

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2019**

Members Present: Chairman Wallace
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Jeff Funke
Tom Pretz
Suzanne Melton
Jennifer Becker

Members Absent: Vice Chairman Kessler
Peter Vargulich
James Holderfield

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

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

Chairman Wallace called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Presentation of minutes of the August 20, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.

Motion was made by Mr. Funke, seconded by Ms. Purdy and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the August 20, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

5. RTM Fox River LLC Subdivision (Robert Manthei)

Application for Minor Subdivision

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

Motion was made by Ms. Purdy and seconded by Mr. Pretz to approve the Application for Minor Subdivision for RTM Fox River LLC Subdivision (Robert Manthei).

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Purdy, Melton, Funke, Pretz, Wallace, Becker

Nays:

Absent: Kessler, Vargulich, Holderfield

Motion carried 6-0

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, September 3, 2019
Page 2

6. Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Recommendations for East Side study area
Recommendations for West Side study area

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

Motion was made by Ms. Purdy and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend approval of the East Side study area recommendations.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Purdy, Melton, Funke, Pretz, Wallace, Becker

Nays:

Absent: Kessler, Vargulich, Holderfield

Motion carried 6-0

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

Motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Ms. Melton to continue discussion of the West Side study area to the October 8, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Purdy, Melton, Funke, Pretz Wallace, Becker

Nays:

Absent: Kessler, Vargulich, Holderfield

Motion carried 6-0

7. Additional Business from Plan Commission members or Staff

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, September 17, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, October 8, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, October 22, 2019 at 7:00pm Century Station Training Room

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, October 14, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, November 11, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

9. Public Comment- None

10. Adjournment at 8:05 p.m.



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

Transcript of RTM Fox River LLC

Date: September 3, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
RTM Fox River LLC Subdivision :
(Robert Manthei), Application :
for Minor Subdivision. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, September 3, 2019
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 218471A
Pages: 1 - 10
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 CENTURY STATION

4 112 Riverside Avenue

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

6 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

11 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

12 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

13 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

14 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

15 Development Director

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of RTM Fox River LLC
Conducted on September 3, 2019

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Call this meeting of
3 the St. Charles Plan Commission to order. I'll do
4 roll call.

5 Wallace, here.

6 Kessler.

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Becker.

9 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Funke.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Holderfield.

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin Purdy.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Vargulich.

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Melton.

21 MEMBER MELTON: Here.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm assuming -- I
23 wasn't at the last meeting, so I was just asking
24 if the Pledge of Allegiance is now going to be a

1 part of our meeting.

2 All right. Item 3 on our agenda is the
3 Pledge of Allegiance. I'll ask everyone who
4 wishes to to stand.

5 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Presentation of minutes
7 of the August 20th meeting of the Plan Commission.
8 Is there a motion to approve?

9 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll make that motion.

10 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Second.

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

13 (Ayes heard.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes.

17 Item 5, RTM Fox River LLC Subdivision
18 application (Robert Manthei) Application for Minor
19 Subdivision.

20 Before you start I'll just note I know we
21 don't have microphones in this room, so if anyone
22 can't hear, just let us know. I want to make sure
23 that everyone knows everything that's going on, so
24 just raise your hand.

1 Ellen.

2 MS. JOHNSON: So this property, as you'll
3 see on the aerial, it's a vacant 10,000-square-
4 foot parcel on South 4th Avenue between South
5 Avenue and Adams Avenue. Robert Manthei is here.
6 He's the property owner. He's seeking approval of
7 a final plat of subdivision to divide the parcel
8 in two to create two buildable lots of single-family
9 homes.

10 The subdivision qualifies as a minor
11 subdivision, so there are no engineering plans
12 required at this time. And the applicant is here,
13 if you wish to say a few words or if there's any
14 questions from the Commission.

15 MR. MANTHEI: I'm good.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm now second-guessing
17 what I had thought this was. Have we previously
18 looked at this on the concept plan?

19 MS. JOHNSON: No, we have not.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That was a property in
21 the area?

22 MS. JOHNSON: 504, yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Got it. Okay.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Were there any

1 staff comments? Because I didn't really see any.

2 MS. JOHNSON: There were a few technical
3 comments from planning just on particulars of the
4 plat to do certificates and that sort of thing, a
5 comment that sidewalk will be required along 4th
6 Avenue, and then there are a few engineering
7 comments that were not included in the staff
8 report. A couple were included but kind of
9 technical issues that will need to be addressed
10 that have to do with the sanitary sewer and
11 stormwater.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
13 questions?

14 MEMBER BECKER: I have a question. Was
15 this ever part of the original plat of subdivision,
16 or had this always been this size lot and was not
17 platted to the widths of the others?

18 MS. JOHNSON: Correct. Yeah, it was always
19 kind of a leftover piece that was never divided.

20 MEMBER BECKER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
22 questions?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion?

Transcript of RTM Fox River LLC
Conducted on September 3, 2019

8

1 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: I'll make a motion
2 to approve RTF Fox River LLC Subdivision
3 (Robert Manthei) Application for Minor Subdivision
4 as long as the staff comments are addressed and
5 taken care of.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So the
7 motion is to recommend approval to City Council
8 subject to resolution of staff comments. Is there
9 a second?

10 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
12 discussion on the motion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. We'll do
15 roll call.

16 Becker.

17 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Funke.

19 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin Purdy.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Melton.

1 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace, yes.

3 All right. That passes.

4 (Off the record at 7:05 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 10th day of September, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois



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

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown

Date: September 3, 2019

Case: St. Charles Plan Commission

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x
In Re: :
Comprehensive Plan Update for :
Downtown: Recommendations :
for East Side Study Area; :
Recommendations for West Side :
Study Area. :
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, September 3, 2019
7:06 p.m.

Job No.: 218471B
Pages: 1 - 52
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 CENTURY STATION

4 112 Riverside Avenue

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Conducted on September 3, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

4 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

5 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

6 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

7 TOM PRETZ, Member

8

9 ALSO PRESENT:

10 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

11 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

12 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

13 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

14 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic
15 Development Director

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Conducted on September 3, 2019

4

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

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Now we have Item No. 6 on
3 the agenda is Comprehensive Plan Update for
4 Downtown: Recommendations for East Side Study
5 Area and Recommendations for West Side Study Area.

6 MR. COLBY: So just to recap, I presented to
7 the Plan Commission the preliminary recommendations
8 for both east side and west side study areas at
9 previous meetings. So I'll be presenting the
10 updates to those documents based on comments we
11 received from the last meeting where we primarily
12 reviewed the east side study area for changes
13 based on the original comments, and then there
14 will be revisions to the west side area based on
15 the comments from the previous meeting.

16 So I'm just going to skip ahead in the
17 slides because we walked through these previously.
18 There's just a few items I wanted to highlight
19 that came up in the discussion.

20 One, there was a comment to retain or
21 relocate the veterans memorial which is currently
22 located along the river trail in this area north
23 of the police station. This site has potential to
24 be included in the redevelopment, so there was a

1 comment that that memorial should either be
2 preserved, if possible, or relocated to another
3 location.

4 There was a comment regarding maintaining
5 some public access and a visual connection to the
6 river from the existing intersections along
7 Riverside Avenue, so from Cedar Avenue extended
8 toward the river and from State Avenue extended
9 toward the river. So that's been added to the plan.

10 There's also a note regarding -- comments
11 regarding a potential parking structure located in
12 this area which, based on topography, could be
13 accessed from 2nd Avenue, and there was a comment
14 that that 2nd Avenue access would require some
15 study to determine if it was safe to install it
16 without adding other additional traffic measures
17 along that street.

18 Any questions on those revisions? Those
19 are the main changes that came out of the discussion
20 from the previous meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No questions.

22 MR. COLBY: So the draft recommendations
23 for the east side are the same as was presented
24 previously. We had a discussion regarding the

1 open space and how the floodplain -- depending on
2 where the floodplain remains. If the Active River
3 Project were to happen, the location would change.
4 That would change the potential area of open space
5 that's available along the riverfront. So we
6 accounted for that in the recommendations for open
7 space.

8 The land use recommendations, mixed use,
9 and residential as discussed previously, discussed
10 building height within the current zoning and
11 requiring taller structures to go through some
12 kind of review process, conceivable parking within
13 the development where possible.

14 And those were all the recommendation from
15 the east side study area. Any questions or
16 comments on that?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. COLBY: Then to switch over to the
19 west side, again, we walked through this
20 information at the previous meeting.

21 In this discussion we had regarding the
22 conceptual modification of the floodplain there
23 was a comment that it might be best to -- in the
24 areas where we're showing potential cut into the

1 floodplain to exclude the area which currently is
2 parking for Carroll Tower, recognizing that it's
3 not a property that the City owns, and right now
4 it's serving an existing use. But if there were
5 potential for that parking to be relocated, this
6 area could potentially be used as part of the cut
7 area to offset some fill that could be used
8 elsewhere within this area.

9 We have suggested that that could occur on
10 the west side of Route 31, and this area could still
11 function as parking. It may just provide additional
12 flood storage that doesn't currently.

13 Regarding the improvement plan, there was
14 a discussion about the trail connections that are
15 shown. As shown at the last meeting, there's a
16 trail connection along the river that would
17 connect from the State Street/Route 31 area up
18 along the river and connecting to the bike bridge
19 that exists currently. There was discussion that
20 that type of connection would likely require some
21 type of stairs or some design which may not be
22 compatible to bike traffic and that since there is
23 the existing bike bridge and ramp to the north of
24 Route 31 that extends south from the bridge and

1 sort of ends in this location, that that trail
2 could be extended south along Route 31 in order to
3 provide a direct connection from the current end
4 of the trail to the Route 31 and State Street
5 intersection. We discussed the potential for a
6 traffic signal here, that that could serve as
7 access that you could get between those two points
8 without having stairs as you would along the river.

9 So those are the two modifications to the
10 west side study area.

11 So the draft plan recommendations, these
12 are similar to what was presented at the previous
13 meeting, that the primary land use is mixed use
14 and that there's different alternatives for how
15 the floodplain could be dealt with.

16 One option is for the existing floodplain
17 to really continue to function as floodplain and
18 utilize it in a more limited manner for parking or
19 open space. It was discussed this would limit
20 development potential on Route 31, but there would
21 still be opportunities to enhance the appearance
22 of parking lots along the Route 31 frontage.

23 The second option would be to relocate some
24 of the floodplain storage to areas such as along

1 the riverfront and the State Street Creek corridor,
2 which was depicted in that diagram that showed the
3 potential cut in the fill areas. And there would
4 be opportunities then to use those relocated
5 floodplain areas as a greenway along the State Street
6 Creek or as open space along the riverfront,
7 and this could potentially provide additional
8 development parcels for along Route 391.

9 The other option if there were a need to
10 do this would be to provide the floodplain storage
11 elsewhere outside the study area in order to
12 maximize the development footprint that could occur
13 in this area. That is complicated to do because
14 you'd have to find land to do that, and it's an
15 expensive solution to correct this floodplain issue
16 which perhaps could be incorporated from a layout
17 standpoint into the project as suggested under the
18 first two scenarios.

19 So the other draft plan recommendations
20 talked about a public parking structure being
21 needed to serve the northwest quadrant of downtown,
22 recognizing that the parking in this area serves
23 the Main Street businesses and not just the
24 businesses right in the vicinity of where those

1 parking lots are located.

2 Regarding building scale, to have height
3 within the range of the current zoning it would
4 require taller structures to go through review
5 process.

6 The pedestrian trail infrastructure
7 improvement talked about the bike bridge connection
8 to State Route 31 which could be done along the
9 river and along Route 31, potential to narrow
10 Route 31 or find ways to improve or extend sidewalks
11 along the frontage with greater buffers to make it
12 more pedestrian friendly.

13 And traffic improvements. A traffic signal
14 at State and Route 31 is recommended to improve
15 walkability and access and some type of cross
16 access between 4th Street and Route 31 north of
17 State. Right now there's a large block and
18 difficulty to cross from one side of the block to
19 the other, which causes traffic to be falling back
20 down to State.

21 So those are the draft plan recommendations
22 for the west side. As I said, these haven't really
23 changed since the last meeting.

24 Any questions on that information?

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Conducted on September 3, 2019

11

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. COLBY: I know we have some members of
4 the public who would like to speak. So if the
5 Plan Commission would like to entertain them, this
6 would be an appropriate time to do so.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Tom Anderson, 712 Horne
9 Street, St. Charles. Myself and my family are
10 owners of property on the west side right in the
11 quadrant you're talking about.

12 Discussions have been happening for years
13 of something ought to be here, something ought to
14 be there. Just for reference, for fun I brought a
15 1960 photo that shows a railroad used to go
16 through here where 31 goes now. It was industrial
17 stuff. Joshua's Lumberyard was here, Colonial's
18 ice cream production was here, and this was a
19 construction company's office where the Dick Pond
20 building is now, and we had the McKornack Oil
21 tanks out here.

22 So this is industrial use of the past.
23 Well, we've gone beyond that. 31 went through
24 there in '62, so we've got a whole new ball game,

1 but just to show how things change.

2 Colonial, my grandfather -- we have been
3 involved since 1917 when he bought half a block
4 there. So needless to say, my whole life, guys,
5 we've talked about that quadrant, what happened,
6 what could be. Used to make ice cream, popsicles,
7 all that fun stuff.

8 So anyway, there are different slides.
9 And Russ shared with me prior to what you just
10 saw. So I saw the uses, the floodplain issue, and
11 the hike and bike trails as I call them. So I
12 come to you today to make some ideas as a property
13 owner. As Mr. Funke said in his minutes -- I saw
14 the last comments -- it ought to be inviting for a
15 developer. Right? Okay. Good. Well, I'd say
16 so, too.

17 I'm not necessarily -- I'm a property owner,
18 not a developer. I don't have any incentive to do
19 something, but if something should happen, somebody
20 could make an offer.

21 After hearing all the comments -- and you
22 guys have got a lot there; Russ has done a lot of
23 work -- it's still variables. Parking lot could
24 double story, could be filled in, could be a

1 floodplain. Anyway, I'm going to share with you
2 some ideas tonight, specifically my ideas, and you
3 can shoot the messenger because I'm the messenger.

4 Anyway, just for transparency, this is a
5 map showing who owns what. So the red is the
6 parking lots that the City owns, and the black is
7 what my family and I own. So just to show you,
8 there's a very substantial interest in this whole
9 thing. All right? If you go forward with this,
10 my great grandkids would have shoes, and we'll
11 have a good investment.

12 So just to let you know what that is, I
13 own the Dick Pond building, the half a block where
14 Taste of Himalayas is, good Indian food, Tony's
15 for Italian, as well as you see what's in the
16 area, and we've got some homes that are rented.

17 So anyway, that's why I'm interested,
18 that's why I'm here today. I would have been here
19 last week, but my wife took me on a tour of
20 Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and that was
21 a good time. Thanks, Chris.

22 MRS. ANDERSON: I knew it would be my
23 fault, just wondering when.

24 MR. ANDERSON: So I've got a copy for

1 everyone. Don't blame Russ for what I'm showing
2 because this is all my work if you like it or
3 don't like it.

4 All right. So the color coding goes,
5 first off, the red is the parking lots that the
6 City owns. And based on a comment that you've
7 said here, these parking lots are basically used
8 to support Main Street, not to support this area.

9 If this is supposed to be redeveloped, my
10 opinion is you need more parking to support these
11 big mix areas, additional parking. You can't just
12 say -- like 1st Street, you've got a five-story
13 building, you do more -- well, at some point you
14 might run out of parking on 1st Street, but I'm
15 not going to say that.

16 So the other big thing -- and this was
17 brought up I think in your discussions -- if you
18 come into town on 31, you come right down the
19 road, you're looking at the river straight ahead,
20 you see the windy motions twirling, and then you
21 run into Carroll Tower that's right on the road.
22 If you look to the west, to the right as you're
23 coming south; you see the businesses there.

24 Those are my tenants that would like --

1 Breadsmith would like to have you know that
2 Breadsmith is there if you're going on 31. If you
3 consider a multideck parking lot there, the value
4 of the retail on 3rd Street disappears. It just
5 doesn't work. Plus -- and the same with the
6 restaurants and everything that are looking for
7 exposure there, and my building that has Dick Pond
8 and everything, that's exposure on 31, traditional
9 retail-type exposure.

10 Also, keeping that open on street level as
11 it is right now, you've got a chance for landscaping,
12 make it look nice. It's a nice open area in
13 St. Charles. If you consider a deck for that
14 parking lot on the corner of 31 and State, it will
15 block off anything on Third, and a deck on a main
16 highway looks ugly in my opinion. So I'll just
17 give you my opinions. You guys decide what you
18 want to do.

19 So if that parking lot is really as this
20 picture shows it full, a lot of daytime people, in
21 the evenings, Saturday nights and stuff the whole
22 area is full with supporting Main Street, as I said.

23 So then the deck parking that I presented
24 an idea is that -- and you had this in your

1 discussion, too -- State, 31, and Cedar, you
2 currently have the VFW parking lot. The Drew Martin
3 parking lot, that can be double-decked. You could
4 have an entrance coming off of State Street. That
5 would give parking that would then be needed to
6 develop what I'm calling mix here. Mixed use is
7 what was on your plan.

8 If you don't do the deck parking there,
9 you can't expect that this thing is going to end
10 up being full of retail and offices or whatever is
11 supposed to happen at the time. You need the
12 double deck happening.

13 So then what I show is the mix, the bigger --
14 the bigger rectangle is the current half a block
15 that my grandfather bought could become -- if you
16 want a pretty picture idea, think of the newest
17 building going up on State Street -- excuse me --
18 1st Street. Retail first, apartments up two,
19 three, four, whatever heights are allowed. It
20 could be sitting right there, another one.

21 But if there's parking underneath, bedrock
22 is only down 6 feet, and I think the people living
23 in the apartments expect a parking lot underneath
24 their building, covered parking. So could be

1 developed but also the retail or offices would be
2 supported by the double deck and the VFW lot.

3 The box marked "Mix" on the north side of
4 State Street could become another property. It
5 could become a mixed use of retail, offices,
6 depends on the market and what somebody wants to
7 develop. That's partially in a floodplain, and
8 the other part of the floodplain, as Russ pointed
9 out in his report to you guys, it's expensive to
10 raise land and expensive to dig a hole to
11 compensate -- what's the word, Russ?

12 MR. COLBY: Compensatory storage.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Compensatory storage. To
14 do that takes something, but the parking lot might
15 flood, could be -- it's a little field behind,
16 could become lowered, could become a place for
17 compensatory storage on-site to build a smaller
18 mix building.

19 The spirit of the city supporting
20 buildings, the "P" that's right opposite towards
21 the river could be developed into a parking lot.
22 The City is supplying parking. They buy that,
23 makes it incentive to build the mixed building.
24 And that takes in -- yeah, the flood, the mix.

1 The other part of the lot marked "P" is a
2 green. Here is an opportunity for some softening
3 of everything. That is an angle that is not
4 square, not good for parking lot. You could have
5 a nice little triangular park there, and that
6 could be the orientation or the origination of a
7 trail. I call it a bike trail because the people
8 could walk through the middle, but a bike trail
9 that's 6, 8 feet wide going all the way up into
10 the bike trail on this side, but it could start as
11 a bigger park.

12 And the other thing that happened that's
13 before everybody's time here, but I don't know how
14 the Charleston Center building ever got built
15 without a -- I have another one here -- oh, it's
16 too late. I have to share with the audience. I
17 don't know how there's no sidewalk there. It
18 never was required, I guess.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Which one?

20 MR. ANDERSON: In front Charleston Center
21 right here where I wrote "Bike trail, wide."
22 Right now they're driving on his road in the
23 parking lot. So no sidewalk ever happened there.
24 So nobody is around right now to know why but it

1 didn't happen, should have happened.

2 So at some point maybe the City has to buy
3 parking, create a walkway to create a sidewalk.
4 And you can do the same thing with the property I
5 own down here. Because, as you can see, the
6 configuration is not maximum parking lot parking
7 there. There's an angle that could do it. We
8 don't want to lose any parking.

9 And then I marked the green along the river
10 from end of State Street going up past Salerno's.
11 And my dad and I sold the property to Salerno's
12 back in the '80s, and we put in a 10-foot easement
13 along the water. It is recorded; they know that.
14 But Salerno bought 100 feet from the railroad
15 which was available, but he never put in his 10 feet
16 going through. So the north part of his parking
17 lot there isn't any easement, so you're going to
18 have to arbitrate to go through. And yes, you get
19 to the other side and stairs to get up or
20 something. It would just be a nice river walk.

21 All right. The other part that's here in
22 pink with an "R" that says "multi-family," on the
23 plan that you've got up there is yellow, I guess,
24 "existing houses," I think in the long term --

1 decide whenever long term is -- those five houses
2 are sitting there surrounded by parking lot,
3 industry, and it's an isolated deal. If you want
4 to add population to the downtown, that could be
5 multifamily apartments, townhouses, whatever,
6 which would tie in real nice to finishing this
7 off. I know we're preservation stuff, but still
8 it's out of place, and maybe it could still be
9 considered.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom, what are the
11 buildings just to the north of that?

12 MR. ANDERSON: North of?

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Of the multifamily.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Well, one on 4th Street
15 used to be Wilson Printing, and it's now a co-op
16 shared work space place.

17 That's the other thing I put in there was
18 that double line because in your plan it talked
19 about a connection. Well, I don't know if you want
20 a connection from one or the other. It's on one
21 of the pictures; you drew a white line through it.

22 When I bought the property that Dick Pond
23 is in right now, it comes with an easement to get
24 to 4th Street. Because when the building was

1 first built, Mr. Soderquist, that's the way they
2 came to his property, and he has an easement
3 through there. I guess if those barricades -- I
4 guess I could take him to court and say move the
5 barricades because I have an easement, I want to
6 drive through there.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Where are the
8 barricades at?

9 MR. ANDERSON: About halfway up there.
10 That was a comment that says that all the
11 Charleston Center and all that can't get through
12 to 4th Street. It would be a nice connection.

13 They're cement like construction barriers
14 that are just plunked there. Years past it used
15 to be open, and the guys left potholes that were
16 big enough that nobody wanted to drive through,
17 partly because why maintain it for everybody else.

18 So an idea for the City, if you said, hey,
19 with some agreement you could maintain something,
20 it would flow better. I don't know. But how
21 those people would participate is to be decided.

22 So I'm presenting this as ideas,
23 development ideas in this lot area that I think
24 can be a lot more specific than possible stuff

1 that's up there. There's a lot of "to be
2 determined." I think the mission would be for you
3 to keep considering something and say, "Yes, we
4 want to do this."

5 The big thing I'd say is that 1st Street
6 parking lot -- excuse me -- 2nd Street parking lot
7 on 31. To say that it's going to become multi-
8 story and then somebody doesn't even want to rent
9 from me the restaurants because it's blocked off
10 from 31.

11 But it comes up all the time, guys, prior
12 to you guys sitting there, "Oh, we could always
13 build more parking there." Now, you've got the
14 opportunity of more parking at the VFW, which I've
15 already stated, and then you could keep 31 open
16 all the way down until you get to Carroll Tower,
17 and then it gets narrow going to Main Street.

18 So comments, ideas for me? I'm presenting
19 it to you.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a question for
21 you. If you were going north on 3rd Street, you
22 run into the house right there.

23 MR. ANDERSON: That's my house, beautiful
24 house.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You own that, also?

2 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. It's on the plan.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It wasn't included in
4 the --

5 MR. ANDERSON: I know because you guys
6 called it historic, and if I tore it down,
7 Mr. Pretz wouldn't forgive me. It's a beautiful
8 house.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: It's a fine example of
10 architecture, and from the Preservation Commission,
11 they wanted to express some -- not sympathy but
12 consideration that it could be preserved, but it
13 is not a historical home. Similar to the police
14 station on the other side, so kind of the same idea.

15 The two that was of the most concern were
16 the two stone houses, Johnson Statuary. Those are
17 significant in comparison to the other. It's a
18 downgrade.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm just curious -- I
20 don't know if you've made any consideration for
21 any potential extension of 3rd Street to the north
22 if the opportunity presented itself to acquire
23 some of the property. I think that would help
24 with mixed use development if there was a street

1 that went through there.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Well, right now they come
3 right through and come through there anyway. It's
4 just only the people that are there.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Well, right now technically --
7 not technically -- practically they drive in front
8 of Dick Pond to get to that end anyway.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I know. I do, too.

10 MR. ANDERSON: We've been trying to put up
11 some "No Through" street signs.

12 MEMBER FUNKE: I made that comment at the
13 last meeting about how we've got to make this area
14 conducive to developers, make it exciting. I
15 think right now we have a great opportunity to
16 look at what is the big picture.

17 I think right now we're looking at this
18 from a detailed perspective. We're looking at
19 well, the parking deck can go here, mixed use can
20 go here. But in my mind I think it's more of a
21 big picture where you're creating -- you know, we
22 really don't have Main Street because Main Street
23 is now taken over by cars, automobiles that are
24 going very fast, and it's hard to create that idea

1 of Main Street because Main Streets are about
2 pedestrians, about people moving back and forth,
3 it's about retail. How do we create that?

4 I talked about Cedar Street is a great
5 opportunity for creating a new Main Street. We've
6 got great amenities in St. Charles. We have our
7 parks; we have the river; we have these great bike
8 paths that kind of stop short when they get to the
9 downtown. I ride bikes with my kids all the time,
10 and I find every time I hit the downtown I'm
11 always worried about where my kids are, if they're
12 going to get hit by a car.

13 So do we look at the big picture, create
14 these connections from our parks? Our parks are
15 our assets. We have a great park here on the west
16 side. So how do we connect that to the river, how
17 do we create that Main Street, that feeling, that
18 big picture to I think entice developers that this
19 is our idea, this is our master plan for the
20 future, we're doing this, and this is what it
21 could look like.

22 We've got to create the density. I think
23 when you start taking lots that are sparse and
24 sporadic all over the place, you're not going to

1 create that continuity and connecting one space to
2 another.

3 I think by creating a Main Street atmosphere
4 with the density and hiding parking -- I think
5 creating parking decks, it's going to kill that
6 idea of the pedestrian. When you're walking, you
7 want to window shop; you want to see things in
8 stores. When you're walking by a parking deck
9 that's four or five stories, I think that it
10 doesn't create that continuity from one street to
11 the other, which in turn doesn't promote in my
12 mind retail development, pedestrian feel, or the
13 density that I think that we need in this area.
14 You need density.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Well, I'd agree with you
16 except these parking lots support Main Street, not
17 this area.

18 MEMBER FUNKE: You can still do parking
19 and still create retail. I wouldn't want to see a
20 parking deck that's right abutting up to Cedar
21 Street.

22 MRS. ANDERSON: There's parking there
23 anyway now.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: The retail is not continuous

1 in that area.

2 MR. ANDERSON: I have trouble renting to
3 any retail. You've got another part of 1st Street
4 coming south of Illinois that I think is going to be
5 retail. So the City has got a lot of opportunity
6 to do your shopping retail on 1st going one more
7 block towards the Blue Goose on the west side that
8 isn't finished yet.

9 Is that right? Isn't that planned to be a
10 building?

11 MS. TUNGARE: That is correct.

12 MR. ANDERSON: So I think your Main Street
13 is the 1st Street, and this is just support before
14 Main, and we're not going to create that the
15 atmosphere I don't think.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

17 MEMBER PRETZ: I don't have a question,
18 but I'd say, you know, you do have a vested
19 interest in that area, and I was just going to say
20 I appreciate your time in really taking a look at
21 a little more micro-view of the area and coming up
22 with some ideas like this. I mean, to me it's
23 well thought out.

24 MR. ANDERSON: I've been thinking about it

1 since 1917 -- almost.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: I was going to say I do
3 like that idea of 3rd Street continuing through,
4 though. I think based on taking a look at this
5 very specific that Mr. Anderson presented here, I
6 think that makes sense going through, to bring
7 that traffic up and down.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It would help to address
9 the issue of people going through Dick Pond's
10 parking lot.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Well, it would pull people
12 off of 31, but it's only to those, and then how
13 you would -- well, the other development
14 opportunity -- Grove's building is not going to
15 move I don't think, but the little -- Joe Salas'
16 building, which is right at the end, if you decide
17 to put some development there. But your street is
18 feeding one piece of property. So if you'd deem
19 that a worthy investment, I don't know.

20 The other thing, what I was proposing is
21 that's where you could put your flood water and
22 hold it. As soon as you eliminate that and try to
23 build on the floodplain, then you're going to have
24 to buy something downstream or somewhere. I don't

1 know how you'd do that exactly.

2 But what has not been discussed here before
3 is multifamily in the area, which I think is getting
4 your density downtown. And that could be apartment
5 buildings, I don't know, but it seems like you
6 don't want to just leave that individual houses
7 that were built in 1910 or '20 or '30 long term.

8 MR. RABCHUK: To Jeff's point about taking
9 a look at the bigger picture, the other thing,
10 just off this map the Allied Plastics property is
11 only two blocks away. That's been sitting vacant
12 for a long, long time, and it's sitting vacant
13 because there's no access to it.

14 The owner of that property now I know is
15 very desirous of selling it and having somebody
16 else develop it because they can't figure out a
17 way to develop it. It has a hazardous waste
18 issue, and I know there's some other issues
19 involved, but they're trying to liquidate it.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That kind of supports
21 the thought of having an access between 31 and
22 4th north of State, which would be able to bring --

23 MR. RABCHUK: You're still two blocks
24 away. The east side of the Allied Plastics

1 property is 6th, I think, so we've got some
2 residential in between there.

3 But I think it speaks to Jeff's point about
4 if you really look at the bigger picture, this is
5 a great opportunity for a developer to put a whole
6 bunch of things together, some retail, some either
7 single-family and/or mixed, you know,
8 residential/retail kind of stuff.

9 Because I think that's about 20 or 30 acres,
10 isn't that, Russ, the Allied property?

11 MR. COLBY: 26 acres, I think.

12 MR. RABCHUK: That's a pretty good-sized
13 piece.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It goes down as far as
15 5th Street?

16 MS. HAWK: It's 6th.

17 MR. RABCHUK: 6th and all the way over
18 until about 9th, I think. And especially if --
19 you know, the park district has been awarded a
20 grant, and they're in negotiations to acquire that
21 railroad right-of-way between the river and Randall.

22 So if that were to develop into something
23 like a 606 Trail sort of a thing, having access to
24 all that from a pedestrian and cycle standpoint,

1 if there's a way to get vehicular traffic -- I
2 mean, 7th Street is the direct route into it,
3 which has a light on 64, on Main Street. But it
4 would be -- you'd almost have to, like Tom has
5 indicated here putting that access through.

6 If you could get that all the way through
7 to that property somehow, that would make a big
8 difference. Then you're talking quite a
9 population growth which would support substantial
10 retail, restaurants, all kinds of stuff.

11 MR. ANDERSON: I just had a thought. I'm
12 looking at the top of the picture above the
13 Charleston Center and the old railroad property.
14 Maybe that's where a road is supposed to be
15 considered. Shorter distance and it's unimproved --

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Behind Charleston
17 Center?

18 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, behind -- up where it
19 says "Approved opportunities," put a road up
20 there. Then you're not disrupting the current
21 retail setting and --

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Maybe that would open up
23 to Mark Street, which goes from 6th over to 5th or
24 4th, I think.

1 MR. ANDERSON: What John just brought up
2 is -- my opinion is part of this discussion is
3 because the City has surplus property where the
4 police station is. Discuss both sides, but maybe
5 this side is supposed to go further west somehow.
6 Tie it together before you make any decisions or
7 something and just put something in.

8 MEMBER BECKER: I have a question. Maybe
9 staff could refresh my memory since I was not here
10 last week; I apologize.

11 When we're thinking about providing
12 parking for potential mixed uses, and in the same
13 packet of information we have the potential for
14 the riverfront development, was there a place for
15 that parking to go?

16 Because it doesn't seem like that kind of
17 demand would be taken care of in this kind of a
18 scenario. Or we're not supposed to be talking
19 about providing for that?

20 MR. COLBY: There likely would be a need
21 if the project were to happen for there to be some
22 additional parking. The majority of the parking
23 in this quadrant south of State Street is all
24 public shared parking. So it's likely that it

1 would need to be accommodated in the public
2 parking supply in that area.

3 There's private parking primarily north of
4 State Street. So that would increase the amount
5 that would need to be accommodated potentially in
6 these parking deck locations we talked about.

7 MEMBER BECKER: We're talking about a
8 multilevel deck to serve additional mixed uses in
9 this northwest quadrant and supplement parking for
10 the Main Street businesses. It doesn't seem to me
11 that that would be adequate with just one surface
12 lot and a couple other areas.

13 So it seems like there might be a need for
14 more parking if that scenario plays out in this
15 area anyway. That's just my observation.

16 MR. ANDERSON: What was in your report, I
17 think Russ made the comment the lot directly south
18 of Salerno's, Russ indicated -- or the people were
19 saying it ought to be open, green, or parking.

20 Well, the comment was the parking there
21 could support the Active River Project if it
22 happened, which would be right on the river right
23 where you need 30 parking stalls, and then you
24 move across 31 and do some additional parking.

1 So that lot for sure stays parking at this
2 point, not thinking it's supposed to be green
3 space on the river. Is that partly what you're
4 saying?

5 MEMBER BECKER: I'm thinking that more
6 than 30 would be needed, and I would think that it
7 might be requiring more than one multilevel
8 parking deck, but that's to be seen with whatever
9 demand studies you do that would accommodate all
10 of them.

11 MR. RABCHUK: One additional comment, just
12 something to think about is instead of a potential
13 traffic light at State Street is if there was a
14 traffic light up at this -- the potential of a new
15 access drive up there that would cross directly
16 into Salerno's parking lot.

17 And then relative to parking along the
18 river, an ideal spot, in my opinion, for a
19 multideck parking would be between Salerno's and
20 the railroad bridge to the north. And then if the
21 City say, for example, would build that and take
22 ownership of the parking lot on the south side of
23 Salerno's, that would give you extra parking along
24 the riverfront.

1 That would open up -- and put 3rd Street
2 all the way through to that new street. That
3 really opens up that whole area for a whole bunch
4 of stuff, and that makes the parking decks that
5 Tom has talked about on the VFW and everything
6 much more accessible.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, sir?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a quick question.
9 Is it the intent that the multifamily areas and
10 the mixed use areas would have parking
11 incorporated into each of those buildings for
12 those buildings?

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. So we've identified on
14 this land use map -- the mixed use areas are assumed
15 to include parking for those uses and potentially
16 the public parking, as well, recognizing there was
17 some discussion about wanting to try and keep the
18 parking concealed within the development so that
19 it's not directly right along the street frontage.
20 So how it would actually be configured, it would
21 need to be designed to determine what exactly that
22 would look like, but the assumption is the mixed
23 use areas contain parking.

24 The only areas that were sort of undetermined

1 were these areas marked as "TBD" on here, which are
2 the existing parking lots that are in the floodplain,
3 which I think is what Tom was mentioning.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So any of the decks that
5 would accommodate the shoppers on Main Street, the
6 bars, the Active River Project, and any other
7 strip shopping that is ultimately developed. So
8 in reality the mixed use and the multifamily are
9 not hindering parking because they have their own
10 accommodating, right?

11 MR. COLBY: It's assumed it's going to be
12 accommodated within the development.

13 MR. ANDERSON: That's for residential
14 units, right? The retail -- on 1st Street there's
15 no -- except for the deck, the residents park
16 underground in their building covered, which you'd
17 do in a mixed-use building. But the retail people
18 are mixed in with everybody else, and that would
19 have to be somewhere.

20 MR. COLBY: If there was structured
21 parking incorporated into the project, there could
22 be some portion that's public and some that's
23 private, under-building parking that's similar to
24 the 1st Street Phase III project exists where the

1 public parking is separate from the private parking
2 under the building.

3 So the assumption is it would be
4 incorporated into the building in some manner or
5 into the development in some manner, but we're
6 really just identifying the land use, and when
7 we're saying mixed use, we're also talking about
8 parking in those locations.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

10 MR. ANDERSON: I guess reference to the
11 floodplain, my building that Dick Pond is in is in
12 the middle of it. I pay \$8,000 a year in flood
13 insurance, guys. Anyway, it's there, but I don't
14 think you're proposing that it gets razed or
15 removed to satisfy the flood --

16 MR. RABCHUK: If the Active River goes
17 through, then you're not in the floodplain anymore.

18 MR. ANDERSON: Well, yeah, if the Active
19 River goes in, then there's not an issue of
20 floodplain.

21 MR. COLBY: Well, there still is some.
22 It's relocated. So there still is some floodplain
23 to be dealt with, but that would be reduced.

24 MR. ANDERSON: That would still be below

1 the water? The water would go that high even when
2 it's reduced to begin with?

3 MR. COLBY: This is just based on modeling
4 that was done. This may not be exactly accurate,
5 but it gives you an idea of the magnitude of the
6 area potentially it could be reduced to, and what
7 this shows is that there could still be some
8 flooding that could occur along the State Street
9 Creek behind the building.

10 MR. ANDERSON: I thought John's project
11 would save me 8,000 a year. It's not going to
12 save me anything -- that's just a joke.

13 MR. RABCHUK: I thought that the original
14 study pulled the floodplain up the other side of
15 31 between 31 and the river.

16 MR. COLBY: I don't think so. But what we
17 did discuss potentially is that if there could be
18 additional storage added within the project, that
19 potentially you could compensate for some of that
20 area at least based on the modeling.

21 MR. RABCHUK: Because on the drawings that
22 are the -- it doesn't matter which one of the
23 alternatives, on the west side the river the
24 floodplain is pulled inside of 31 on all

1 three drawings.

2 MR. COLBY: Does it show a floodplain?

3 MR. RABCHUK: It's that dotted line there.

4 MR. COLBY: I think that's just the
5 existing water line, the dotted line. So I think
6 it pulls the shoreline --

7 MR. RABCHUK: It gives a lot more shoreline.

8 MR. COLBY: But I think the floodplain not
9 completely.

10 MS. TUNGARE: That's correct.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
12 questions, comments?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. ANDERSON: Well, let me ask if something
15 tonight is going to go to City Council to approve?
16 It's still got variables all over the place.

17 MS. TUNGARE: Procedurally the Plan
18 Commission will be making a recommendation.
19 They're a recommending body, so they'll be making
20 a recommendation to a planning and development
21 committee. It doesn't go directly to City Council.
22 It will be going to planning and development
23 committee next Monday night.

24 Planning and development committee will

1 consider all of this information. They will
2 consider the Plan Commission recommendation,
3 members of the public will again get a chance to
4 present their information, and then the planning
5 and development committee will make a
6 recommendation to the City Council.

7 The planning and development committee is
8 all 10 Council members. It's a committee of the
9 whole, but that's where they will deliberate this
10 matter, as well.

11 MR. ANDERSON: That's next Monday?

12 MS. TUNGARE: That is correct.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: I just would like
14 to say I think you came up with some great ideas.
15 I personally do like the idea of a multilevel
16 parking deck where you said. I think that makes a
17 lot of sense given the businesses around that area.

18 And I do agree with you, also, that from
19 a -- coming into town from the north and seeing a
20 multilevel parking deck wouldn't really be
21 desirable in that first parking lot that you
22 mentioned. You do need to see the businesses; you
23 do need to see the signs. Coming from a retail and
24 business background, I 100 percent agree with you.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

2 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: So I think you came
3 up with some really good ideas.

4 MR. ANDERSON: I don't know, can I make a
5 motion that some ideas of this you guys consider
6 and something gets decided specifically?
7 Otherwise, you still could have a multideck on 31.

8 Anyway, if it's going to stay that way,
9 it's been that way for years. Before you were all
10 here everybody always said, "Oh, we could always
11 have a deck here."

12 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Well, I wanted to
13 go on record saying that, so it's all being
14 recorded.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What are the timing
16 issues of City Council considering this? Is it --
17 would it be an undue difficulty to bring this back
18 before Plan Commission for further discussion?

19 MS. TUNGARE: Well, at this point we already
20 have it on the agenda for the planning and
21 development committee next Monday night. So we
22 will begin that process with the planning and
23 development committee.

24 As for the Plan Commission, there's a lot

1 of information to share with the planning and
2 development committee. So I do not anticipate
3 that it will get wrapped up in one meeting at
4 planning and development committee. I anticipate
5 that there will probably be a couple of meetings
6 where they will be discussing this matter.

7 So if the Plan Commission -- so here is an
8 option. This is, again, an exercise. So we're
9 not anticipating that we will be developing actual
10 plans. What we're talking about is conceptual
11 land uses.

12 So one of the ways the Plan Commission
13 could choose to advance this forward is by making
14 a recommendation with certain conditions or criteria
15 they would like the planning and development
16 committee to consider. So that's one option.

17 Another option is you could continue
18 deliberation to an upcoming Plan Commission meeting,
19 which at this point if you had to bring it back,
20 it probably won't be until October. It would
21 probably be at the first meeting in October is the
22 earliest we would bring it back.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Would there be difficulty
24 if -- because there's an east and a west side, and

1 my general impression is that the east side, we've
2 been through that, there weren't any additional
3 questions or anything like that, that that can go
4 forward.

5 Would there be difficulty if we just kind
6 of made a motion to send the east stuff and then
7 hold back on the west and then finish where we can
8 concentrate a little bit more on what's presented
9 here and then have our discussion even if it's in
10 October? Would that run into problems with --

11 MS. TUNGARE: I think that would work.
12 That would make sense. Because the east and the
13 west sides, although they are related, they are
14 unrelated in many ways, too.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are we thinking that we
16 won't be able to get to it on September 17th because
17 of other items we're discussing?

18 What I would suggest, if somebody is
19 inclined to make a motion, would be to have this
20 on September 17th as a -- not as a thorough
21 discussion but just as a status type of update for
22 any discussions that are going on and then have it
23 be on for action in the October meeting. Does
24 that make sense?

1 MS. TUNGARE: It does. We do have some
2 staffing issues for September 17th, as well.
3 Neither Russ or I will be able to be at the Plan
4 Commission meeting on September 17th due to other
5 commitments. So we won't be able to be here at
6 the meeting.

7 We do have an item that -- we will have
8 the general amendment to the zoning ordinance for
9 recreational cannabis that night, so we anticipate
10 some interest in that.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: I had a question.

12 There were some great studies that were
13 done for the Charlestowne Mall. I think there was
14 great master plans that were completed for that.
15 When does that take place in this -- is this the
16 initial concept phase, and then we take it to
17 another level by doing similar studies in the area
18 similar to what was completed at Charlestowne Mall?
19 I know there were some master plan studies that
20 were completed showing traffic relationships,
21 connections from east to west.

22 MS. TUNGARE: Some visualizing vignettes?

23 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes, and pedestrian
24 patterns, public spaces, all those things.

1 I think -- in my mind from an architect's
2 standpoint, I think we need to think about those
3 items before we make an approval and just say,
4 hey, this is where mixed use is going to go, and
5 this is where parking is going to go. I think we
6 need to look at the big picture and figure out the
7 connections from east to west and figure out all
8 these connections that we have within our city,
9 the downtown.

10 MS. TUNGARE: So this was the scope that
11 was authorized by City Council. So what you just
12 described is what we would call Phase II of this
13 process, and what we're hoping is that once this
14 advances forward to a planning and development
15 committee of the City Council, if that's the
16 direction we receive from them, then that's what
17 we would advance forward with would be development
18 of those plans, and there may need to be some
19 appropriation of funding if we need to hire some
20 consultants to assist us in that work. At this
21 point there's been no appropriation of funding for
22 that scope.

23 MEMBER FUNKE: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So at this

1 point I'll entertain a motion or motions. If you
2 want to take it one at a time, I'll recommend -- or
3 I will accept a motion for the east side study area.

4 Is there anyone that wants to recommend --
5 recommending approval to the planning and
6 development committee?

7 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: I will recommend
8 approval for the comprehensive plan update for
9 downtown for the east side study area.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: And I'll second it.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
12 seconded. Discussion on that motion?

13 MEMBER BECKER: So that would be which of
14 the diagrams are we talking about?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: For the east side.

16 MEMBER FUNKE: There were two or three,
17 weren't there?

18 MEMBER BECKER: Which one of these are we --
19 or is it just the one?

20 MR. COLBY: Just to clarify, there's a lot
21 of background information that's in these
22 presentations, but it would be really what's
23 contained on the last two exhibits, the one that
24 shows the land use, the one that shows the

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Conducted on September 3, 2019

47

1 improvement opportunities, and then the slide that
2 has the draft plan recommendations. The rest of
3 it is just supporting information.

4 MEMBER BECKER: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any further
6 discussion on that motion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Becker.

9 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Funke.

11 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin Purdy.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Melton.

17 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace, yes.

19 And I will entertain a motion regarding
20 the west side study area.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Is that just a tabling?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We would continue it.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: I would make a motion to
24 continue the comprehensive plan update for

1 downtown, the west side study area.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I guess we'll say
3 to the October 8th meeting. We could bring it up
4 as far as status goes informally at the next
5 meeting. So we'll be continuing it to October 8th.

6 MR. COLBY: Is there any specific
7 direction that the Commission would provide about
8 what additional information you'd want provided
9 that day? Would you like us to just take into
10 consideration the comments that have been provided?

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think one of the
12 things would be the feasibility of a pass-through,
13 east/west pass-through north of State Street, as
14 well as the parking needs, you know, relative
15 parking needs, be it on the east side of this area
16 versus the west side.

17 Anything else? Well, I know the other
18 thing that was discussed was whether it would be
19 advisable to extend -- I think this is more of a
20 major undertaking, but to extend the study area to
21 the west at least for the purpose of investigating
22 connections.

23 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: I agree.

24 MEMBER FUNKE: I agree.

Transcript of Comprehensive Plan Update for Downtown
Conducted on September 3, 2019

49

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry; there was a
2 motion but was there a second?

3 MEMBER MELTON: I'll second.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any discussion?
5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Becker.

7 MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Funke.

9 MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin Purdy.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN PURDY: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Melton.

15 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace, yes.

17 All right. That passes and that concludes
18 Item No. 6 on your agenda.

19 Item 7, any additional business?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: None. Okay.

22 Item 8, we've all seen the weekly
23 development report. It's available online, as well.

24 Item 9, we had already discussed the

1 upcoming meetings.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm not going to be here on
3 the 17th.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any public
5 comment?

6 MEMBER BECKER: I just have a question
7 about the upcoming agenda item on the 17th. It
8 will be a public hearing for a zoning amendment?

9 MS. TUNGARE: That's correct.

10 MEMBER BECKER: And so the publication
11 will be just citywide for general knowledge?
12 Okay. Got it.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion to
16 adjourn?

17 MEMBER FUNKE: I'll make that motion.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

19 MEMBER BECKER: I'll second.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded.

21 All in favor.

22 (Ayes heard.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
2 St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at
3 8:05 p.m. Thank you everyone.

4 (Off the record at 8:05 p.m.)

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

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 10th day of September, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois