building
3 not right next door to us but just to the south
4 of us.

5 The property has a small vacant parcel
6 right across 3rd Avenue. I don't know if it's
7 called a park or just an expanded right-of-way.
8 We are right on Riverside Avenue, which then, of
9 course, flanks the east bank of the Fox River.

10 So the concept plan on the screen right
11 before you shows the footprint of a proposed
12 three-unit attached building. So three
13 single-family homes attached. We'll call them
14 townhomes or row homes.

15 They each have two-car garages that you
16 would enter from the rear. The front elevations
17 face the river with a scenic river view and the
18 westerly evening sunsets. The homes are oriented
19 such that the kitchen and living room is on the
20 ground level, level with the garage entry to the
21 rear with a front porch.

22 The second story is where your three
23 bedrooms are. The buildings will be served by an
24 elevator with some enhanced colonial architecture,

1 and we're making use of the roof pitch on the
2 building to introduce kind of an outdoor terrace.
3 It will be served by the elevator. It's kind of a
4 partial story on the top level which is tucked
5 into the roof pitch.

6 So to summarize the concept plan before
7 you, we're showing an asphalt driveway that enters
8 off the rear of the building. We're meeting the
9 30-foot rear-yard setback, the 10-foot interior
10 side-yard setback, the 20-foot front-yard setback,
11 which matches the existing home to the south; and
12 we're also meeting the code compliant 15-foot
13 corner side-yard setback to the north.

14 There's a couple of deviations from what
15 otherwise this zoning code would allow, and that
16 is lot coverage. The zoning code, I believe,
17 calls for 3,750 square feet per unit. Our total
18 lot size is 100-by-100. So that's about 10,000
19 square feet. So our three units will average
20 about 3300 square feet per unit.

21 If you take the inverse of that, we would
22 be allowed by code compliance 2.7 units on this
23 property. So we're a little shy, but I'll go into
24 the uniqueness of this development and some of the

1 PUD standards that I think could help make up for
2 these slight deviations.

3 I'm going to scroll now through to the
4 front elevation. This would be the elevation that
5 would face west that would see the evening
6 sunsets. The first level has a front porch where
7 the living room would be and the front door.
8 There's stairs up to the porch elevation.

9 The second floor elevation also has a
10 porch or a deck. That would be the master bedroom
11 location.

12 The third level, as you see, is that
13 outdoor terrace that's kind of tucked into the
14 roof pitch. We see it from the front elevation,
15 but realistically, if you're driving down the road
16 or standing on the sidewalk, you may not even see
17 that top elevation from the street due to the
18 perspective and the angle.

19 This illustration perhaps accentuates my
20 last point. There's a little bit of an arbor or a
21 terrace up on that top level. You can see along
22 the bottom of the page the profile of the existing
23 terrain. As you know, all the land on the east
24 side of the river flows down towards the Fox.

1 Our rear lot line is at around the 692
2 elevation. Our front property line is around the
3 686 elevation. So there is about 6 feet of slope
4 on this property which makes it unique.

5 We're actually carving out the earth on
6 the back half of the site or the east side where
7 the garages would be to kind of tuck the building
8 down into the ground a little bit. And that's
9 important to note when we talk about one of the
10 other deviations that's needed by code in this
11 district is building height.

12 I think the maximum building height in
13 RT-4 right now is 32 feet. This proposed
14 building, as we've calculated per City code, we
15 measure it at the front of the building where the
16 porches are, we come out to around 38 or 40 feet
17 or so in height as measured on the west side of
18 the site.

19 I think some of the uniqueness of the
20 design, some of the dormers that Dan Marshall, the
21 architect, has engineered for us kind of blends in
22 with the slope and the topography. So you'll
23 notice perhaps a taller building from the river
24 side; but from the interior neighborhood side, I

1 believe the side elevation and then the rear
2 elevation -- well, we don't have one.

3 The side elevation towards the rear just
4 shows how the property kind of blends in with the
5 terrain and kind of blends with the neighboring
6 single-family homes around us.

7 We are providing off-street parking per
8 code in terms of two stalls for each unit. The
9 footprint of each unit is around 1500 square feet,
10 25-by-50.

11 It's living space on half of the first
12 level and the entire second level and then half of
13 the third level. So these units are going to be
14 well appointed and top out at perhaps 2200,
15 2300 square feet.

16 For sake of reference for those of you who
17 travel southbound on 31, Hogan Design &
18 Construction is constructing the five unit row
19 home buildings on Stevens and First Street. It's
20 under construction now. They back up to the
21 river. They are on the east side of 31 right at
22 Stevens Street.

23 So similar design there. That property
24 was an inverse. It slopes towards the river. So

1 the buildings face 31. The garages are tucked
2 around the back. This is kind of flip flopped
3 around.

4 So with that, that concludes my
5 presentation. Architect Dan Marshall is here, and
6 I'll be available for questions as well.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a question.
8 What is the height as measured from the rear of
9 the lot? Do you know?

10 MR. GREEN: The height. 6 feet higher
11 than this report. So 39 feet less about 6 feet,
12 so around 32, 33 feet.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So if viewed from the
14 back, it would appear to be 32 feet high --

15 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- as opposed to 39.

17 MR. GREEN: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Questions,
19 Plan Commissioners?

20 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. Is
21 this site in the 100-year floodplain? Any
22 floodplain, do you know?

23 MR. GREEN: Part of the street in front of
24 the site is in the floodplain; and although we

1 didn't complete a survey yet, the City engineering
2 staff noticed on the area GIS maps that the
3 floodplain may nick the sidewalk at the front.
4 But given that, we have a 20-some-foot setback.
5 The house would be built completely outside of the
6 floodplain and in conformance with FEMA standards.

7 MEMBER FUNKE: Another question -- the
8 16-foot, the drive in the back, I'm concerned
9 about that last unit to the south. If they're
10 pulling out of their garage, do they have enough
11 space to turn around?

12 MR. GREEN: I think, realistically, this
13 is just a conceptual schematic. I'd like to do a
14 little 5- or 7-foot bump out with the radius.

15 MEMBER FUNKE: All right. What's the
16 percentage of permeable compared to -- do you know
17 that?

18 MR. GREEN: Lot coverage. Well, from your
19 stormwater ordinance standpoint, we're not
20 triggering a need for stormwater detention, but I
21 will note that the recent Kane County countywide
22 ordinance was adopted, and I suspect we may need
23 best management practices, volume control best
24 management practices.

1 That could take the form of a dry well; or
2 if there's room, a rain garden; or perhaps
3 something like a permeable pavement area in lieu
4 of asphalt.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: Is the 16-foot driveway all
6 the way up to the property line?

7 MR. GREEN: No. On the east side, there's
8 about a 10-foot landscape buffer there.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Oh, there is. Okay.

10 MR. GREEN: Yes. The staff report
11 suggests, and we would comply with some type of
12 buffer landscaping there, something that's green
13 year around.

14 MEMBER FUNKE: And what would be your plan
15 for trash typically? I mean, what do you have in
16 mind? Where would it go on this?

17 MR. GREEN: Yeah. We'd work with the
18 private waste hauler, but I believe their refuse
19 containers would be kept in the garages like
20 single-family homes would and then on trash day
21 brought out to the curb.

22 MEMBER FUNKE: Brought out to South
23 Avenue?

24 MR. GREEN: Probably.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: So you'd have six
2 containers, one for recycling and one for regular
3 trash for each unit?

4 MR. GREEN: Yeah. Well, with the
5 proximity to downtown and all the wonderful
6 restaurants here, I don't think we'll be
7 generating a lot of trash.

8 MEMBER FUNKE: That's all I have.

9 MR. GREEN: We'll have to work those
10 details out.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a question.
12 Is there only one in and one out? You're not
13 going to have a curb cut on South, or are you?

14 MR. GREEN: Yeah. There's only one.
15 There's only one curb cut to the north on South
16 Avenue.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: On South Avenue.
18 So it's not here?

19 MR. GREEN: The current curb cut on this
20 property is off of South 3rd Avenue --

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right.

22 MR. GREEN: -- which would be the bottom.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: And that's going to
24 be closed off.

1 MR. GREEN: That's going to be closed.

2 MEMBER BECKER: I'd like to address the
3 PUD standards, and the staff memo talks about what
4 the benefits of a PUD would be for a community,
5 and I wonder if you could just briefly discuss
6 what benefits this PUD would provide pursuant to
7 the PUD standards that would be a benefit, and
8 what amenities or -- I'm not seeing anything in
9 the plan that, you know, checks a box there.

10 MR. GREEN: Sure. The City's
11 comprehensive plan calls for -- with such
12 proximity to the downtown district -- a mix of
13 uses and densities. So we feel, although a little
14 deviation is needed for the site, the PUD
15 accomplishes that, but it also follows the intent
16 of the comprehensive plan of bringing more
17 rooftops closer to the downtown area.

18 With respect to the specific standards, we
19 believe the upscale colonial-type architecture and
20 the fact that we have introduced outdoor living
21 spaces on all two-and-a-half to three levels of
22 the property as well as architecture that's
23 conforming with the neighborhood, some of the
24 older homes, and fits within the character of the

1 community.

2 MEMBER BECKER: Thank you.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: In relation to the eastern
4 view of the building or the back, and you did not
5 have any kind of drawing for that, I would be
6 interested in seeing what that would look like.
7 If it is just three double garage doors that the
8 residents on the east side are going to be taking
9 a look at just a very sterile back of a building,
10 or if there would be some detail, architectural
11 detail to at least make it pleasing for what
12 they'll be looking at.

13 MR. GREEN: Sure. I understand your
14 concern. Like the south elevation, they're not
15 just box vinyl windows perhaps, but there's
16 details to the top and bottom of the sills.

17 I will add that the three garage doors,
18 the garage floor is sitting about 3, 3 1/2 feet
19 below grade at the lot line, and with 10 feet of
20 room for buffering and landscaping, that at ground
21 level we think we'll probably have year-around
22 screening of the garage doors, assuming we plant
23 6-foot or 7-foot tall pines and arborvitaes.

24 But your point is well noted that we'll be

1 sure that the back has some intrigue.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Does any member
5 of the audience wish to ask any questions? Yes.

6 MS. HUTCHEON: Where is parking?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Come on up.

8 MS. HUTCHEON: Where does the parking go?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on. We're on the
10 record so you have to come up here and state your
11 name and your address.

12 MR. HUTCHEON: Donna Hutcheon, 503 South
13 4th Ave. Where does parking go?

14 MR. GREEN: Each of the units will have a
15 two-car garage, so the parking will be inside the
16 units. I'm outlining here with the mouse pointer
17 the southerly of the three units, and right along
18 the back here where there's a hard surface
19 driveway will be a two-car garage, where two cars
20 park inside the unit.

21 MS. HUTCHEON: The driving is so dense
22 already on South Ave, we live at South 4th Ave,
23 that people have to pull over because there's only
24 one car that can park there.

1 Have you anticipated any -- have you
2 studied that? What are your thoughts on that?

3 MR. GREEN: We meet the intent of the City
4 code with respect to two stalls per unit provided
5 offsite. At the time of final engineering, we
6 could perhaps look at providing maybe one or two
7 parallel guest spots.

8 We'd have to measure the topography and
9 see where there's some possibilities, but we
10 realize it's a heavier traffic area more or less
11 because the streets are a little narrower or
12 things are a little tighter.

13 MS. HUTCHEON: Do you anticipate
14 contributing to that problem?

15 MR. GREEN: We do not because we're going
16 to provide two stalls per unit.

17 MS. HUTCHEON: Okay.

18 MR. GREEN: Times six with, hopefully, an
19 opportunity to provide one or two extra off-street
20 stalls for visitors.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

22 Yes, sir.

23 MR. DIDOMENICO: Mark Didomenico, 311
24 South Avenue, so we're directly to the east.

1 THE REPORTER: Can you spell your last
2 name, please.

3 MR. DIDOMENICO: Sure. D-i-d-o-m-e-n-i-c-o.

4 So a couple of questions. A big concern
5 for us is drainage, right, and I think it was
6 already mentioned in terms of being on the
7 floodplain; but, you know, water rolls all the way
8 down the hill, and I'm worried that whatever
9 retaining walls are put in place for the structure
10 will block that water and back it up further up
11 east.

12 So is that an issue that is going to be
13 addressed or not?

14 MR. GREEN: It will be addressed, and, you
15 know, the County ordinance, the City ordinance,
16 and the State riparian water law will not allow us
17 to block any drainage. So we'll make sure that we
18 accept the water.

19 I expect that our proposed rear driveway
20 will have a couple of catch basins or drainage
21 influence. So we'll probably actually be able to
22 capture some of the water; meet the intent of the
23 County ordinance with respect to infiltration into
24 the ground to minimize runoff; and then, number

1 three, connect our drains to the City storm sewer
2 that outlet right towards the Fox River.

3 So I suspect we'll kind of have a positive
4 impact in terms of stormwater because we'll be
5 bringing some storm sewer amenities to the
6 property that it doesn't have right now.

7 MR. DIDOMENICO: Okay. I guess -- I think
8 Donna already addressed the traffic issue that
9 we're all concerned about as well. As was already
10 mentioned, it is a pretty high traffic area
11 already on South Avenue, as people coming over the
12 bridge from Prairie tend to turn up South Avenue.

13 So I'm wondering if there is going to be
14 some type of alleviation for that with the
15 increased traffic that we expect on the block.

16 MR. GREEN: This is something that we may
17 work on at time of final submittal; but if the
18 site warrants some type of traffic analysis, we'll
19 surely comply with that. I know there are certain
20 parts of town that actually have on-street parking
21 in the forms of, you know, providing a parallel
22 stall or two in the City parkway area.

23 I don't know if this part of the zoning
24 district would be amenable to that, but we can

1 certainly work with staff to explore options on
2 parking.

3 MR. DIDOMENICO: And the last, I guess, is
4 mostly just a comment. The question was asked
5 about, you know, the back of the building and the
6 look and feel there.

7 In reality I don't really care that much
8 how that building looks in that the complete
9 coverage of the lot that is being proposed here,
10 essentially, eliminates the view that most of us
11 have to the river. So I understand it's called
12 the Riverview townhomes, but we already have a
13 river view.

14 So my concern there is what happens to our
15 property -- property values as, you know,
16 something like this goes up and, essentially,
17 eliminates what is a pretty large portion of
18 our -- you know, the reason why we moved into the
19 house was to, you know, get that view off of the
20 back of our house.

21 So I'm not sure if that's something that
22 goes on record as a comment, but I would very much
23 like that to be a consideration.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

1 Yes, ma'am. Come up, please.

2 MS. HUTCHEON: Am I restrained to making a
3 comment -- a question versus a comment?

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You can make a comment.
5 That's fine.

6 MS. HUTCHEON: It seems like a
7 redistribution of wealth to give him a variance
8 for a three-level river view condo when it will
9 impair the views of a lot of the neighbors who
10 have lived there and bought the house particularly
11 for that purpose. It will disseminate our view.
12 It will disseminate Mark's view.

13 It's not zoned for that. I don't see why
14 they would be entitled to that. It seems like an
15 over-dense use of the space. It seems -- I don't
16 see what it contributes to St. Charles. We have
17 plenty of condos across the way. It seems like it
18 will just be overkill. Other than the developer,
19 I don't see who it benefits.

20 That's my comment. It will ruin our view.
21 It will ruin his view. I think it will create
22 driving -- parking problems, traffic problems, and
23 I just don't see anyone who benefits other than
24 the developer.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. GREEN: I think I have just one
3 counterpoint to that. We looked at what two units
4 would look like on this property, and with the
5 trend of there being -- larger units not selling
6 these days, the 22-, 2300 square feet per unit we
7 think is right where we need to be.

8 Conversely, if we had to make this project
9 work with two units, they would be bigger; and the
10 yellow box shown on this aerial exhibit is not
11 representing any variances to any setbacks.

12 So, you know, perhaps an alternative that
13 really doesn't even work economically, if it had
14 to be two units, they'd have to be bigger. So
15 perhaps the structure would be the same footprint.
16 We're not looking for variances on any setbacks;
17 but from a density standpoint, we have to be able
18 to sell the units. So if that kind of helps our
19 point of view.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a question for
21 staff. What would they be able to build of right?

22 MS. JOHNSON: So they have a
23 10,000-square-foot lot. So the minimum lot size
24 for single-family is 5,000 square feet. So they

1 could divide the lot and make two single-family
2 homes, or they could do a duplex. A duplex
3 requires 7500 square feet. So either way up to
4 two units could go on the lot by right.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Yes.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: You bring up an
7 interesting point, if you were to build two units
8 as opposed to three. I'm just wondering if that
9 should come about, would that lower the height of
10 the building? Would you not be as tall? I mean,
11 I don't know if you're gone down this path that
12 far anyway.

13 MR. GREEN: Well, you have to be able to
14 sell the units too; and although I'm not the
15 realtor or developer in terms of putting the
16 pro forma together, you can only sell attached
17 units for a certain price point and there's
18 also -- there's only a certain demand for a
19 certain size. So the project doesn't work with
20 two units.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It wouldn't work.

22 MR. GREEN: It would not work.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So that's off the
24 table.

1 MR. GREEN: Yes.

2 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. You
3 have a 32-foot maximum height; right?

4 MR. GREEN: Uh-huh.

5 MEMBER FUNKE: And you're at, what, 36?
6 You're not at 40, are you? As I'm reading this,
7 36 1/2.

8 MR. GREEN: Yeah. 36 or 38 1/2, something
9 like that.

10 MEMBER FUNKE: Well, in the drawing it
11 says 36 1/2. So since you're only 4 1/2 feet
12 above the height requirement and you've got a
13 pitched roof, you could make that flat. You could
14 go -- I mean, if you wanted to, you could be at
15 three stories with 32 feet; correct? Correct?

16 MR. GREEN: Yes.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: So, you know, within
18 reason, I would think.

19 MR. GREEN: I think so. Maybe Ellen can
20 help me on this. I'm not certain if three stories
21 by themselves kicks in the need for the deviation
22 or if it's the --

23 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, it would. Either the
24 height or the number of stories.

1 MEMBER FUNKE: What if they do a half
2 story, maybe two-and-a-half stories?

3 MS. JOHNSON: The maximum number of
4 stories is two.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
6 comments or questions from members of the
7 audience? Yes, ma'am.

8 MS. DEPOTTER: My name is Clementine
9 Depotter. I live at 510 South 3rd Avenue right
10 next door to the property in question.

11 What they are planning is a monstrosity,
12 and it's going to cost lives -- thank you -- that
13 it's going to cost lives in the long run.

14 The way it is now, the people at 504
15 South 3rd Avenue and South Avenue, we share a
16 grass strip between our driveways. We take --
17 they put part of their snow there. I put part of
18 my snow there. And my snow is done by hand by a
19 young man who really is not that young, about 57,
20 that works with a shovel instead of those blowers
21 that blow it all over the place, and he does that
22 for me.

23 Grass cutting -- the people that live
24 downstairs at 504, they take excellent, excellent

1 care of that property. He's constantly cutting
2 the grass. He's -- you know, he's always doing
3 something to take care of that property.

4 The people that have lived upstairs there
5 have been running away, and they're in and out.
6 But the person that's up there right now was so
7 happy when she got that small apartment because
8 she can walk if she has to. She walks her dog.
9 She goes to work. So she is in and out.

10 She was given no warning that this thing
11 was in the works. The possibility of it was in
12 the works. So after finding a place that she can
13 live, she finds out she may have to move.

14 But for me if this thing goes through,
15 this monstrosity, it's going to put me in a cave.
16 Not only will it put me in a cave; but if they do
17 demolish that property -- do you know what happens
18 when they demolish property? Do you know what
19 goes all over in the air, that flies everywhere.
20 I will be breathing it, but not just me. All the
21 neighbors are going to be breathing that in.
22 That's dangerous.

23 I, in particular, have a bad time because
24 I have osteoporosis so I have lung problems. I've

1 had an aorta surgery. So I have quite a few
2 things that are against me. I don't want to see
3 that thing come.

4 You know what else is something that may
5 happen? Kitty-corner from that property -- if
6 you go from the corner of South Avenue,
7 kitty-corner across the street is a little park
8 where kids play. You know what's going to happen
9 if a car crashes because they can't see because of
10 that building? Some of those children are liable
11 to be dead, or other people will be injured.

12 So I am thoroughly against this. I
13 think -- I don't know where they came up with such
14 an idea, but it does not make common sense, and I
15 hope they will take into consideration what I am
16 saying.

17 Now, I have a hard time with the diagram
18 in here, all the pages that have the drawings, but
19 my son got here today from Florida, and he's got a
20 blueprint. He can read all kinds of things. He's
21 going to look at this for me, and he will explain
22 to me exactly where this is fitting, how they're
23 going to fit.

24 When I first saw this, I thought they were

1 going to go like this, up the hill, up to South
2 Avenue. I did not realize they were going to come
3 this way on 3rd Avenue and then also up South
4 Avenue.

5 And then also I don't know what they're
6 planning where you people live.

7 Their house is right there in the middle;
8 and from the looks of the diagram, they want to go
9 right up to their property.

10 Underneath all that -- now, I'm going to
11 look at the people that lived here all of their
12 lives, a lot of you have been on different
13 committees. No. Flagstone, we're by the river.
14 Years and years ago, this is where the Indians
15 were. That flagstone runs through it. This
16 building could very well have water running down
17 below it.

18 I don't know how they think they're going
19 to take care of that. They may think they've got
20 it licked for a while, but eventually that is
21 going to do its natural thing. So I hope you will
22 take this into consideration.

23 It really is -- it doesn't belong here.
24 It's too, too big. Thank you for listening to me.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you, ma'am.

2 All right. Any other comments or
3 questions? Yes sir.

4 MR. ALONGI: How is it going? It's James
5 Alongi, 402 South 3rd Avenue.

6 THE REPORTER: Can you spell your last
7 name, please.

8 MR. ALONGI: A-l-o-n-g-i. They got it
9 wrong on the mail.

10 I've got to let you know the parking is
11 not going to work. I've got a car that's 17 foot
12 and a truck that's 21 feet that are backed up. I
13 just wanted to make that comment. You've got to
14 do something to increase the parking. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

16 Any other comments? Questions?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Does the
19 applicant have anything else?

20 MR. GREEN: Yeah. I wanted to point out
21 on this concept sketch, the 16-foot dimension is
22 the driveway approach only or the apron from South
23 Avenue extending to the north face of the
24 building. Once you get to the first corner, it

1 widens out to plus or minus 24 feet, which will
2 have adequate turning and maneuvering. We just
3 didn't -- we wanted to minimize the impervious and
4 the hard surface as much as we can. So where cars
5 are just coming and going off South Avenue, we
6 tightened it up a little bit. I think the City
7 code allows for that.

8 That's all I have.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

10 Yes, sir.

11 MR. DIDOMENICO: I have one more question.

12 So it's hard to see in the picture, but
13 how far up towards our property line will that
14 driveway go? You said there's going to be about
15 10 foot of space in between. There's already a
16 pretty good vegetation on that line. We've got
17 some trees. We've got a, you know, nice garden
18 going.

19 So how much of that will get eliminated in
20 this, and how close to our property line will
21 everything go?

22 MR. GREEN: I think there's like 6 or
23 8 feet there, if I'm just adding up the numbers
24 here in my head. I know there's a couple of large

1 overstory trees. We haven't performed a survey.
2 So we'll spot those eventually, if we move
3 forward.

4 But in consideration of the comments made
5 in the staff report, we will plan to supplement
6 any existing trees and vegetation there and make
7 sure that we have a green wall or a living wall
8 along that property line such that we're screening
9 the garage doors from the neighbors.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
11 Any further comments? Questions? Yes,
12 ma'am.

13 MS. HUTCHEON: I'm just curious. I have
14 no idea relative to the elevation how it compares
15 to the existing structures. Can the developer
16 provide that?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I didn't hear you. I
18 didn't understand the question.

19 MS. HUTCHEON: Their existing elevation, I
20 don't have any context to view it relative to
21 existing structures. Could they provide that so
22 it makes sense overall?

23 MR. GREEN: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything

1 else?

2 MEMBER VARGULICH: I just have a couple
3 questions.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yep.

5 MEMBER VARGULICH: Just to follow up on
6 Commissioner Becker's request related to the PUD,
7 I think it would be a fair thing to do -- there
8 are nine standards; and in your initial response,
9 you only respond to one of them. While I think
10 that maybe four of them probably don't apply, I
11 think that at least items 3, 4, 5, and 6 do.

12 And so I think those would be fair things
13 for you guys to consider how to address those and
14 pay specific attention to things like superior
15 landscaping, you know, the issue of high quality
16 architecture. I think there's a good start there.
17 I think there's more to do.

18 Innovative stormwater -- you know, beyond
19 volume control, I think there's other things that
20 could be done to address stormwater issues.

21 So I would just ask that if you continue
22 to pursue this, that you could come and address
23 those directly and point to specific parts of the
24 design.

1 I think that the overall coverage, even if
2 you went to a duplex -- I mean there could be some
3 changes to how the building was massed, and you
4 may be able to meet the particular pro forma
5 returns.

6 So I think from an adjacent resident
7 standpoint, the issues of mass and blocking your
8 views, I think that if the property was
9 redeveloped in any shape or form, that it's going
10 to take your view away.

11 So independent of their request for 2, 3,
12 4 feet of height, If you're allowed a maximum of
13 32 feet and somebody builds to the setback lines,
14 the footprint they're showing, it's going to
15 probably be close. So as far as your view back
16 west, I think any redevelopment is going to take
17 that away.

18 So I think in fairness, that would be
19 zoning by right. So they would be allowed to do
20 that. If they can meet the 32 feet and put
21 duplexes on there, then that is zoning by right,
22 and they would be allowed to do that. Just in
23 fairness to those concerns, you should just
24 understand that.

1 I think that the existing tree -- I think
2 there was just one existing tree near the east
3 property line that probably is walnut or something
4 like that that should be addressed and how it
5 could be preserved as part of the development and
6 make sure that it doesn't get impacted with the
7 construction that's going to be necessary, again,
8 assuming you continue to pursue this. Thanks.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

10 MR. MILLER: My name is Greg. I live at
11 602 South 4th Avenue.

12 THE REPORTER: What was your last name?

13 MR. MILLER: Miller.

14 I have been a resident of St. Charles in
15 this neighborhood for now 20 years. I have also
16 been a builder in this neighborhood for 20 years.
17 I know a few people on the panel here. My only
18 concern is that -- I know you can meet your
19 setbacks. I know you can get a little bit of
20 leeway with your height regulations and such.

21 My only concern is that this side of the
22 river has always been a single-family residence
23 area and I understand very -- I understand all to
24 well the dollars and cents that are associated

1 with purchasing a property, building a
2 single-family home, and trying to make a profit on
3 it, which, ultimately, Hogan Construction is
4 trying to do. And I think they've done a
5 wonderful job on some of their projects. Again,
6 I've been doing this for 20 years.

7 I don't want to see a precedent set where
8 this side of the river becomes a brownstone or a
9 multifamily residence area because that is not
10 what it is. I remodeled a house kitty-corner at
11 316 South Avenue, competed with other builders who
12 wanted to just tear it down and build some
13 monstrosity on the property. I took the time to
14 rebuild that house to its original character.

15 All I'm concerned about is this
16 neighborhood that I've raised my -- I'm raising my
17 kids in.

18 The monstrosity that went on kitty-corner
19 to Lincoln School is a good example. When that
20 was started and they started clear cutting all
21 those beautiful Oak trees on that entire block of
22 property, and then the developer came in and went
23 bankrupt, and it sat vacant for awhile, although
24 he had put in all the infrastructure. And then

1 Midwest Custom Homes came in and built a complete
2 different -- I wish I had an iPhone back then.
3 This was back in 2003 maybe, 2004. I wish I had
4 an iPhone to take a picture of what it was
5 originally proposed to be done on that property.

6 They were all going to have the red brick.
7 They were going to have some copper accents that
8 all matched the mansion that now houses, I
9 believe, two, or correct me if I'm wrong, maybe
10 three condos there. And what went up originally
11 didn't match it whatsoever, and then subsequently
12 when Midwest Custom Homes came in, they built two
13 others that were completely contrary.

14 And I've walked my kids up to Lincoln
15 School now for 10 years, and every time I walk by
16 that place, nothing looks like it was originally
17 proposed. I know for a fact, because I've been
18 doing this for quite a while, that a lot of these
19 details on these buildings, they cost money. Your
20 scuppers, your details, your soffit, your facia,
21 all these beautiful -- they look nice.

22 I just don't want to see something happen
23 on this property as what happened kitty-corner to
24 Lincoln School when it sat for years upon years

1 and not only that, but we lost all this -- it was
2 a heritage building. You know, I mean, it was a
3 beautiful structure.

4 So that's my only concern that I wanted to
5 voice this evening, is that if something like this
6 goes underway, that it doesn't set a precedent
7 that this side of the river and this particular
8 neighborhood becomes a multifamily period thing
9 where all the older homes are getting torn down or
10 all the potentially vacant properties are getting
11 torn down and multifamily units are going up.

12 So thank you for your time this evening.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

14 Anything else?

15 MS. DEPOTTER: May I come back up there?

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

17 MS. DEPOTTER: My name is Clementine
18 Depotter. I live at 510 South 3rd Avenue.

19 One of the things I did not mention but
20 will take place if they go through with this is
21 repair trucks getting into my driveway. They have
22 trouble now. It's a bad spot. It's a bad
23 driveway to get in and out of with people being
24 able to see both ways.

1 If they were to do this, they wouldn't be
2 able to get the garbage trucks in there. How are
3 they going to get in there to pick up garbage?
4 How are the repair trucks going to get in, the
5 Culligan Man. They're all big wide trucks, and
6 they need to get in and out.

7 If they do this, I don't know how they'll
8 ever get into my driveway. Then what am I
9 supposed to do then? Like I said, they're putting
10 me in a cave.

11 So I hope that they will give some
12 serious, serious consideration to not go through
13 with this idea. Thank you for letting me come
14 back up again.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

16 MEMBER VARGULICH: Todd, excuse me, one
17 question.

18 Is there parking currently allowed on
19 South Avenue?

20 MS. DEPOTTER: They do it but there's --

21 MEMBER VARGULICH: On both sides or just
22 one side?

23 MS. HUTCHEON: Parking on one side because
24 people have to pull over.

1 MEMBER VARGULICH: Parking on one side.

2 MS. HUTCHEON: People have to pull over
3 when it's tight.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: So I would just ask as
5 part of their traffic analysis or whatever they're
6 going to have is to look at maybe adjusting and
7 widening South Avenue on the south side to create
8 parallel parking so that there's the ability to
9 park a little easier and still have traffic flow
10 as a way of addressing those issues.

11 They've done that on a number of streets
12 where they widen it a little bit to create those
13 parallel spots and to give a little more room for
14 traffic. So possibly on this side of the street,
15 that could be done which would help address some
16 of the parking issues that have been raised
17 as well as to provide -- to make sure that there
18 is some ample visitor parking provided with a
19 minimal cost to do it by taking a little bit of
20 the parkway.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, ma'am.

22 MS. HUTCHEON: Unless you kill all their
23 parkway grass, there's no space. There's no space
24 for parking.

1 Can I make one last comment?

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

3 MS. HUTCHEON: I realize we're probably
4 going to lose our view with a two-story, but we
5 have a monstrosity, it is a new house kitty-corner
6 to us, and they built to the hilt. I don't want
7 that area to lose the character it has.

8 Three stories, I just don't see any
9 justification for it. I really don't. It doesn't
10 seem like it adds anything to St. Charles, just,
11 again, so. That's all.

12 MEMBER BECKER: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

14 MEMBER BECKER: I'd just like to address
15 one thing and looking at the exhibit that has the
16 zoning district boundaries. When I took a look at
17 the zoning map today in prepping for the meeting,
18 I noticed that the existing PUDs are called out on
19 the zoning map by number, and the closest
20 dedicated PUD is several blocks away in the CBD
21 district.

22 And I guess my concern is that granting a
23 PUD here as a transition zone between one
24 single-family that might allow duplexes to another

1 would be a precedent, and I guess I'm not
2 comfortable with that particular issue at this
3 location.

4 MEMBER FUNKE: I've got a question. We
5 have RT-3 just to the south. There's a dentist.
6 Is that a commercial property?

7 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, it is. That's a
8 nonconforming use.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: So I think that, you know,
10 you have nonconforming uses in the area and a
11 little more density.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any other
13 comments? Questions? Anyone? Going once. Going
14 twice. Yes.

15 MR. MILLER: Just one last comment. With
16 the standard City lot being 50-by-100, I would ask
17 the question why wouldn't -- I mean, I know the
18 dollars and cents may not be there for land
19 acquisition cost, but I just think two
20 single-family residences would look beautiful on
21 this property. You know, smaller, 2,000,
22 2200 square foot, more in keeping with the
23 character of the rest.

24 I understand land cost. I understand

1 construction costs. I understand when you see all
2 the way down 31, the multifamily. But that would
3 just be my question would be why can't we see two
4 single-family residences go on there. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. All right.

6 At this time I will ask plan commissioners
7 to give their impressions, both positive and
8 negative, for the applicant so that they can take
9 that away and incorporate that into an application
10 that they may come in with in the future.

11 I guess I'll start at the other end.

12 MEMBER VARGULICH: That's not an issue I
13 had with respect to the comments or suggestions
14 regarding how the project could move forward. I
15 think there was a lot of neighborhood concern that
16 should be looked at and evaluated. And I think
17 that the PUD standards, if you're going to apply
18 for them, ought to be considered strongly.

19 And finally, regarding the height, that
20 seems to be a hang up. Could there be a
21 consideration that the structure have an open roof
22 area and not have an actual third story?

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: This is really hard

1 for me because I used to live in that
2 neighborhood, and I know Greg. I know the work
3 you've done.

4 So before I sat down here, I was all -- I
5 was thinking it was a great use for that land; but
6 having heard some of the neighborhood comments,
7 it's difficult because, yes, we don't want to lose
8 the integrity of the neighborhood. Having lived
9 there for 15 years, I understand. And to Greg's
10 point, maybe it would be nice to kind of look at
11 two single-family homes on that lot.

12 But if this does move forward the way that
13 it's been -- the concept plan has said, I would
14 recommend that you look at the height of the
15 building and maybe reevaluate that, looking at the
16 PUD requirements, 32 feet, and be a little bit
17 more maybe sensitive to the neighborhood. You
18 know, there's a lot of neighbors here with
19 concern, and I would just suggest that you be
20 sensitive to that and maybe consider some other
21 options and, again, take a look at the PUD
22 requirements.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I do love
24 the building, and I love the fact that it's

1 located in a place that looks out over the river.

2 It's a neat concept, but I think the
3 purpose of the PUD is to not just offer an
4 opportunity to locate a structure but also to
5 protect the area that it's in. I'm not convinced
6 that this concept plan meets the purpose of the
7 PUD. I think that you would have to spend a
8 little more time focusing on that.

9 Regarding the setbacks, that's great. I
10 do believe that anything that gets built here is
11 going to block views. If you want to put one
12 single-family home on there, it's going to have
13 some height, and it's not likely going to be in
14 the same spot.

15 As far as the height of the building,
16 there are things you could do with that roof even
17 with three stories to soften that height, but I
18 think the focus has to be on the PUD, to
19 accommodate the changes, zoning changes that you
20 would need to build the structure as it sits
21 there.

22 MR. GREEN: I'm sorry.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I say you need to
24 address the PUD issue so you could accommodate

1 those zoning changes that would be required for
2 the structure as it sits today.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jennifer.

4 MEMBER BECKER: I've already made a couple
5 of comments, but I'd like to just highlight that
6 there's a difference between granting zoning
7 variances and granting a PUD that really in my
8 opinion is a precedent in a transitional area.

9 And, I think, echoing other commissioners'
10 concerns, that the PUD standards are for a reason,
11 to provide community benefit in addition to
12 allowing development rights for a developer, and I
13 think that there needs to be a greater
14 investigation into what community benefits
15 granting this PUD would bring to the development.
16 Thank you.

17 MEMBER FUNKE: I also made comments, but
18 I'd like just to say that I actually just moved
19 into the neighborhood about a year ago, and I
20 appreciate the fact that I can walk downtown and
21 be there within five minutes.

22 So what I disagree with is that I don't
23 think that, you know, the ability to put two
24 single-family homes there is going to work because

1 right now you're on a busy -- we just bought a
2 single-family home in the area, and I've got a
3 family of five; and being on Route 25, I wouldn't
4 do it. I'd be worried about my kids running out
5 there. I'd be worried about, you know, all the
6 complexities of the traffic in that area.

7 So you do have a commercial lot to the
8 south. So I think it's going to be another tough
9 priority then to build two single-family homes.

10 So I'm actually for the project. I think
11 the architect did a great job with the front
12 porch, giving context and giving visibility to the
13 street. And, you know, from what I see from the
14 elevations, it says 36 1/2 feet to the peak.

15 If the architect wanted to do a building
16 within 32 feet or, you know, 34 feet, I think, you
17 know, they could do something. They could do a
18 two-story building that's going to block the
19 views.

20 So I'm actually, you know, in favor of the
21 project, and I like the architecture.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, right now I'm neutral
24 as it relates to the project. I'm neutral because

1 of the balance between the two sides here.

2 The project is a nice project, well
3 presented, very knowledgeable, and you've answered
4 all the questions, and I'm sure that your
5 architect will come up with something that will
6 dazzle me as far as his design and very pleasing,
7 you know, for the neighborhood.

8 But on the other side, the concerns of the
9 residents and that balance kind of puts me in the
10 middle here, and also maybe, you know, being that
11 this would be the precedent of the PUD into that
12 neighborhood. So I do have some concern with
13 that.

14 My recommendation from that, though, would
15 be that as you proceed or if you continue to
16 proceed, would be that as you develop your ideas a
17 little bit more, is that you take the time to
18 maybe have some sessions with the neighbors so
19 that they understand what you're doing. Because I
20 think in the long run, they would probably be your
21 best cheerleaders as far as what you would be
22 presenting for your final product.

23 That would be my takeaway to you is spend
24 time communicating with them and discuss, see --

1 it's not a perfect world. I don't expect you to
2 meet every obstacle; but if you can mitigate many
3 of them, where their concerns are at, it will help
4 in your progress going forward in your
5 presentation. So, again, right now I'm sitting
6 neutral as far as what you're presenting.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have to agree with
8 Tom. I'm pretty much in the same boat. When I
9 first saw this concept, I thought this is really
10 pretty neat. This is going to complement the west
11 side of the river and development on First Street,
12 and I was impressed with that.

13 I've walked 3rd Avenue about three times
14 in the last three or four days looking at this.
15 What I've heard here tonight kind of refocused on
16 what I felt as I walked the neighborhood.

17 The height of the building really disturbs
18 me. It's mitigated a little bit by the slope of
19 the property that goes to the east of the
20 residence behind. It will be a little bit higher
21 elevation, but nevertheless, I think that's
22 something that has to be addressed in some way.

23 The other aspect is that -- the
24 architecture I'm fine with that. I'm good with

1 that. And I think that would work well. But I
2 don't know how this really plays into what you can
3 do; but my pathway to the library takes me up
4 South Avenue all the time, and that is very
5 congested there. I don't know if this is going to
6 add to it, but I'm concerned about it.

7 I don't think there's a way that the
8 street can even be widened as was mentioned
9 tonight. Parking is allowed, as I understand, on
10 the south side of this; and so these are all
11 things that disturb me. I've just got mixed
12 feelings about it.

13 Like I said from the beginning, you know,
14 yeah, this is going to be great; but the more I've
15 looked at it, my concern is building height; and I
16 don't know what you could rectify as far as the
17 traffic pattern but something was mentioned about
18 a study. I don't know, but that might help.

19 Those are my comments.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And my
21 thoughts are similar to, I think, what is kind of
22 becoming the consensus. I have issues regarding
23 the massing and the lot coverage and height. I
24 think the architecture is beautiful, which isn't

1 surprising; and I think that this would be
2 appropriate for along the river. I'm just not
3 convinced that this is the right location for this
4 size -- with this size lot.

5 But, you know, certainly, if and when you
6 come back with an application, I would be
7 interested to see what you come back with.

8 So thank you, gentlemen, for being here.

9 Thank you, everyone else, for your input.

10 And that concludes our concept plan
11 review.

12 Item 5 on the agenda is the weekly
13 development report, which you all should receive.
14 It's also available if anyone wants to see the
15 status of development applications. That's
16 available online through the City's website.

17 I think, Ellen, I don't know if you know,
18 when you go to the City website to get to the
19 weekly development report, is it just through --
20 actually, I have the website right here.

21 I believe you need to look on planning.

22 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. You go to the city
23 departments under community and development, and
24 then planning division, and then there's a link on

1 the right side to the weekly development report.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And so everyone
3 wanting to keep updated on what the status is of
4 pending applications before the City could do
5 that.

6 Meeting announcements -- we have upcoming
7 meetings on August 6th, 20th, September 3rd.
8 September 3rd is after Labor Day. So the City
9 Council will be in this room on Tuesday night, and
10 we will be kicked out over across the street.

11 And we have Planning & Development
12 Committee meetings coming up as well.

13 Any change in schedule?

14 MS. JOHNSON: No. We expect to have a
15 meeting on August 6th.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

17 MS. JOHNSON: I will note that this
18 concept plan will be reviewed by the Planning &
19 Development Committee on August 12th as well.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. So
21 it will be up again that Monday in this same room.

22 Any public comment?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Comment

1 from Plan Commission members. Tom.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes, I had one. About two
3 weeks ago I had the privilege of attending a Plan
4 Commission meeting in another community north of
5 the border and one of the things that -- it was a
6 room probably about this big, well attended. They
7 were reviewing their First Street project, so
8 obviously a lot of interest.

9 And one of the things that struck me that
10 I would like to see or at least thought about
11 adding to our agenda is that early on in the
12 meeting, they actually did the Pledge of
13 Allegiance, and I thought that -- and it struck me
14 that we don't do that for our meeting. I know
15 that the City Council does.

16 And I thought, well, gee, is there maybe a
17 reason that we don't or a conflict. You know, I'm
18 not really sure. But I would like to entertain
19 the thought of adding to our agenda going forward
20 to do the Pledge of Allegiance.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
22 discussion on that?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to give
24 that some thought. I think that there are a lot

1 of reasons why one would and one wouldn't. I
2 think that's something that requires some thought
3 and discussion. I know that it's been a real
4 issue in many communities just this year.
5 St. Louis Park, Minnesota; Kansas City, Missouri.
6 I believe in St. Louis, Missouri, as well.

7 So I think a little research and
8 conversation about that as opposed to just
9 unilaterally adopting would be appropriate.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: And I did just want to
11 bring it up as, you know, a thought process. That
12 way we could talk about it as we go forward in
13 other meetings and that.

14 What surprised me, though, was that the
15 audience, and it could be a matter of the
16 audience, but the audience there were -- there was
17 no objection or anything like that. I think you
18 had more than 100 people doing the Pledge, which
19 is actually quite moving.

20 So that's why I thought it would be good
21 for us to talk about and kind of think about that.
22 So we can have it on our next meeting and talk
23 about it or something.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would say since we

1 obviously haven't published the agenda yet, can we
2 add it on for discussion at the next meeting --

3 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- after our business
5 items.

6 All right. Anything further?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
9 motion to adjourn.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
13 seconded. All in favor.

14 (Ayes heard.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The meeting of the City
18 of St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at
19 8:08 p.m.

20 (Off the record at 8:08 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 21st day of July, 2019.

My commission expires: May 16, 2020

Joanne E. Ely

Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois