

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 19, 2022**

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

Members Absent: Zachary Ewold

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 June 7, 2022 meeting of the Plan Commission

Motion was made by Ms. Wiese, seconded by Mr. Studebaker and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2022 Plan Commission meeting.

5. River East Lofts (STC 216 LLC)

Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development

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. Wiese to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain: Moad

Absent: Ewoldt

Motion carried 7-0

b. Discussion and Recommendation

It was noted there was a lot of discussion about whether or not it is proper to give away public land and if that would be a City Council issue. Ultimately, it would be City Council decision. However, if the Commission has a recommendation related to that, they can include it as part of whatever the final motion is.

A comment was made regarding the significant amount of comments made throughout these hearings around parking, and while they know there's a forthcoming parking analysis being done, the fact is, is that this property meets the criteria for parking based on the number of units and the number of parking places.

Ms. Wiese said she believes the elimination of the street and the creation of the pedestrian friendly area, along with the potential retail partner that's going in the first floor, is going to enhance the pedestrian nature of the community, as well as the likeability of this community. She thinks that's extremely important, particularly for those that live downtown and would like to see a reduction in traffic. She believes the community is a beautiful community and better viewed from a pedestrian and or bike point of view. She commended the community for voicing their concerns and getting the attention of the developer, and the developer for working in good faith and trying to create the best project possible for our city.

Mr. Gruber noted the proposal meets all the ordinances and he thanked the public for bringing up the concerns associated with parking. His concern is that although it meets the spirit of the law and all the things in the ordinances and building codes, does it add to the problems, sustain the problems or improve the parking problems that they have on the east side of the downtown area. Although he feels the building they approved will enhance the community, he asked if they are just kicking the can down the street in regards to the parking problems that have been brought up by the citizens. He asked if they were addressing that appropriately, or if it's even their responsibility to address that.

Mr. Vargulich felt it's within things they should talk about. He noted they are a recommending body and they can bring up topics and ask things of staff and elected officials for them to consider in the recommendations. The Commission is responsible for land use and how that gets done. He mentioned the topic of green space and from their perspective if it's a good idea to have it be in private hands. He said it's definitely a topic for the Commission. The proposal, as it stands right now, shows it as a separate lot which will have a number of restrictions on it. He thinks the City attorney would weigh in on that as far as whether the language protects the City's interest to keep that as open space even though when it's in private hands. Ultimately, it's the decision of our

elected officials. He wasn't sure giving away the land was an appropriate way to explain it; it's a transfer of ownership.

A question was asked if there will be bike racks. Mr. Hurst said there is an opportunity to do that.

Motion was made by Mr. Funke and seconded by Ms. Wiese to recommend approval of applications for Special Use for Planned Unit Development and PUD Preliminary Plan for River East Lofts (STC 216 LLC), subject to resolution of all staff comments.

Roll call vote:

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

Nays:

Abstain: Moad

Absent: Ewoldt

Motion carried 7-0

6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff - None

7. Weekly Development Report

8. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, August 2, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, August 16, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Wednesday, September 7, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, August 8, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, September 12, 2022 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

10. Public Comment - None

11. Adjournment at 9:08 p.m.



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

Transcript of River East Lofts

Date: July 19, 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: :
River East Lofts, Application :
For Special Use :
(PUD Amendment) :

-----x

HEARING
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, July 19, 2022
7:00 p.m. CST

Job: 412181
Pages: 1 - 91
Transcribed by: Sheila Martin

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

Planning Commission held at:

CITY OF ST. CHARLES
2 East Main Street
Chicago, Illinois 60174
(630) 377-4400

Pursuant to Notice, before Jacob Faden, Notary
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

- PETER VARGULICH
- LAUREL MOAD
- KAREN HIBEL
- JEFFREY FUNKE
- COLLEEN WIESE
- ZACHARY EWOLDT
- DAVE RISENBERG
- GARY GRUBER
- CHRIS STUDEBAKER
- RUSSELL COLBY

Transcript of River East Lofts
Conducted on July 19, 2022

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. VARGULICH: I'd like to call our St. Charles Plan Commission to order. It's 7:02 p.m. Roll call, Laurel Moad?

MS. MOAD: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Colleen Wiese?

MS. WIESE: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Jeff Funke?

MR. FUNKE: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

MS. HIBEL: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Zack Ewoldt?

MR. EWOLDT: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Dave Risenberg?

MR. RISENBERG: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Gary Gruber?

MR. GRUBER: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Chris Studebaker?

MR. STUDEBAKER: Here.

MR. VARGULICH: Could I ask everybody to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, please?

ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with

1 liberty and justice for all.

2 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. All right.

3 Presentation of the meeting minutes for June 7th
4 meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

5 UNKNOWN: So moved.

6 UNKNOWN: Second.

7 MR. VARGULICH: Moved and second, all in
8 favor?

9 SEVERAL MEMBERS: Aye.

10 MR. VARGULICH: Nays? All right. Item five
11 on the agenda is the River East Lofts project. Before
12 we start, I have a couple of things that I just want to
13 clarify as far as some things that have been brought to
14 our attention related to the planning commission and
15 the planning commission members.

16 There was a question regarding the conflict
17 of interest of Commissioner Laurel Moad due to her role
18 on the River Corridor Foundation. We have reviewed the
19 decision with our city attorney. The River Corridor
20 Foundation is a volunteer organization and Mrs. Moad
21 does not receive any economic benefit for her role.
22 Therefore, she is not required to recuse herself from
23 the proceedings on this application. However, given
24 the River Corridor Foundation's role and their

1 potential interest in the project, Commissioner Moad
2 has the option to abstain when we vote.

3 So for Ms. Gaus who brought this to us, I
4 hope that addresses your request. And just as a
5 clarification for everybody, our planning commission
6 works under certain rules and all commissioners have
7 agreed on the procedure that no member of the
8 commission shall participate in any case in which he or
9 she has a personal or [unintelligible] interest in the
10 property or action concerned or will be directly
11 affected by the decision or has -- or believes has any
12 conflict of interest as defined by Illinois Revised
13 Statutes. So our body is governed by that, and the
14 city attorney offered that option and explanation for
15 tonight. And Commissioner Moad will abstain from
16 voting but participate in all the proceedings. All
17 right.

18 Also as part of our record, obviously, there
19 was a number of documents that were included on the
20 city's website that obviously everybody could download
21 and view and prepare for our meeting tonight as did all
22 the commissioners. Since that, in the last few days,
23 we -- the city has received letters and there was an
24 email from Bob Carter dated 7/19, an email from

1 Margaret [[unintelligible] dated 7/18, a letter from
2 Janet Foster dated 7/19 and a letter from Greg Taylor
3 dated 7/19. All the commissioners have received these.
4 I'm not going to read them word for word in any way
5 into the record. But all of them have received these
6 and had the opportunity to review them prior to our
7 proceedings tonight.

8 With that, we'll begin item five. River
9 East Lofts is an application for special use in a
10 planned unit development in a PUD preliminary plan
11 filed by STC 216, LLC. The planning commission
12 reviewed and recommended approval of the zoning
13 application for this project earlier this year. The
14 developer has revised the plan for the project and has
15 submitted new applications requiring a public hearing
16 and [unintelligible].

17 Item 5A will be our public hearing. It is
18 the role of the planning commission to conduct public
19 hearings on zoning applications that are filed with the
20 city. All testimony and evidence both for and against
21 this application shall be given under oath. Our
22 procedure tonight is first the applicant will make a
23 presentation, then we will take questions from our
24 commission, followed by questions and comments from

1 members of the public and anyone else wishing to give
2 testimony tonight.

3 When the commission feels it has gathered
4 enough evidence to make the recommendation to the
5 Planning and Development Committee of the City Council,
6 it will close the public hearing. The Planning
7 Commission will then discuss the evidence gathered
8 relative to the findings of fact and vote on the
9 recommendation. The applications will then go to the
10 Planning and Development Committee of the city council
11 at its appropriately next scheduled meeting and with
12 any the documents that we produce.

13 Before we begin, anyone wishing to give
14 testimony including questions, providing any kind of
15 comments, I would ask for you to be sworn in. And so
16 anybody wishing to do that tonight, if you could please
17 rise.

18 Do you swear that the testimony you will
19 provide tonight will be the truth? Say I do.

20 VARIOUS PEOPLE: I do.

21 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you all. Again, when
22 you're speaking, please come to the lectern, state your
23 name, spell your last name, and state your address for
24 the record. If the applicant is ready, we'll ask you

1 to begin.

2 MR. HURST: Good evening, everybody. I'm
3 Curtis Hurst. I live at 700 North Third Avenue in St.
4 Charles. I'm going to move this a little bit before I
5 -- it gives a little bit of better perspective than
6 what -- what has been done. Those are all two
7 dimensional, so I think these give you a better
8 perspective of some of the things that we've been --
9 that we've done. So I wanted to get these up here
10 first.

11 UNKNOWN: Curt?

12 MR. HURST: Yes.

13 UNKNOWN: If you could, speak up more
14 directly in the microphone.

15 MR. HURST: I was talking to myself here.

16 UNKNOWN: No problem. Thank you.

17 MR. HURST: So as you stated in your opening
18 comments, we've been through this process, you know, it
19 started a while back through the concept review and so
20 forth and so on. We did have the previous application
21 -- PUD application approved -- or recommended for
22 approval. So in the interest of, you know, not
23 repeating everything, we're not going to -- I'm not
24 going to go through all the findings of fact, all of

1 those things that were in the previously applicant --
2 previous application because essentially they're all
3 exactly the same.

4 We did make a few changes that we think are
5 relevant and those are the things that I'm going to
6 highlight because they're the differences that really
7 define this application versus the previous
8 application. The first and most significant probably
9 is the removal of the fifth floor that reduced the
10 height of the building from 59 feet to four stories at
11 50 feet. And that by itself gets us under what is
12 currently allowed by the zoning -- the zoning
13 ordinance. And therefore, that has come out of the PUD
14 application because it's no longer required as a
15 variance.

16 The other thing that we did -- and a lot of
17 this is, you know, collaboration, if that's the right
18 word, between the things that we've heard over the past
19 year or so and listening intently while still keeping
20 in mind all of the things that go into a development as
21 well. And one of the things that stands out in the
22 architecture is aligning the building elevation that's
23 on Riverside Avenue with Riverside Avenue as, if you
24 recall before, it was more set back, if you will.

1 I think it's important to note that sort of
2 the history of why we were where we are -- where we
3 were and where we are now is, I think, relevant. When
4 we bought this property and we said let's, you know, do
5 this project here, you know, we were kind of, well, we
6 could manage to maintain the existing footprint of the
7 existing building. Let's use as much structure as we
8 can because sometimes that works.

9 And then the other thing that was of note
10 was the -- the ATM. So we were kind of moving our
11 architecture and planning around those things. When I
12 freed myself from that, let's tear the building down,
13 let's get rid of the be -- the ATM -- the ATM, and
14 let's see what we can do to make this a building that
15 we think fits architecturally, addresses some of the
16 comments that we've heard, and still does all of the
17 things that we think should be achieved as a
18 development of this nature.

19 And so that's really why we're where we are
20 now. A couple of things that we did in addition to --
21 and the reason -- so we -- we took off the fifth floor
22 and we moved the Riverside elevation onto Riverside.
23 We think it gives it a great presence on the street
24 there. And we were able to maintain our unit count at

1 -- well, it was 43 before and it's 42 now and that's
2 because we did a couple of things. We shifted the
3 building's south elevation a little bit further south.
4 We grew the building is the way to say it. And that
5 was at the expense, if that's the right word, or
6 exchange of the space that was previously the patio.
7 So essentially what we did was make the patio a little
8 bit smaller and push the building a little bit further
9 south on the south elevation.

10 The other thing that we did was move the
11 parking lot elevation a little bit further south.
12 That's kind of why we were able to grow the parking
13 lot. And that way we could maintain our -- our unit
14 count, but also increase our parking from what was
15 previously -- I want to read it so I get it right. We
16 had 53 stalls in our previous application. In this
17 one, we have 60 stalls. And we'll have 42 dedicated to
18 residents and 18 for public and retailer use.

19 So those will be -- those are the ones along
20 the street on 2nd Avenue. There's 36 stalls inside
21 what is the existing parking lot. I'll back up a
22 little bit more. There's 37 stalls today. And with
23 the new plan that we have here, there's 36 stalls. So
24 we have one out of that, but we made it up because

1 there were -- there's 11 existing on 2nd Avenue right
2 now and there's 18 in our plan. So that's how we get
3 to our 60. I'm sorry, 24 -- 24. Eighteen are
4 dedicated to retail and -- and use other than residents
5 is the way to say that. So we did increase our
6 parking.

7 And in addition to that, you know, some of
8 the things that we heard and listened to were, you
9 know, the way that parking was configured. While we
10 were within, you know, the ordinances, if that's the
11 right way to say it, it was a pretty tight parking lot.
12 That's why we moved the south -- that's why we moved
13 the -- the elevation of the first floor. You don't
14 really see it, it's not really an elevation but it's
15 the wall -- the north wall of the first floor.

16 We moved -- we short -- basically the way to
17 say it is we -- we made the retail space a little bit
18 smaller so we could get that space back into the
19 parking lot. And that's how we gained the spot -- the
20 spots and the width in the parking. We think those are
21 probably -- the parking and the height and moving it to
22 Riverside Avenue from an elevation perspective -- are
23 probably the three most significant things that we did
24 in our change.

1 And that's really why we -- because of those
2 changes, most particularly the 50 foot not being
3 required as a variance, that's why we chose to do a new
4 -- with staff, you know, collaboration, chose to do a
5 new PUD application rather than muddy the water with
6 what was previously -- previously existing.

7 Those are what I would consider the most
8 significant changes that we've made. There's a lot of
9 things that you can notice in some of these -- probably
10 better to show the footprint. Let me see if I can find
11 the right ones. Landscaping, we did a lot of --
12 there's the landscape planning. Maybe this perspective
13 shows it better.

14 One of the things we did in the landscaping
15 as it relates to Riverside Avenue as well and in the
16 parking lot in the back -- and I'll show you that --
17 that next. We separated the street from the sidewalk.
18 We grew the sidewalk, and we made a very generous, you
19 know, gathering spot, if that's what you want to call
20 it, by the -- the corner there where the stoplight is.
21 So that it's, you know, it's more of a, you know,
22 you're not crowded at that -- at that spot when there's
23 a lot of people waiting to cross the road or however
24 that's going to happen.

1 And then there's also a nice buffer of
2 sidewalk and there's plenty of sidewalk from an
3 ordinance standpoint on the -- what would be the east
4 side of those planters to separate the sidewalk from
5 the street. Again, another comment that we've heard,
6 and we think it's a great change and that's why it's
7 incorporated here. So you'll see that all along going
8 to -- down Riverside Avenue.

9 And then when you get up to the -- the south
10 side, one of the changes that we made -- because it was
11 kind of a, you know, confusing, if you want to call it,
12 exchange of the extension of Indiana right here. So
13 before, we had a larger patio that went over here and
14 there was a concentration of ramps that came down for
15 ADA access. But now what we've done is aligned the 2nd
16 Avenue sidewalk directly across the street from the
17 access to this, and this is now the ramp.

18 So this is now change of elevation from this
19 point to Riverside Avenue and it's a straight shot from
20 2nd Avenue down to the crosswalk at Riverside Avenue.
21 And this is now the patio which, again, the size of the
22 patio from extension to the south didn't change. What
23 changed is this elevation came down and the patio got
24 smaller. So that's really the biggest change there but

1 we think it was important to point out that we aligned
2 that 2nd Avenue sidewalk so that it's a much more
3 accessible friendly pedestrian exchange from 2nd Avenue
4 down to Riverside Avenue and to the river as well.

5 So I think those are probably the -- the
6 biggest changes that we made. The architecture is very
7 similar. We did make a couple of changes that are more
8 stylistic than anything. If you recall we had a more
9 traditional bay window on the front for all of those
10 areas that are, you know, more of a prairie style now.
11 And then we also changed the -- the cornice and the
12 treatment on the top for a much more prairie style look
13 throughout. So it's a little bit more consistent, not
14 only with the neighborhood, but also with -- with the
15 architecture overall in this specific building.

16 The materials didn't really change as far as
17 the brick goes. But what we did change was everything
18 that you see in white -- and again, it's hard to get it
19 on these architectural renderings, but to the best we
20 could, we're showing everything in white. That's going
21 to be a natural stone. So it really does give you that
22 prairie style feel, along with the -- the type of brick
23 that will be a very prairie field as well.

24 You know, we had a lot of positive feedback

1 from the historic commission so we're very comfortable
2 from the standpoint that we have an approval there as
3 well. And if you recall, the previous approval in the
4 historic commission was one abstained and that is now a
5 yes vote and that was primarily because of the fifth
6 floor. Everything else was fine. And so now we have,
7 you know, all members voting on -- on the historic
8 commission in favor.

9 So I think, you know, again, not going
10 through all of the details of the application itself
11 because they didn't change and it was approved before,
12 all the findings of fact, everything else stayed
13 essentially the same. So I'd rather just kind of open
14 it up to questions now and see if there's any comments
15 or issues that you want to talk about.

16 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. Anyone?

17 MS. HIBEL: I have a question on parking.

18 MR. HURST: Sure.

19 MS. HIBEL: Sixty spaces, 42 are dedicated?

20 MR. HURST: Forty-two are going to be
21 dedicated to the apartments, yes.

22 MS. HIBEL: Okay. So on -- can you scroll
23 to slide six? For some reason I had --

24 MR. HURST: Yeah.

Transcript of River East Lofts
Conducted on July 19, 2022

18

1 MS. HIBEL: -- 36.

2 MR. HURST: What's that?

3 MS. HIBEL: Page six, where --

4 MR. HURST: [unintelligible]?

5 MS. HIBEL: Yeah, it just showed all the
6 spots, so I just --

7 MR. HURST: You want to show the spots?

8 MS. HIBEL: Yeah.

9 MR. HURST: Yeah. That one? Okay.

10 MS. HIBEL: On the six. They were numbered
11 on at least page six.

12 MR. HURST: Keep going? I can't read very
13 well. Keep going?

14 MS. HIBEL: Yep, one more.

15 MR. HURST: I can't see that far.

16 MS. HIBEL: Right there. So in the main lot
17 there's 36, correct?

18 MR. HURST: There's 36, yes.

19 MS. HIBEL: And there there will be six more
20 on -- around the corner?

21 MR. HURST: That's correct, yes. Six more
22 of these on this front area right here will be
23 dedicated to residents.

24 MS. HIBEL: So there will be signage saying

1 dedicated or?

2 MR. HURST: Dedicated, yes.

3 MS. HIBEL: It will. Okay. And then the
4 remaining of it is public for the retail or --

5 MR. HURST: That's correct. The 18 spots
6 that are available, which was currently 11, that's
7 correct.

8 MS. HIBEL: Okay. So no signage, they'll
9 just be open?

10 MR. HURST: You know, we have to explore how
11 that goes. You know, I think at -- at the most, what
12 we would want to do is control the opportunity for a
13 retailer to be successful in parking as much as
14 residences would. And so during the day, the best
15 opportunity is to restrict the parking for the retailer
16 so that they can use those.

17 And then after hours, which that's done in
18 other areas, it's done on city parking, you know,
19 public parking throughout the city. They have
20 restrictions for loading zones, they have restrictions
21 for not parking during certain business hours so that
22 those businesses around there have the availability of
23 that parking. And when those buildings are not -- when
24 those businesses are not open, then it's more of a, you

1 know, open format for parking. And that's probably
2 pretty much where we'll land on this.

3 MS. HIBEL: All right. So -- okay. Okay.
4 Thanks.

5 MR. FUNKE: Hi. First of all I just want to
6 say thank you for making, you know, just listening to
7 us and making the changes that you did. And, you know,
8 you didn't have to come back, you were already
9 approved, and this is a great difference. I mean, I
10 like the project, I -- I like what you guys have done,
11 and contextually adhering to the river and -- and the
12 pedestrian feel around the building, I think is great.

13 So I really appreciate that and thank you
14 for spending the time and I know, you know, the money
15 too to make these changes. So it's a big difference.
16 Couple of suggestions, whether you guys do them or not,
17 I mean, you know, I like the project so just a couple
18 of things architecturally.

19 MR. HURST: Uh-huh.

20 MR. FUNKE: I think the pedestrian
21 connection from Indiana crossing over 2nd Avenue, I
22 think you have parking right now. It would be great if
23 you can make that, you know, take -- take a couple of
24 spots out of there and make it a plaza or just, you

1 know, pedestrian zone to where, you know, if we're
2 coming, you know, I walk down -- I walk down Indiana
3 all the time to connect to the city and it would be
4 great just to see the pedestrians in that plaza. I
5 mean, that -- that Plaza has a much better feel and,
6 you know, it'd be nice if I didn't see cars blocking
7 the, you know, the cafe, the restaurant or tables,
8 whatever you're going to have in the plaza. So just a
9 suggestion.

10 MR. HURST: So deleting a couple of spots
11 there on the north or the east side of the plaza so
12 that --

13 MR. FUNKE: Yeah, that blue car right there
14 and that accessible space. I mean, just --

15 MR. HURST: Right here.

16 MR. FUNKE: -- make the visual -- the visual
17 connection so if there is, you know, yeah, you know, it
18 would be great, I mean.

19 MR. HURST: Right.

20 MR. FUNKE: The next comment I would have is
21 you have a couple of blank walls on the sides on the
22 first floor. I mean, just some sort of articulation,
23 whether it's a different colored brick, you know,
24 darker color to emulate glass or even maybe vertical

1 green walls in that area, lighting of some sort just to
2 -- to break it up so it doesn't look like -- on both
3 the west and the east walls. I'm noticing, you know, a
4 couple flat walls and some more articulation would be
5 great.

6 MR. HURST: So --

7 MR. FUNKE: I love what you did with the
8 side and what you did with the articulation on -- on
9 the first level. I -- I think it's a -- it's a great
10 direction and a great move.

11 MR. HURST: So one of the -- I mean, and I'm
12 glad you pointed it out because it's somewhat
13 intentional. You know, again, you have to, you know,
14 there -- what's behind there are the cars, so we have
15 to kind of be sensitive to not having, you know, that
16 exposed as much as we can. I don't disagree with your
17 comment. And what we really plan on doing there is it
18 becomes a canvas.

19 MR. FUNKE: I'm sorry?

20 MR. HURST: It becomes a canvas for us to
21 put art work which is a theme throughout the city. And
22 so it was very intentional, we tried to do that so that
23 we had that opportunity to do that. And so whether
24 it's something that's permanent there or, you know,

1 rotating or whatever, we feel like it's a great
2 opportunity to have, you know, showcase some, you know,
3 different types of things so it changes and it doesn't
4 become stagnant.

5 MR. FUNKE: Yeah, I love it. And, you know,
6 think about when you're working on the construction
7 drawings, the lighting too. Lighting is key, you know,
8 I mean, if you can -- you can create some great
9 lighting effects in this building and, you know, you're
10 on a prominent corner and I think this is really going
11 to create a nice gateway to the city.

12 MR. HURST: And we agree with that
13 wholeheartedly. We -- we see a lot of the buildings of
14 -- the municipal building being one of them -- that
15 just looks spectacular because of the lighting and the
16 building itself and the architecture, so that will be
17 definitely focused.

18 MR. FUNKE: Okay. And the last thing is
19 really is the balconies on the south end. I mean, if
20 they -- they -- they look like they're added, right?
21 So they're just plastered onto the building. You know,
22 it would be great, you have these great masonry piers
23 and, you know, I mean, you can create a loja on that
24 south end, you know, a brick loja that -- that kind of

1 emulates what you have on the railings on the first
2 floor and stuff. But maybe do the same thing instead
3 of doing, you know, angle. It looks like you've got
4 steel balconies on that south end.

5 MR. HURST: Right.

6 MR. FUNKE: You know, just something a
7 little bit more decorative or more solid that -- that
8 adheres to -- you've got that -- that rhythm of those
9 piers, the brick piers going throughout the building.
10 Maybe wrap it around -- wrap it around and create a
11 loja under here. A loja would be great and --

12 MR. HURST: I should write that down.

13 MR. FUNKE: Even on the top floor, right?

14 MR. HURST: Yeah.

15 MR. FUNKE: You know, I know a lot of
16 residents, they like to be covered, you know, they like
17 to sit out if it's raining or something. But if you
18 had that loja on the top floor that would be awesome
19 space. So overall it really looks great. And thank
20 you for making the changes and really appreciate you
21 coming back.

22 MR. HURST: Thank you.

23 MR. VARGULICH: Any other comments,
24 questions from our -- from our side?

1 MS. MOAD: I -- I guess I do have one.
2 First of all, thank you for listening to the feedback
3 at the last meeting and adjusting the building
4 footprint. I -- I -- I think that the work that you've
5 done on Riverside is beautiful in terms of the
6 landscaping and the -- the accessibility from the
7 walking perspective.

8 What I would like to ask is that you take
9 another look at how you're landscaping 2nd Avenue where
10 the tree -- where you have three trees in small
11 planters, if you will. I think they're -- they're pear
12 trees based on the plan. It seems somewhat inadequate
13 for the amount of parking that we have back there. And
14 then additionally, at the trash receptacles in the
15 parking lot, I'd like to ensure that we have adequate
16 foliage on 2nd Avenue to create a barrier --

17 MR. HURST: Yeah.

18 MS. MOAD: -- from 2nd Avenue.

19 MR. HURST: I apologize because this is not
20 in color and that it is, you know, three basic trees
21 here. And, you know, you have some limitations on
22 what's going to survive. But we did really pay
23 attention to these areas. This is the trash enclosure.
24 These areas are green space, there's a wrought iron

1 fence along this path with a two foot buffer. So there
2 is what -- it's -- it's a little hard to see here, but
3 when you get it, you know, in more of a three
4 dimensional plan, I think you'll -- we did address that
5 and we were very concerned about that and making sure
6 that that had a significant impact as well on the
7 landscaping. So we'll definitely make sure that that's
8 a focus of this.

9 MS. MOAD: Thank you.

10 MR. HURST: I have a few things that I want
11 to ask you about first. You have some bike storage in
12 the residential lobby it looked like. At least on the
13 architectural plans, it looked like there was some bike
14 storage. But I was just wondering if there were some
15 other areas, maybe kind of at the north west corner in
16 the parking, there's kind of like some dead space
17 inside the building north of those two spots. Maybe
18 that could be some additional bike storage.

19 MR. HURST: Yeah, I mean, those are -- we're
20 going to start working through those details as we kind
21 of move through it and that's definitely one of the
22 things that we considered was, you know, having the
23 opportunity here for, whether it's residents or
24 whatever to have, whether it's bike storage or bike

1 rentals, we may have availability of bikes down there
2 for those that don't have a bike. I mean, there's lots
3 of things, as you know, to being competitive in a
4 marketplace for -- for rentals, you want to try and be
5 as amenity rich as you can. And that's definitely one
6 of those things that we're going to be looking at in
7 addition to Zoom spaces, as they call them now. You
8 know, all of the things that we can try and do to be
9 amenity rich so that we can really, you know, be
10 successful as a -- as a rental unit.

11 MR. VARGULICH: And yeah, because there's
12 some bike like rentals that are available now
13 throughout the -- starting on the north and heading
14 north to Elkin. We'll be addressing bike paths and
15 things like that and then so there's potential to tie
16 into that as a supplier or as a vendor that then
17 becomes an opportunity for your residents to have if
18 they don't or if they're friend is coming to town they
19 can use that or something like that.

20 MR. HURST: Yes.

21 MR. VARGULICH: It would be great.

22 MR. HURST: And I think it's not a, you
23 know, a secret of what the first floor retail is going
24 to be. I'm always hesitant to be out there with it,

1 you know, but you know what that's going to be and it's
2 going to have a very robust program of interacting with
3 the community, specifically, you know, the things that
4 you mentioned. Because, in fact, now there's -- I
5 think it was formed recently so maybe it's public,
6 maybe it's not, but there's, you know, a real effort
7 from the city's standpoint to start thinking about, you
8 know, pedestrian and bicycle friendliness as it relates
9 to the communities and the bike paths that get us, you
10 know, in between here and the surrounding community.
11 So it's definitely a focus of what we'll be doing.

12 MR. VARGULICH: And I want to say that
13 there's a lot of improvements, as already said, related
14 to pedestrian level of service along Riverside and even
15 along 2nd. And I probably would ask that you consider
16 a couple additional or a couple of things to kind of
17 tweak some of that.

18 I think that there's the planting at the
19 corner of Illinois and Riverside. And it would be nice
20 -- because it looks like it's a curved or a raised
21 planter, if that could maybe not have turf. There's
22 some sod identified in the landscape plan and it'd be
23 nice if maybe that was planted out like all -- pretty
24 much all the other planters that are along Riverside

1 instead of having a little bit of sod because it looks
2 like it's a raised curved planter.

3 MR. HURST: Are you -- this is where you're
4 talking about?

5 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, right there.

6 MR. HURST: Right.

7 MR. VARGULICH: And so there's a tree with
8 some plantings, but then it also identifies turf. It
9 seems kind of awkward given that location and from a
10 maintenance standpoint.

11 MR. HURST: [unintelligible].

12 MR. VARGULICH: You know, if you could just
13 plant it out like the rest of it, I think that would be
14 a benefit.

15 MR. HURST: Yeah, I think the way that it
16 gets addressed, and again, these are, you know, our
17 high level rent rates and, you know, we're -- you start
18 to, you know, get into the planning stages once we get
19 past this and just start focusing on practicality and
20 how it's going to, you know, interact. So those are
21 definitely things that, you know, we'll be looking at
22 very closely.

23 MR. VARGULICH: Okay.

24 MR. HURST: They are -- they are easier to

1 maintain, there's no doubt about it.

2 MR. VARGULICH: Right, especially when you
3 start flushing. You can just kick them over, otherwise
4 you have to lift them over and all that.

5 MR. HURST: Yeah, don't disagree.

6 MR. VARGULICH: I think that the planters
7 along Riverside north of the stairs and the ramp that
8 bring you down from the -- from the retail level, I
9 think there's an opportunity to increase the depth of
10 those off the curb because you kind of have a six or
11 seven foot sidewalk that's running along Riverside
12 right now in front of the retail portion, right?

13 MR. HURST: Right.

14 MR. VARGULICH: Because you've got a ramp,
15 you've got the stairs, and then you have kind of a
16 raised level as far as getting into the retail just
17 because of the finished floor elevation, flood things,
18 and all of those technical issues. But these four
19 planters with the --

20 MR. HURST: These right here?

21 MR. VARGULICH: No, with the shade trees in
22 them.

23 MR. HURST: These down here?

24 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah.

1 MR. HURST: Okay.

2 MR. VARGULICH: You've got a lot of
3 sidewalks there and I think that it might be nice if
4 there was more planting versus sidewalk from an
5 experience standpoint, and -- because you're not, I
6 mean, if we had retail where that parking was, that
7 might be a different conversation because you have
8 people coming and going inside the building. But right
9 there, you're just kind of moving parallel to Riverside
10 Avenue headed towards Illinois or away from Illinois
11 Avenue. And I think that there's some additional width
12 that could be added that would certainly benefit those
13 trees in the long run. And so if we could, you know,
14 look at increasing the width there --

15 MR. HURST: Well, it was -- it was
16 purposeful, you know, at this stage, to be generous in
17 the -- in the sidewalk for -- there will be a lot of
18 activity here, there will be a lot of people there. We
19 want to make sure we have a generous landscaping
20 opportunity, but there will be a lot of traffic here,
21 foot traffic, bicycle traffic coming and going.

22 But we also envision that not only be just
23 for pedestrians, you know, passing through, but the
24 opportunity to put some cafe tables out there, have a

1 cup of coffee, those types of things because that will
2 be very interconnected to what's happening in the
3 retail space as well. So we want to make sure we have
4 enough space to do all of those things.

5 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. Fair enough.

6 MR. HURST: And -- and definitely make sure
7 that, you know, the landscaping has the opportunity to
8 survive as well.

9 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, I think there's a huge
10 difference in how trees perform --

11 MR. HURST: Oh, yes.

12 MR. VARGULICH: -- whether you're in St.
13 Charles, East Chicago, Elmhurst or Lake Forest. It
14 doesn't matter. When they're in a planter that they
15 have shared root zones and adequate ability to develop
16 the root zone correctly, there's a huge difference in
17 how they grow as well as their long-term health.

18 And so increasing those even more, because
19 they look like they're maybe like five feet wide or so,
20 six feet wide right now, if we could increase those a
21 few more feet, those are all things that add to the
22 longevity of those trees. I had a similar thought that
23 Jeff covered related to that facade and those patches,
24 if you will, of seemingly just lots of brick, nothing

1 on the brick.

2 MR. HURST: Sure, yeah.

3 MR. VARGULICH: But it's great to hear that
4 you're looking at the opportunity for art and lighting
5 those, you know, we'll say that down -- down lighting
6 those so that you also get some light at the, you know,
7 it hits street level, but then also on the facade --

8 MR. HURST: Absolutely.

9 MR. VARGULICH: -- would be an excellent
10 addition there and just add to the visual diversity as
11 people walk along the street. And that can be a
12 permanent program or a rotating program of some kind.
13 Again, I think those are all things that help the
14 downtown so I'm very excited about that. On 2nd
15 Avenue, we'll request suggestions. If at the corner of
16 2nd and Illinois, if you could add a tree to the
17 planter that's in the parkway --

18 MR. HURST: So in this --

19 MR. VARGULICH: -- so it'll kind of be like
20 two trees at the corner --

21 MR. HURST: In this one right here?

22 MR. VARGULICH: -- instead of just one,
23 yeah.

24 MR. HURST: In this one right here, right?

1 MR. VARGULICH: Uh-huh. And that the
2 planter that's directly across from the refuse
3 enclosure, that that be also planted out instead of
4 having sod there because I think that would help in
5 kind of visually taking away from the enclosure. I
6 understand you'll probably have some sort of fence or
7 wall treatment for -- for those -- for the containers
8 there, but I think that adding more planting from the
9 sidewalk to the curb would be better than less
10 planting.

11 MR. HURST: Than sod right here, yeah.

12 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah.

13 MR. HURST: In this area right here, yeah.

14 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, the one tree is fine,
15 I think there's nothing wrong with that.

16 MR. HURST: Yeah.

17 MR. VARGULICH: But I would suggest those
18 couple of little changes in that area.

19 MR. HURST: Sure.

20 MR. VARGULICH: Probably my concern would
21 be, that Laurel has kind of touched on, is -- is those
22 three pear trees that are in those little triangular,
23 if you will, cut outs. They look like they're kind of
24 like half of a five by five and I'm just not really

1 sure you can plant a tree in half of a five by five cut
2 out. And then even if you could plant it, I'd be very
3 surprised of its success beyond the first year. So I
4 would ask that you consider doing those in a five by
5 five tree rake that's flush with the sidewalk. Okay?
6 And that you also add around that tree break a product
7 called Silva Cell which is -- which would go beneath
8 the pavement in just a four foot wide band that would
9 go around the five by five break. And basically what
10 it does is add root zone for the trees to grow
11 underneath the pavement.

12 MR. HURST: Yeah, those are all great
13 suggestions and --

14 MR. VARGULICH: That's all, understanding
15 everything needs more detail --

16 MR. HURST: Yeah, absolutely.

17 MR. VARGULICH: -- I just think that
18 whatever those trees are, they -- they need more space.

19 MR. HURST: And we're going to have an
20 interest -- we're going to have an interest in, you
21 know, making sure that the long-term survivability is
22 something that's not problematic for us.

23 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, replacing them every
24 couple of years is helpful.

1 MR. HURST: So those are going to be things
2 -- and those are going to be the details we'll work out
3 as we go through it.

4 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah.

5 MR. HURST: These are, you know, engineer
6 and architects and developers throwing it in there and,
7 you know, we're trying to, you know, so but as we work
8 through the detail, we'll definitely be doing those
9 types of things.

10 MR. VARGULICH: Okay. And I think that the
11 -- the pear trees, while they have a lot of general
12 popularity, on the Urban Forestry Bureau, they're
13 probably getting close to being classified as the bane
14 of the urban forestry world. They're becoming very
15 invasive because of how easily they spread, and then
16 they're having impacts on woodland areas.

17 It doesn't seem like a big deal, but I know
18 that there's a lot of communities that don't allow the
19 planting of them anymore for that reason. So I think
20 that there's definitely some other trees that could be
21 done -- used that have more of a narrow profile, which
22 is, I think, what you were looking for there.

23 MR. HURST: Yeah, I mean, those are, you
24 know, I'm sure I'll get schooled by a landscaper

1 because those are me saying let's put a Bradford pear
2 there because it's compact, you know, it's not a honey
3 locust where it's just invasive and just, you know, but
4 as we --

5 MR. VARGULICH: Right, in proximity to the
6 building it's a challenge.

7 MR. HURST: Yeah, and as we go through that
8 we'll kind of figure out what that best shape is and
9 what that best, you know, tree is for an urban
10 environment.

11 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, because I think
12 there's things like corn bean, narrow sweet gums, or
13 quaking aspens there's narrow varieties that maybe only
14 grow 15 and 15 feet wide --

15 MR. HURST: Right.

16 MR. VARGULICH: -- and maybe 35 feet high or
17 so. So I think those will -- and those will be better
18 long term trees.

19 MR. HURST: Yeah.

20 MR. VARGULICH: But still achieve that kind
21 of narrow profile you have.

22 MR. HURST: Right.

23 MR. VARGULICH: So I would propose for
24 consideration.

1 MR. HURST: Sure.

2 MR. VARGULICH: I think that depending on
3 how the parking count works out and what everybody else
4 is comfortable with, Jeff had asked -- suggested to
5 maybe take out a couple of spaces directly kind of east
6 of your patio, the upper patio and lower patio, that's
7 on the south side of the building. I think that could
8 be okay and I think that there's a good plus to that
9 depending on how that works out. I think another
10 opportunity would be to --

11 MR. HURST: I think -- just to kind of touch
12 on that. I mean, you know, we -- we intentionally put
13 the handicap spot there so we could have the -- the
14 open space next to it is the sidewalk as it were. But,
15 you know, an option would be to just move the other
16 handicap spaces down to that area and they become less
17 populated. And so it would keep it open X percent of
18 the time. I don't know what X percent is.

19 But we all know ADA parking spots are
20 infrequently used as a way to save. So there might be
21 a way to still manage, you know, keeping the parking as
22 high as we can but, you know, making sure that we have
23 adequate parking for ADA and residents and public and
24 the retailer and then still opening that space up for

1 [unintelligible].

2 MR. VARGULICH: And maybe another way to
3 accomplish some of the thoughts that Jeff had would be
4 to shorten the -- the lower planter, or the -- I'm
5 sorry, the lower patio with maybe like a five foot wide
6 planter. So right now it looks like you have a wall
7 that parallels 2nd and have a railing on top of that
8 wall because of the grade change of about three feet or
9 so.

10 And so what I would look at is maybe adding
11 a planter there along -- parallel along the lower
12 patio, say five feet wide, that you could put shrubs
13 and perennials in. So that, again, that view, you
14 know, you know, if there are no cars there, the view is
15 of planting and the fence is behind the planter.
16 Understanding that your upper patio has those brick
17 piers spaced along the outside.

18 MR. HURST: This I believe -- this I believe
19 on this eastern side -- and I'm not sure if we've got
20 that detail worked out or not because this is -- this
21 patio here is at the same elevation as the sidewalk.
22 That's our ADA access from the back area here from this
23 entrance to the -- to the building. So that is at the
24 same top floor foundation. This one is dropped down

1 two or three feet, so there's probably an opportunity
2 -- and I think it's a railing at this point but there's
3 probably an opportunity to add something there from a
4 visual standpoint that's a little bit more than a
5 railing.

6 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, you just push the
7 railing, if you will, towards the river five feet and
8 then plant in front of that.

9 MR. HURST: Sure.

10 MR. VARGULICH: So you just use -- you will
11 lose a little space in the lower patio.

12 MR. HURST: Sure.

13 MR. VARGULICH: Not a lot but, you know,
14 five feet.

15 MR. HURST: It's a generous patio so we've
16 got some opportunity.

17 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, because I think you've
18 got room. When I looked at the grading plan it looked
19 like about at that corner between the north and south
20 curb the upper and lower patio looked like three, three
21 and a half feet.

22 MR. HURST: That's about right.

23 MR. VARGULICH: So you know, that could be
24 an opportunity to do something there. I -- I think

1 there was a staff comment related to extending the
2 sidewalk along riverside down to the reconfigured 2nd
3 Avenue intersection.

4 MR. HURST: Yeah, that -- we actually talked
5 about that and didn't make it into this iteration. But
6 along here, you know, the -- the patio or the sidewalk
7 will extend along Riverside. This will get
8 reconfigured a little bit so that it can pass in front
9 of it. And then there's an opportunity to make the
10 connection across the street as well with a crosswalk
11 and this patio even -- or I'm sorry, this sidewalk.
12 And now you're starting to connect to Hazelton, I
13 think is it, Hazelton and Ohio.

14 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah.

15 MR. HURST: So now that -- now that sidewalk
16 has got connectivity all the way down Riverside Avenue.
17 And we talked about that, it just didn't make it in
18 this plan. So we definitely have that in focus.

19 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, I would think that
20 that would be kind of -- if you're walking along
21 Riverside on the east side and you're headed north into
22 town, you know, you get to that kind of division point
23 that I can either continue up 2nd or walk down
24 Riverside towards Illinois.

1 MR. HURST: Correct, definitely.

2 MR. VARGULICH: Right now you're kind of be
3 forced to walk up, over, and jog around.

4 MR. HURST: Yeah. Right.

5 MR. VARGULICH: And I think it'd be just
6 nice if we just continued down, you know, if there was
7 a, you know, kind of parkway area five or six feet.
8 You could have some shade trees along there to kind of
9 keep that street feel walking and --

10 MR. HURST: Definitely.

11 MR. VARGULICH: -- that level of service
12 there. And I'm not sure what the city has in mind
13 ultimately for that corner, if you will. But I would
14 extend the sidewalk that you have along the back
15 parking so that all that meets up. And then the city
16 can kind of figure that out, say, with art or signage
17 or whatever they want to do. But I think that was all.

18 MR. HURST: Those are all good suggestions,
19 and we're certainly open to all the [crosstalk].

20 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, and I think there's
21 some trees that can be added there. Again, that could
22 kind of show that off. I noticed in the engineering
23 drawings there was one tree along 2nd Avenue they're
24 showing for removal and a few trees along Indiana. I'm

1 assuming that has to do with infrastructure
2 improvements of some kind.

3 MR. HURST: Yeah, by the time we get done
4 going through all of that. So it's just, I think,
5 easier to replace those.

6 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, so I think those will
7 just -- will make their way back into the landscape
8 plan as far as placements --

9 MR. HURST: Right.

10 MR. VARGULICH: -- you know, once all that
11 infrastructure work is completed. So I think that
12 would be more positive. I think the -- the -- the
13 plant list was -- overall was fine from my perspective,
14 other than let's say on the trees, the pears, which
15 we've already talked about on 2nd. I think that the --
16 the design is showing a lot of small shrubs, which are
17 great.

18 But I think the plant list isn't really
19 coinciding with that. They have dogwoods, cotoneaster,
20 and North Korean lilac, all of which grow like six to
21 eight feet, which to me doesn't sound like a small
22 shrub. So I think that there should be -- maybe those
23 should be removed because I don't think you really need
24 them in the plant list and certainly from a design

1 standpoint, you're not really using them.

2 And some additional lower smaller shrubs be
3 in there because really. The only one you have in
4 there right now is the spirea, but I think that can be
5 improved. And I think that all those -- the -- the
6 grasses and the perennials that all things that, you
7 know, are durable, can be -- the spacing could be
8 tightened up from 18 inches to 12 inches in some of
9 them. But overall, I think that those are some --

10 MR. HURST: Those are all great suggestions
11 and I'll -- and now that we've got them in the, you
12 know, we'll just take this section of the comments and
13 give them to the arch -- landscape architect and start
14 collaborating with him and see what works and what's
15 practical and so we can start moving through those.
16 But yeah, some of those things we've already talked
17 about. For instance, the sidewalk that connects here
18 and goes across this new section as well. And then you
19 can see it's already got the crosswalk in what would be
20 -- that's Ohio connecting to Hazel -- Hazeltown Park so
21 that that connectivity keeps going.

22 MR. VARGULICH: Right. We already have the
23 crosswalk, you know, across Riverside Drive aligning --
24 aligning with the Piano Factory Bridge --

1 MR. HURST: Right.

2 MR. VARGULICH: -- pedestrian bridge. So if
3 we could, you know, extend those walks along Riverside
4 now so that those things are all connected in logical
5 places where people should cross.

6 MR. HURST: Right.

7 MR. VARGULICH: As pedestrians, we tend to
8 cross wherever we think is appropriate.

9 MR. HURST: And it's -- it's mutually in
10 everybody's best interest to make as much connectivity
11 as we can down here.

12 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, I think those would be
13 all positive things. I appreciate some of the cycling
14 changes that you've made. None of those are simple and
15 how you're incorporating issues related to stormwater
16 management --

17 MR. HURST: Right.

18 MR. VARGULICH: -- so the water can flow
19 into the parking area and back out in the worst case
20 scenarios --

21 MR. HURST: Right.

22 MR. VARGULICH: -- underneath your elevated
23 walkways and stuff. So -- so will there be grills or
24 something to kind of visually hide those areas so they

1 don't look like little caves.

2 MR. HURST: Yeah, there will be powder
3 coated metal grills that have sort of a louvered effect
4 on them, if you will.

5 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah.

6 MR. HURST: And they'll be removable so we
7 can clean when we need to. They'll have -- because we
8 actually have those right now. If you look at
9 [unintelligible] we have those louvers, very similar
10 look. There's, you know, there's some screening on the
11 back to keep the animals and, you know, it won't keep
12 insects out, but it'll keep certain things out and that
13 way -- but we do want to make them so that there's a
14 maintenance schedule that we can keep in there, so they
15 don't get, you know, debris that, you know, smells,
16 doesn't look good, do all this stuff, absolutely.

17 MR. VARGULICH: Understood. I was going to
18 say, yeah, because you'll also have -- looked like from
19 the perspectives you also have those on your upper
20 patio?

21 MR. HURST: That's correct, yes.

22 MR. VARGULICH: Also some water concerns.

23 MR. HURST: Underneath, yeah. That's all
24 same -- part of the same system.

1 MR. VARGULICH: Same -- same stormwater
2 system.

3 MR. HURST: That's correct, yes.

4 MR. VARGULICH: Excellent. Thank you.
5 Anybody else? I think what we'd like to do at this
6 point is open it up to members of the public who would
7 like to speak or ask questions. So please come up.

8 MR. RASMUSSEN: Hi, Bob Rasmussen, 10
9 Illinois Street, Unit 5C. I'm actually very excited to
10 be here tonight, actually. When I looked at this
11 proposal about ten days ago I think I saw it and I have
12 to say hats off to some comments that Peter and Jeff
13 have made. In the last meeting that I sat in at, I was
14 very disappointed to leave when the vote came up and
15 kind of rubber stamped the project forward that I
16 didn't think was a great project.

17 Tonight, I have to commend Mr. Hurst for
18 what he's done. I think this is tremendous. I think
19 the changes that have been made make this project
20 something that we can all be proud of. We've got a
21 four story building that fits with the transitional
22 nature of the neighborhood next door and what was in
23 the comprehensive plan to happen here. The parking lot
24 where the BMO Harris, it's a huge victory to get rid of

1 that -- that drive through. The parking lot now meets
2 all of our ordinances for the distances between the
3 parking and the driveway. We can now count this in the
4 SSA as properly fitting into the ordinance.

5 The couple of -- and -- and the architecture
6 on it with -- with Peter's comment to run that along
7 Riverside made all the difference in the world. I
8 think it really, really does the job on this corner. I
9 live on the fifth floor across the river. I sit out
10 there every single night and look at the site. When I
11 saw this drawing, I believe this is the right building
12 for this site. And I think the Hursts have done a
13 tremendous job here.

14 My only comments, Jeff and Peter already
15 talked about this possibility of a span grass in the --
16 in the garage, but the artwork I think is even better.
17 So we've got a lot of things going on there. My last
18 comment on the parking, there's two issues here.

19 Opening up that sidewalk coming down Indiana
20 is a huge victory for that neighborhood. You're going
21 to walk down that street, as Jeffrey does, as I do, my
22 offices are right there, and you're going to see the
23 river, you're going to see the sidewalk, you're going
24 to have the ability to get there. I think it's a huge

1 difference from the previous plan and it's very
2 neighborhood friendly, and it does help the city of St.
3 Charles make this site compatible with everything else
4 we have.

5 The question I have on the triangular
6 portion, and it's -- it's not about the development
7 right now and it's not about the ownership right now.
8 Someday this property will probably be sold. We've
9 sold a lot of our properties in town. I think in order
10 to continue to have that access in perpetuity with that
11 sidewalk and that park area so that the public can be
12 there, I would -- I would question whether the city
13 maybe puts an easement on it in perpetuity to keep that
14 ability, or just simply continue to own that property
15 in this exact format that Mr. Hurst wants to develop.

16 And I think that's important to us in St.
17 Charles so that we can -- can continue to use that
18 property forever and never have a concern that somebody
19 else will buy this property and maybe change something
20 or not allow the pedestrians to walk through there
21 because it is private, or maybe not allow those last
22 nine parking stalls to be used by the public which has
23 been a concern of the neighborhood because there is a
24 parking issue here.

1 So I think we should look at that from a
2 city standpoint and make the right decision on whether
3 that ownership should change or whether there should be
4 an easement there so that we can continue to use that
5 property forever. And I think that's -- that's an
6 important thing.

7 And then the last comment I have is we do
8 meet the -- the ordinance in the SSA with the parking
9 that Mr. Hurst has put forward here. And this is not
10 Mr. Hurst's responsibility at this point. Those of us
11 who live downtown and own property downtown understand
12 the cost in our tax bill of this SSA, it's a lot of
13 money. That SSA needs to work and move forward to
14 solve our parking problem on the east side of town.

15 We're going to lose the 48 stalls that are
16 currently open for the public, and they are only open
17 because the -- the lot is vacant, but we're going to
18 lose those. And they are full every Thursday, Friday,
19 Saturday night. They just are. People circle and
20 circle and circle. So we know we've got a parking
21 issue.

22 Somebody on this commission, somebody at
23 city council made the comment directly to me, should we
24 stop development and wait for parking? Or should we

1 not develop while we wait for parking? And my answer
2 was -- was yes. I'm not -- I'm not saying wait for the
3 parking, but ensure we have a solution to the parking.
4 Whether that solution is 24 or 48 or 60 months from
5 now, we can work with that. But you cannot ever
6 develop a property if you don't have a long-term
7 solution for parking.

8 That's not Mr. Hurst's concern here, that's
9 our city's concern. So this commission, I think, will
10 -- will probably see other things come forward that we
11 need to look at and I think I'll have these same
12 comments at the council that we need to look at the
13 east side of town.

14 We put a significant amount of pressure now
15 on the west side of town and the parking garages as I
16 watch people who do actually walk across the bridges to
17 get to that parking. And then I go look and I see that
18 the fifth floor for the first time ever this summer is
19 full. That's because of the east side pressure. None
20 of that west side parking was designed to help
21 facilitate the east side and -- and staff knows that,
22 and I think we can address that down the road.

23 So I don't say don't develop. I do say have
24 a plan so that we can develop and that really is what

1 the comments should -- should be. But again, I think
2 the comments that were made here that I think made a
3 significant difference and made a project that our town
4 can be proud of. And Mr. Hurst has just done a
5 tremendous job in the revamp of the project. I think
6 it'll be a great success, thank you.

7 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. Please.

8 MS. FOSTER: My name is Janet Foster and I
9 live at 1120 South -- I don't use it for mailing, but I
10 think it's 1120 South 3rd Street in St. Charles. But
11 more significantly is that I own the property at 203
12 Illinois Avenue and operate the business Wilson Travel
13 and Cruise that occupies that building. So that's part
14 of my concern. The other part, of course, is just as a
15 citizen of St. Charles.

16 And I too would like to commend Frontier for
17 what they've done, tremendous change. The -- obviously
18 the positive part in that they would do that and bring
19 it back to the commission is really wonderful and
20 speaks largely to the character, I think, of that
21 company.

22 Where -- and I don't want to go through
23 everything all over again. And I especially appreciate
24 what you've said about the parking because all of that

1 is absolutely true and needs to be dealt with. So my
2 only concern now, because I think the project works the
3 way it is, and I certainly have never been not in favor
4 of the project. It's been about what the project is
5 and how it goes forward.

6 My concern is still about the parking for
7 the project itself. It is not the developer's
8 responsibility, as been said, to fix the parking
9 situation that we currently have. It is the
10 developer's responsibility, though, to furnish enough
11 parking for that development. And I don't really
12 believe that that has been accomplished with this plan.

13 With the number of units and the number of
14 cars those units will generate, I don't believe there's
15 enough parking spaces. If you -- now the -- the
16 project has a lot more two bedroom units which to my
17 thinking and past time with real estate dealings and so
18 forth is that if you have a two bedroom unit, you most
19 likely are going to have two cars.

20 And so if we now have switch to more
21 [inaudible], that means more cars. And if we
22 conservatively calculate and say just one car in those
23 12 one-car unit -- or one bedroom units, and two cars
24 for the 30 two bedroom units, that's 72 cars. Where

1 are there 72 parking places? And take ten percent off
2 of that for the normal, you know, you can't fill every
3 unit every day, and you still are short parking places.
4 And that's if every parking place were to be dedicated
5 to those people that are living there.

6 So I see a great disparity there and it
7 doesn't account for any retail parking and if you take
8 all of those for the people that live there, or for any
9 other kind of parking. Maybe they'll have a guest,
10 there's another car or two. So when the tenants all
11 come home from work, their parking places will likely
12 be already filled just by the nature of how parking is
13 working in the neighborhood.

14 The patrons of area restaurants, bars,
15 they're going to be in those parking places and it's
16 going to leave the tenants searching because they've
17 got more cars than they have assigned spaces. So they
18 have to park somewhere and they're going to park
19 somewhere, and I don't know where they're supposed to
20 park.

21 Currently, my lot is full on nights and
22 weekends and none of the cars are my employees or my
23 clients. That's not a lot of spaces, but nevertheless,
24 it's having to be used now. So if there aren't enough

1 assigned spaces for the actual tenants with cars, I
2 don't know where they're going. They're going I'm
3 going to have to park on the streets, already congested
4 and narrow streets. I really think the last thing that
5 has to be dealt with here is still the parking.

6 And again, emphasize not the developer's
7 problem to fix the parking issue that has been brought
8 up, and we all know there is one. I still don't think
9 that -- and I don't know, you know, maybe it's within
10 zoning, but if you think about it, the numbers don't
11 work. There aren't enough spaces for people in cars
12 based on the number of units.

13 And so while I commend them for what they've
14 done and I'm in favor of the project, I still would
15 like to respectfully request that this be denied until
16 there's enough parking to handle the residents that are
17 going to be living there. Thank you.

18 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. I would just
19 offer that in the staff report they have identified
20 that the developer has met requirement in the downtown
21 district. The requirement is one parking space per
22 unit. [inaudible] bedrooms, it's one parking space per
23 unit. Okay? So that's -- as far as the math that
24 relates to the zoning application, understanding that

1 sometimes that can vary based on each tenant who rents.
2 But as far as the zoning requirement, it's one per
3 unit. Okay? Please.

4 MS. GAUS: My name is Martha Gaus. I live
5 at 211 South 3rd Avenue. Russell, is that correct, one
6 parking space per dwelling unit?

7 MR. COLBY: Yes, that is the parking
8 requirement in the CD1 zoning district for residential
9 uses.

10 MS. GAUS: Is it also the requirement that
11 any private parking be replaced?

12 MR. COLBY: Correct, so any existing private
13 parking cannot be eliminated.

14 MS. GAUS: Thank you. Dear Planning
15 Commission, Mr. Hurst is presenting a revised plan for
16 the River East Lofts that has reduced the height to
17 what he is allowed. That is a welcome change as other
18 people have stated. He also has removed the ATM from
19 the parcel, which gives him more flexibility and is
20 another welcome change.

21 Other changes that we requested are not
22 included. He is still at double the density allowed
23 and has not provided enough parking and very sadly
24 still seeks a land grab along 2nd Avenue, Indiana

1 Avenue, and the triangle green space south of his
2 property. For many of the neighbors, and this is also
3 part of what Mr. Rasmussen was addressing, the most
4 disheartening part with the PUD is still the closure of
5 Indiana Avenue and the takeover of the green space.

6 But our main concern with the handover of
7 the land is that Mr. Hurst will then own it and will
8 develop it as he sees fit, or any subsequent owner.
9 That parcel will be zoned CBD1 which means that without
10 any approval process, per the current zoning, he could
11 put another four story building with another five
12 apartments, another 5,900 square foot of retail space,
13 and addition -- and an additional 5,900 square foot of
14 office retail -- office rental.

15 Technically, that parcel is not in the
16 historic district so the architecture could be anything
17 any developer would want. He could build all the way
18 to the new lot lines and is not required to provide any
19 landscape buffers. And worst of all, he would not be
20 required to put in any parking for this new building.

21 For this reason the city needs to retain
22 ownership of Indiana Avenue, 2nd Avenue and the green
23 space. The city and the neighbors need to have some
24 power to determine how it is used. And any way Mr.

1 Hurst takes over the land to use it for parking and a
2 lower patio, and therefore the closure and the takeover
3 are not actually necessary for the development.

4 He provides a zoning compliance table in his
5 application and here are the numbers without the land
6 grab. So you can see it with the density. The
7 dwelling units allowed are based on the square footage
8 of the land he actually owns, so that would be 20
9 through 23. This PUD is requesting you to approve 42,
10 nearly double what's allowed.

11 And I'm just going to point out the obvious
12 that the density and the parking issues go hand in
13 hand. The parking, he's got 37 spaces right now that
14 are private, and he's got 36 that he retains, and the
15 difference is negative one. So he's short one parking
16 space to meet the ordinance. He -- he gets his other
17 parking by taking over our property and using that for
18 parking.

19 Despite your feedback and the community
20 feedback at all the previous meetings, the new PUD is
21 no improvement regarding the parking situation. Okay.
22 Mr. Hurst has reconfigured the north parking lot to get
23 seven more spots compared to the previous proposal,
24 which was needed. But he's still far short of

1 addressing the additional parking the development will
2 drive.

3 Here's a chart comparing the previous PUD to
4 this one. And this is what Janet was talking about.
5 And aside from having to provide by ordinance only one
6 parking spot, what's actually going to be driven by
7 this PUD is what's shown here. So the total parking
8 needed for the PUD, you could see the residential
9 parking went up because, like Janet was saying, the --
10 the PUD now calls for more two bedroom apartments. And
11 the total parking that's needed is about the same
12 because he reduced the amount of retail or restaurant
13 space parking that would be needed.

14 Given the talk of cafe tables and
15 everything, I don't think it's very farfetched that
16 we're going to be at the high number on what's going to
17 be driven into this neighborhood from the PUD. Okay.
18 So there's -- this is what's needed, 91 to 129. He's
19 got 36 in his lot. So there's still a deficit of 54 to
20 93 parking spaces which means that the cars are going
21 to be seeking parking in our neighborhood and in -- in
22 addition to that, the north lot, like everybody has
23 said, is already used and those 11 spots on 2nd Avenue,
24 they're already used as a defacto city parking. Well,

1 the 11 spots are city parking. And so all those cars
2 are going to be going right into our neighborhood too.

3 Mr. Hurst owns two parking lots directly
4 across the street on the northeast corner of Illinois
5 and 2nd Avenue. He could include reserving those
6 parking spaces for his development in his PUD, but he
7 doesn't. Instead, he's trying to work a land swap with
8 the city for those lots for the land that's immediately
9 south of the Pollyanna Brewery property, which he
10 intends to use for that business but not for this PUD.

11 He's further stated that the city, meaning
12 all of us taxpayers, should build the parking lot which
13 is what other speakers have talked about as shown in
14 the comprehensive plan and the eastern lots between
15 Walton and Illinois. And while the comprehensive plan
16 shows this is a multi-story truck -- structure,
17 previous testimony has stated that there's not room for
18 it and he looks to connect the floor, so at the most
19 it's going to be a two story parking structure.

20 Still, it's going to cost upwards of two and
21 a half million to build a lot like that. So while Mr.
22 Hurst is not required to provide any more than one more
23 private space for his PUD, he doesn't offer that one
24 space and he doesn't explore any more onsite actions

1 for parking other than the obvious. And he proposes
2 taking our public property, for which he's not going to
3 pay anything, to convert to his private parking use.
4 And I think he was pretty clear when he said he's going
5 to be marking off those spaces and using signage to
6 indicate that they're for the PUD use.

7 The use of public land to provide private
8 parking for the development is directly in conflict
9 with the PUD findings of fact item two, the proposed
10 PUD and preliminary plans conform to the requirements
11 of the underlying zoning district in which the PUD is
12 located and the applicable design review standards
13 contained in chapter 17.06 except where B, conforming
14 to the requirements would be impractical, and the
15 proposed PUD will provide benefits that outweigh those
16 that would've been realized by conforming to the
17 requirements.

18 Mr. Hurst hasn't proved that conforming to
19 the zoning requirements would be impractical, nor has
20 he proved that not conforming would provide any
21 benefits that outweigh the cost to our neighborhood.
22 Also item four, the proposed PUD will be beneficial to
23 the physical development, diversity tax base, and
24 economic wellbeing of the city.

1 Mr. Hurst is only adding taxpayer costs by
2 demanding the land for parking at no cost to him,
3 adding to additional parking woes, and expecting a
4 taxpayer paid parking lot to be built. At the previous
5 meetings, Mr. Hurst testified under oath that this PUD
6 was not viable unless it was five stories. Now he
7 presents a four story PUD. He also testified he could
8 not reconfigure the apartments to rent along Riverside
9 Avenue, but that's what he presents in this PUD. Thank
10 you.

11 But I think it's still possible for Mr.
12 Hurst to accommodate on the land he owns more of the
13 cars his PUD will generate. Logic has it that he's got
14 two options to explore, further reduce the density or
15 add ramped parking deck on the second floor of the
16 north lot and go underground on the south lot. It's up
17 to you, commissioners, to put an end to this
18 unnecessary land grab and to preserve as our property
19 both Indiana Avenue and the green space and to protect
20 the taxpayer dollars.

21 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

22 MR. ALTERGOTT: My name is Robert Altergott,
23 317 Indiana Avenue. The young lady that preceded me
24 knocked down everything almost that I had to say. I do

1 have a question. In the months since the last meeting
2 we had, there's been at least five events where our
3 streets was really crowded out with traffic and parking
4 by the stop signs, by the fire plugs, up by the
5 sidewalks. And I was just wondering if anybody or any
6 of you had had a chance to drive through our
7 neighborhood during those events and see all it does
8 get done.

9 Did any of you manage to go through our
10 neighborhoods when the events were going on in town?

11 No. I'm sorry. That kind of makes me sad that, you
12 know, you didn't take the time to do that. I don't
13 want to say anything more about the traffic because two
14 people in front of me have already done that.

15 I do want to say that I am against giving up
16 the little park and the closing of Indiana Avenue.
17 Just today, a fire truck with the sirens and the
18 flashers going come west on Indiana, tried to make the
19 turn going south on 2nd. And a car pulled up right by
20 the sidewalk and didn't have the range to back up, and
21 here is the fire truck. Firemen had to yell out the
22 window for this guy to get out of the way. So that's
23 -- that's what we -- the fire truck couldn't make the
24 turn with the car that close to the -- to the road.

1 So I, you know, that -- that's just part of
2 what goes on. And that's all I have to say. I thank
3 you kindly for listening to me.

4 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

5 MR. TAYLOR: Hi, Greg Taylor, 211 South 3rd
6 Avenue. I applaud the Hursts for coming back with an
7 improved proposal. Many of the changes made will be a
8 benefit to our neighborhood, but there are two aspects
9 that are still unacceptable. And the first one we've
10 talked about it already, but I want to focus on the
11 consequences of not them addressing parking, currently
12 or in the future.

13 And those adverse consequences are a regular
14 flow of cars into the neighborhood, which will be an
15 eyesore, a hassle to navigate and a burden to us and to
16 our friends. It will also negatively affect the
17 current resident's quality of life and starve the
18 existing downtown businesses of available parking.

19 The comprehensive plan instructs the city to
20 ensure as new development goes in that current and
21 future parking needs are met as it's going in, not
22 after the fact, in more than one place. These adverse
23 consequences are direct violations to special use PUD
24 application criteria 3A, public convenience, 3C,

1 affects on nearby property, and five, conforms to the
2 purpose of the comprehensive plan.

3 The second unacceptable aspect of the PUD is
4 this free land giveaway. During the April 19th Plan
5 Commission meeting, I submitted into the public record
6 a letter from Dr. Anne Vernez Moudon and her
7 credentials, and it's inside of your handout. Dr.
8 Vernez Moudon is a national expert in land policy and
9 was the lead researcher on a study that the developer
10 cited to support his previous PUD application.

11 Dr. Vernez Moudon clearly states in her
12 letter to me that public land is by definition a
13 community asset owned entirely by the people living in
14 the jurisdiction that holds title to said land. The
15 trade value of said land needs to be assessed as
16 compared to nearby properties and its highest and best
17 use as compared to nearby properties. Public land
18 should never be given away free of charge to anyone
19 whether they be other public or private users or
20 owners.

21 In response to this letter, the developer
22 stated in summary that giving away land has happened in
23 the past, and that this is not an uncommon practice.
24 Just because public land was given away in the past

1 does that make it right or appropriate for this
2 application or any application. In response, Dr.
3 Vernez Moudon has been the only source of expert
4 testimony on this subject matter. Her input is direct
5 and clear and speaks directly to the special use PUD
6 application criteria four, that the PUD will be for the
7 economic wellbeing of the city.

8 As commission members, that has to be one of
9 your most important criteria. On July 8th Russell
10 Colby responded to a request of mine advising me that
11 the land that is being given away has not been
12 appraised. I don't know how the Plan Commission can
13 determine if this PUD is for the economic wellbeing of
14 the city without knowing the value of the land.

15 Any objective calculation such as payback
16 period, return on investment that would help this
17 commission determine if the PUD is a good deal for the
18 city requires knowing the value of the land. I would
19 like to see a PUD with no public land giveaway, you
20 know, that's what I would prefer.

21 But if the city determines that the land in
22 question is critical to the River East Lofts
23 development, I would then urge the city to retain
24 ownership of the land, negotiate a long-term lease with

1 the Hursts with restrictions on how the land can be
2 used that is consistent with the current PUD. By doing
3 this, it ensures that a subsequent PUD would not be
4 submitted by the developer that will only require a
5 simple majority approval. To properly negotiate the
6 terms of a long-term lease, the city still needs to
7 know the value of the land.

8 This PUD is an improvement. I appreciate
9 the time, effort, creativity and cost it took to create
10 it. But the city is going to live with this building
11 for 50 to 100 years. There is nothing wrong with
12 recognizing the improvement of the PUD while at the
13 same time requiring the developer to better address the
14 parking issue and to hit the pause button so that the
15 city can perform its due diligence regarding the land
16 value to ensure that the PUD is for the economic
17 wellbeing of the city. Thank you.

18 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. Please.

19 MR. RHEAD: Hi, my name is Matthew Rhead,
20 the last name is a different spelling, R-H-E-A-D. I
21 live at 707 South 6th Avenue. And my concern is not so
22 much with the footprint or the design elements of the
23 building. I actually applaud Mr. Hurst. It looks
24 pretty nice.

1 But what I'm concerned about is traffic flow
2 and safety in the neighborhood, particularly right to
3 the east there, sometimes called the presidential
4 neighborhood. What we are going to have, I think, is
5 increased traffic flow through the neighborhood as
6 people come back from work and try to avoid the
7 stoplights at say 7th Avenue and 64, and Illinois and
8 64.

9 They're already doing it. They come through
10 the neighborhood and the issue that we have is that
11 there are intersections in that neighborhood that are
12 not marked, there are no stop signs, they are
13 completely wide open intersections. There are areas --
14 areas that have absolutely no sidewalk whatsoever, and
15 there are sections of street that have absolutely no
16 curb for four or five blocks from Lincoln School.
17 There's a lot of new families with young children that
18 have moved into the neighborhood. And I think it's
19 incumbent on the city that if this project is approved,
20 that you make sure that the safety of the citizens is
21 not compromised. Thank you.

22 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

23 MS. MYERS: I'm Susie Myers and I'm at 303
24 South 3rd Avenue. I was -- thank you very much, Peter,

1 for mentioning the Bradford pear. It is going to go on
2 the invasive list in Illinois, supposedly they're not
3 supposed to be selling them very soon. I questioned
4 months ago if Riverside -- if you guys have talked to
5 the fire department and if there's any -- if they have
6 any qualms about Riverside being narrowed.

7 The way I understand this, they're going to
8 -- it's going to be four feet narrower and that seems
9 to be the thruway for the fire trucks. So and then --
10 and also adding more crosswalks on Riverside. Just a
11 question I had.

12 But my biggest thing is the parking. I
13 don't know if you guys had to circle today, but I live
14 on 3rd, I walked over here, there isn't a parking place
15 anywhere. It's Tuesday night, it's 7:00, it's not
16 happy hour, it's none of that stuff. It's Tuesday
17 night at 7:00 and it's bloody hot out and people are
18 just parking everywhere.

19 They're parking on 3rd Avenue all the time.
20 All my friends have to park in my driveway. There is
21 no parking on the street. So this is a huge thing.
22 And I agree, you know, development is very important,
23 but at least have an idea of what's going to be going
24 on and have a place that people can park so that we can

1 still have a life in this area, and it will be easier
2 for everybody. Nobody wants to come to a place and
3 have to walk six blocks. And nobody wants to come to a
4 place and have to, you know, go around and around and
5 round and try to find a place. That's my biggest
6 point. Thank you.

7 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

8 MR. SCHULSKY: My name is Mark Schulsky, St.
9 Charles, Illinois and my parents live at the corner of
10 Indiana Avenue and 2nd Avenue, so right at the area of
11 the proposal. First, for the record, I stated before
12 against giving land away to private individuals.
13 There's been a lot of discussion about making this the
14 gateway to the city, being an area that people can
15 gather and stuff.

16 I think the city could take as a project. I
17 think you have a river -- River Corridor group. You
18 could look at this as a project to develop it and not
19 have to give it away. Make it something that's good
20 for all the people and not for something that's
21 directly linked to a proposal. So that's, you know,
22 thoughts on that.

23 One of the things too it's brought up, I do
24 have concerns from what I understand this still does

1 not meet the regulations of the density of the
2 apartments. I'm not sure of all the restrictions you
3 have or why you have density regulations, but I would
4 assume a lot of it has to do with city services. We've
5 talked about parking, but there's also issues like
6 sewage, which is already overtaxed in that area and now
7 it's going to be a lot worse. You have area -- you
8 have concern with police service, fire service, all the
9 electrical, everything that goes above that. I don't
10 know if studies have been looked or what the impacts
11 can be on all of that, but it's something to definitely
12 take into consideration.

13 And then lastly, I don't know -- there is --
14 I believe there is a slide that showed the crossing --
15 proposed crosswalk area from Indiana, 2nd Avenue there.
16 I don't know if it's possible to put that up or.

17 MR. VARGULICH: Well, I think it's up there.

18 MR. SCHULSKY: No, the one that actually
19 shows across the crosswalk, and it actually shows the -
20 - I think it was an artist's rendering of the property,
21 which actually would be on that side. I saw something
22 in a proposal that was passed out. But I guess I'll
23 just say it. The concern there is that's actually the
24 corner my parents live on.

1 Right now if you're walking down the
2 sidewalk on Indiana Avenue and you come there it tees,
3 it doesn't go straight through to, you know, the
4 triangular area that we're talking about. I saw in one
5 of the proposals there is now a sidewalk extended
6 through -- straight through. I don't know, I mean, is
7 that something that's common that you would just add a
8 sidewalk on property like that? Is that, you know, a
9 certain range considered city even though, I mean, it's
10 my parents' property. I guess that's one of the
11 questions I have.

12 MR. VARGULICH: Well, I think the crosswalk
13 that I believe you're addressing is within the public
14 right of way. So it's certainly within the city's
15 purview to add crosswalks or delete them based on
16 traffic --

17 MR. SCHULSKY: I understand --

18 MR. VARGULICH: -- traffic flow.

19 MR. SCHULSKY: -- I understand the
20 crosswalk, what I'm saying is the crosswalk came
21 across. If you don't extend the sidewalk down through
22 their property, it's not going to connect to the
23 crosswalk.

24 MR. STUDEBAKER: The sidewalk does not go

1 all the way to the corner?

2 MR. SCHULSKY: Correct, the sidewalk stops.

3 MR. VARGULICH: Yeah, so I think --

4 MR. SCHULSKY: So either you -- that's why
5 I'm asking there, it's going to be a --

6 MR. VARGULICH: So it would be at the end.

7 MR. SCHULSKY: All right. And so there's no
8 regulations about that, the city has the right to do
9 that?

10 MR. VARGULICH: Well, it's within the
11 [crosstalk].

12 MR. HURST: Probably best to go to the slide
13 so you can point out what you want.

14 MR. SCHULSKY: I'm not sure which slide it
15 is you had on there.

16 MS. HIBEL: Page 20 I think shows it.

17 MR. SCHULSKY: [Crosstalk] like an artist's
18 rendering, not really like a block diagram, it showed
19 like the color.

20 MR. HURST: So you're talking about this
21 section right here, which currently it does not end.
22 That's where I wanted to go.

23 UNKNOWN: At the light.

24 UNKNOWN: Is this Indiana?

1 MR. HURST: Yeah, so this is Indiana, and
2 this is your parents' house. And this is --

3 MR. SCHULSKY: The sidewalk now that's not
4 --

5 MR. HURST: -- this is the -- this is the
6 sidewalk, this is --

7 MR. SCHULSKY: It's not there.

8 MR. HURST: -- this is not there now, and
9 this is in the public right of way, which is what Peter
10 was mentioning. This is in the public right of way.
11 You're -- nobody owns any of the property between the
12 curb and sidewalk, that is all city owned property. So
13 if you look at your survey the boundaries will be
14 [unintelligible]. So that is city right of way.

15 MR. SCHULSKY: Okay. So looking at that,
16 I'll go back to the point about the area that's city
17 right away, been maintained for over 100 years when my
18 grandparents lived in that house before my parents.
19 But what's to stop the city of saying, hey, we need
20 more parking spaces so we're going to just take that
21 area and make it parking? And then they could have
22 cars right up to their bushes.

23 MR. VARGULICH: Well, I -- I guess at some
24 point, and anything is possible, but that's certainly

1 part of this proposal. I don't think the city has
2 plans to add parking on the east side of 2nd Avenue.
3 But as part of a, I guess, to speak to a larger topic,
4 it's certainly on lots of people's minds, is the issue
5 of a parking study.

6 I believe the city is looking to hire a
7 consultant to do that. I understand that there's an
8 RFP out to -- to pursue that consultant and then they
9 can get started on the inventory and all of those
10 things that go into that. And it's hard to know
11 exactly what solutions will be recommended as a part of
12 that.

13 So there might be a suggestion to add angled
14 parking or add parking within these parkways, but
15 that's certainly something the city can look at or
16 address in the future once the parking study is
17 complete. And I'm sure they'll look at solutions like
18 multi-story structures and all of those things to
19 address how to add more parking.

20 I think staff in the staff report, which is
21 available online, they address how the proposal meets
22 the requirements of our ordinance related to parking.
23 So understanding that people have differing opinions on
24 how many cars will be in any one unit, those are --

1 that happens every day. You know, what you expect and
2 what happens is different. But the ordinance requires
3 one per unit and so that's -- that's what's being --
4 that's what's being proposed at this point.

5 As far as this additional crosswalk or a
6 relocated crosswalk, again, that's all within the city
7 right of way. I mean, I'm looking at in my
8 neighborhood, which is on the west side, they're making
9 adjustments to doing those things right now. Exactly,
10 what you're talking about, taking some out that aren't
11 used or don't lead to the correct location, adding ones
12 that need to be added. And so this is an ongoing
13 process not only here in this neighborhood, but
14 throughout the city. So I don't think this is an
15 unusual thing to add or adjust where people are asked
16 to cross the street.

17 MR. SCHULSKY: No, I understand that and --
18 and I understand, you know, trying to solve parking
19 issues. I guess my point is, is when you start as a
20 city getting into giving away land for developments, it
21 raises the question with all the citizens, well, then
22 what's fair game? I mean, everybody that owns property
23 all along there in that city easement then potentially
24 could lose that property for parking spaces. And you

1 can say it's not likely or whatever, but I guess I'm
2 just bringing up the point that it is possible.

3 MR. VARGULICH: Yes, I think this is also a
4 PUD. And so any change to a PUD would mean you would
5 have to come back again. It wouldn't just happen as a
6 -- as a condition of right.

7 MR. SCHULSKY: Right.

8 MR. VARGULICH: Because this is a PUD, not a
9 zoning by right application. So if in fact somebody
10 wanted to propose 50 years from now if they buy it from
11 the Hursts because they've decided they'd retire and do
12 something else, that green space could not just be
13 turned into green space with a building permit
14 application. It would have to have a PUD process just
15 like we're having today. So I'm not saying nothing is
16 possible --

17 MR. SCHULSKY: Right.

18 MR. VARGULICH: -- but it -- it would come
19 back to this type of process. It wouldn't just be
20 something that happened.

21 MR. SCHULSKY: All right. Thank you.

22 MR. VARGULICH: Please.

23 MR. WATTS: Good evening, I'm Al Watts. I'm
24 the community engagement director for preservation

1 partners of the Fox Valley. We're at 8 Indiana Street
2 in St. Charles. We're a nonprofit organization that is
3 based out of St. Charles and we operate four historic
4 sites -- the Durant House and Sholes School in St.
5 Charles at the Leroy Oaks Forest Preserve, and Fabian
6 Villa and Japanese Garden in Geneva. We also educate
7 the community about the value of historic preservation,
8 and that's what I'm here today.

9 Since the commission may not be familiar
10 with the benefits of the historic district, I just
11 wanted to briefly inform commission about the history
12 of the property, the purchase of the St. Charles
13 Historic District, and the city ordinances and national
14 standards that are available to help you with your
15 decision.

16 So first of all, the building that currently
17 occupies the property was constructed around 1920 for
18 the Boden (ph) Dairy company. It was updated and
19 expanded in 1937 when it was purchased by Riverview
20 Dairy and operated as a creamery until the 1970s. I
21 believe it was the last creamery in -- in St. Charles.

22 Since then, several other businesses have
23 used the building, most recently the St. Charles
24 Chamber of Commerce. And the architectural survey that

1 was done in 1994, for the historic district lists the
2 building as a contributing building. Now the purpose
3 of a historic district is to preserve the community's
4 sense of place and to protect property values. So
5 adhering to St. Charles' historic preservation
6 ordinance it encourages the continued vitality of
7 downtown as a place where people want to live, work and
8 play. According to the ordinance "new structures shall
9 be compatible with the surrounding structures."

10 Specifically the district recommends a
11 building height proportionate of its front facade
12 relationship to the open space between it and adjoining
13 structures, and its scale should fit in with the nearby
14 buildings and landscapes. National standards for
15 rehabilitation of historic structures from the
16 Secretary of the Interior offer further guidance on the
17 construction.

18 In certain districts, it states that "new
19 construction will be compatible with the historic
20 materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and
21 massing to protect the integrity of the property and
22 its environment." So applying these recommendations
23 from the city's ordinance and national standards
24 enhance property values in the historic district and

1 help maintain the sense of place for St. Charles.

2 A positive change is necessary to ensure
3 growth and vitality for St. Charles, considering
4 guidance from city ordinance and national standards for
5 structures in historic districts can help assure that a
6 project will create that positive change that downtown
7 St. Charles needs." That's all I have. If you have
8 any questions, I'm happy to -- to answer them.

9 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you.

10 MR. CARTER: Hello.

11 MR. VARGULICH: Hi.

12 MR. CARTER: My name is Robert Carter and I
13 live at 217 South 3rd Avenue, it's the northwest corner
14 of South 3rd and Indiana Avenue, and I'll be directly
15 affected by this. My question -- I have a couple of
16 questions. What does the city really gain by giving
17 away its own property and by closing the street?

18 I mean, I see the drawing, I've heard Mr.
19 Hurst is very persuasive. I just wonder if you're
20 going to give it away like you're -- I -- I'm assuming,
21 can you retain the rights to it, so it doesn't become
22 anything else? That's similar to what Mr. Taylor
23 proposed, as some kind of binding contract for X amount
24 of years or whatever.

1 The other thing that I'd like to know is
2 have the sewer department and storm sewers, has
3 somebody okayed all of this all of a sudden on this --
4 on this block that everything is going to work? I've
5 never heard anybody say anything. Just a question
6 because storm sewers, there's -- you know, we're not
7 always going to get as little rain as we have this
8 year, I'm hoping. But we've had six to ten inch rain
9 over a weekend before and the crews are out pumping
10 water. And there's only so much sewage you're allowed
11 per capita to put into the river. We'd like not to
12 have that be a lot more per property, you know, or
13 propose it. I mean, but I appreciate your time, thank
14 you.

15 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. I would -- I
16 would offer the following comments regarding
17 infrastructure that I think the staff report has
18 addressed in the initial submittal with respect to
19 stormwater and what's being proposed. And I think that
20 it generally meets what the city requires of stormwater
21 management within this area.

22 There are some details to that, but I think
23 that it's still being worked on. But I believe it in
24 general meets the requirements. I think they've also

1 reviewed the sanitary connection. Again, at a
2 preliminary level because that's about where we are.
3 And I think that the general topic is called PEs or
4 population equivalents, and I think that those have
5 been reviewed and so far it appears that the sewers
6 will be able to handle the capacity that will come from
7 this project.

8 I think the only thing I saw in the
9 utilities that was a little bit outstanding was the
10 potential location for a transformer. I think that was
11 the only infrastructure element that hadn't been fully
12 addressed, at least at this point. So I think that's
13 still being addressed.

14 On your question related to what is gained,
15 what is lost, well, the -- on a -- I think at a high
16 level, what is gained and what is lost is part of the
17 PUD process in this discussion. And it's showing this
18 body's, you know, initial reaction and recommendation
19 that we would provide to the Planning and Development
20 Committee, our thoughts on that topic. I don't know
21 that it's a fully closed topic.

22 I think the staff has also done a fair
23 review of what that is. And I think there are a number
24 of easements that are within the Indiana right of way

1 right now that I do not believe will be vacated because
2 of utilities and the -- and the challenge of removing
3 those utilities if they're already there. So I think
4 some of this is being proposed, if you will, on top of
5 it. But at the end of the day, I believe that all of
6 the utilities are still being placed that are there
7 now.

8 How the city, whether it's this room or
9 ultimately our own decided on a property being
10 transferred into private ownership, it has everything
11 to do with what ultimately the whole project does as a
12 whole for our community and how we see that. And it's
13 -- it's hard, I don't believe it's an easy decision.
14 Nor is it a simple yes or no because there are multiple
15 topics that go into that analysis.

16 And so that would be hard to say
17 specifically on any property in any one project. Could
18 the city retain the green space that is being shown?
19 Sure. But there's a proposed shift in property lines.
20 Those can be amended as part of the final approval and
21 final design. And that's something for the city to
22 think about.

23 They ultimately, if they do, then they own a
24 piece of grass that they have to maintain. They can't

1 just ignore it, and so that goes into that question of
2 why do we transfer it to somebody else? It all depends
3 on is it something that the city wants to maintain, you
4 know?

5 The art district goes through that analysis
6 all the time when they're offered a piece of land, or
7 they're offered something. Is it big enough to
8 facilitate what they want to do and how they manage
9 properties? And the city would be no different in that
10 regard whether it would be in their interest to own it
11 because of just what is the long term operational cost,
12 and do they have the right people to do that? So I
13 hope that helps in some way. We still have more to do.

14 MR. FUNKE: And I also wanted to add too,
15 the concerns about getting the -- the [unintelligible]
16 and I think actually from a client standpoint, this
17 benefits the building. When you have bricks on the
18 first floor and, you know, think about if the street
19 was going through, I mean, you're not really going to
20 have any use for cafes or open plaza for pedestrians.
21 You're going to have that street. You're going to have
22 the traffic coming through there.

23 So what this does is it actually terminates
24 the traffic, which will help traffic in that area

1 because people that thought they were in the
2 thoroughfare going, you know, down to the river,
3 they're not going to be able to do that anymore. So
4 this actually activates the building, the -- the -- the
5 fact that you have more pedestrians that are going to
6 be hanging out in front of this building is going to
7 make your building a friendly place, you know, from a
8 planning standpoint I think it's -- it's a great use of
9 what would be a street originally -- you know, turning
10 that into a plaza would be a great use for the
11 property.

12 You have to also think about the
13 infrastructure. You know, the creating the ramps, the
14 stairs and things to accommodate for that retail,
15 that's going to cost money. So you know, the
16 developers will be spending that money and I don't
17 think as taxpayers you'd like, you know, to be
18 spending, you know, money to maintain those retaining
19 walls and the infrastructure on a -- on a yearly bases.

20 So just to, you know, I -- I heard a lot of
21 your concerns and I appreciate those concerns. I just
22 wanted to, you know, from a planning standpoint, I
23 think this is a great benefit to the city. And it's
24 actually going to be one of the few restaurants, if it

1 is a restaurant, or retail spaces that's going to have
2 south exposure and great -- great views of the river.
3 So thank you.

4 MR. VARGULICH: I would also offer that
5 there was a traffic report that was developed by the
6 developer and reviewed by the city so it's all online.
7 And I think there's only a few minor comments if I'm
8 remembering that right.

9 UNKNOWN: Right.

10 MR. VARGULICH: It was a few minor comments
11 on that. But on the -- on the whole they -- the report
12 showed, and the city felt more comfortable with what
13 was being proposed, how the city streets would function
14 and understanding that both the -- the company that
15 prepared the report and the city's outside consultant
16 don't live in your neighborhood, so it was a different
17 perspective, which sometimes is good and sometimes bad.

18 But they -- they felt that the traffic could
19 be accommodated, including the change in the geometry
20 for how 2nd Avenue connects to Riverside, and the
21 removal of the short little piece of Indiana, as far as
22 accessible right of way. Those things were all
23 evaluated as part of that traffic study. So that was
24 also available online and as is the memo, the -- their

1 consultant [unintelligible]. Any other comments from
2 our audience?

3 MR. HURST: Just one quick, you know, I want
4 to address a couple of things that were said.

5 MR. VARGULICH: Sure.

6 MR. HURST: One there is the traffic study,
7 there was also a study that was required and proposed
8 by the city for the water and sanitary, which we
9 endeavor -- it's part of our process that we pay for
10 that. And the city has accepted their recommendations
11 and there's a significant upgrade in the water service.
12 As part of that that, will be covered into the final
13 engineering, as well as with the sanitary. It does
14 meet the existing and future needs, so that's all in
15 the public record. So I don't want to, you know,
16 repeat it, it's all available.

17 And then the other thing that I think is
18 relevant is there's a lot of conversation around the
19 green space and its future use. And what I think is
20 important to note is that everybody says that it's, you
21 know, the potential for it to be redeveloped down the
22 road. Well, the way we've structured this is that
23 actually it's a separate lot and it's significantly
24 covered by easements for the city, utility easements,

1 access easements, all of those things so that that
2 ensures the long term use in addition to the public --
3 the PUD.

4 If -- if we were ever to sell and that were
5 to be developed, we would all be here again and that
6 would be part of the conversation. And I think what
7 that does is it helps ensure in perpetuity the density
8 being smaller than if you were to have that not
9 encumbered by that and then you could build it and then
10 now the density is a little bit different. So it does
11 ensure in perpetuity that density and the -- and the
12 use at our expense, as Mr. Funke points out, to approve
13 it and to maintain it. So I think that's relevant to
14 -- to comment on.

15 MR. VARGULICH: Thank you. Any other public
16 comment before we bring it back to this side of the
17 table? Okay. Let me know if you change your mind.
18 All right. So if the plan commission feels it has
19 enough information to make the recommendation to the
20 Planning and Building Committee of the City Council, a
21 motion to close the public hearing would be in order.

22 MR. FUNKE: I'll make a motion to close.

23 MS. MOAD: Second.

24 MR. VARGULICH: All right. We have a motion

1 to close and second. Any discussion on our motion
2 before we proceed to vote? No. Laurel Moad, please
3 abstain. Colleen Wiese?

4 MS. WIESE: Yes.

5 MR. VARGULICH: Jeff Funke?

6 MR. FUNKE: Yes.

7 MR. VARGULICH: Karen Hibel?

8 MS. HIBEL: Yes.

9 MR. VARGULICH: Dave Risenberg?

10 MR. RISENBERG: Yes.

11 MR. VARGULICH: Gary Gruber?

12 MR. GRUBER: Yes.

13 MR. VARGULICH: Chris Studebaker?

14 MR. STUDEBAKER: Yes.

15 MR. VARGULICH: Myself, yes. All right.

16 We'll move on to item 5B.

17 (Off the record at 8:47 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Jacob Faden, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that said proceedings were electronically recorded by me; 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.

Jacob Faden

Jacob Faden, Court Reporter
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

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, Sheila Martin, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the recorded proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability from the audio recording and supporting information; and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by and of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

Sheila Martin

Sheila Martin
July 25, 2022