
From: Robert Carter <carterbobcat@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 4:58 PM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts

I have some negative feelings regarding this proposal. My name is Robert E. Carter. I live one block east of this proposal @ 217 So. 3rd Av.

I realize this contractor is buying up & rehabbing many buildings on the East side of STC. This is the first one done directly in contact with an older established neighborhood. The following deeply concerns me:

1.) Height

A 5 story structure next to many 2 story homes will totally dwarf this neighborhood.

There was a Shadow Study done with no results available to me. I am certain this study showed just how a tall structure like this will shade the neighborhood.

2.) Parking

This is already @ a premium. With the lovely Arcada doing so well, there are nights that up to 4th Av. is full as are the City Garage.

43 units will not help this problem @ all.

3.) Closing of Indiana Av.

As a retired Public Works employee, I see no good reason to give a useable section of road to any private business for their own investment. School buses as well as all types of vehicles use this to merge with Riverside Av. Giving away public access for the sole use of a business just seems very wrong to me.

4.) Green Space

The idea of the City Officials giving this park land to a business for their own profit really bothers me. This is open public land & should not be a bargaining chip for a private party to use as an investment.

In closing, I wish to thank you for your time.

I do hope you read & think about my comments.

Building & growth seem to be inevitable. I do hope you will keep our neighborhood in the forefront of these deliberations.

Thank you,
Robert E. Carter

Sent from my iPhone

From: janet@wilsontravelandcruise.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 11:07 AM
To: CD
Subject: River East Apartments proposal

Importance: High

Hello,

I own the property at 203 Illinois Ave and operate Wilson Travel & Cruise which is located across the street from the proposed project. As expressed in my earlier letter to the city council, I agree the area should be developed but have concerns about the scope of this particular project.

They are as follows:

- ~ The height of the building should conform with the current rules and I believe this one is higher
- ~ The density of 43 apartments is WAY too high – the area and narrow street space cannot handle that many people
- ~ Parking for the tenants is insufficient as some units will have two vehicles and guests will also come and need to park
- ~ If they are still planning for retail on the lower level there is no parking for that
- ~ Traffic increase will negatively impact existing businesses in the area
- ~ Street property should not be ceded to the project, nor closed off

I appreciate your consideration of these concerns. Please work with the developer to adjust his proposal to make it a better fit for the city and the neighborhood.

Thank You,

Janet

Janet K Foster, President
Wilson Travel & Cruise
203 Illinois Ave
St Charles, IL 60174
Phone - 630-377-3700
janet@wilsontravelandcruise.com
www.wilsontravelandcruise.com

From: Catherine Collins <collins_cathy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2022 10:52 AM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts

Dear Mr. Colby,

I am disappointed with the revised plans for the River East Lofts. I am a St. Charles resident and I am disappointed with the number of multi-story buildings being allowed along the river. It is the river and the public spaces which make St. Charles the city it is and a desirable place for individuals to visit, live, and raise families. First Street is an example of how the height of buildings can destroy the look of the downtown. First Street is a dark, foreboding street, with the buildings blocking views of the river and the Baker Hotel, a prominent historical landmark. The City should not allow such large buildings, as is proposed, along the adjacent river corridor. This location calls for a low-profile building with architectural significance as it is a prime location for individuals enjoying the beauty of downtown and the natural spaces along the river.

From: Suzi Myers <suzibraunmyers19@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 12:56 PM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts

I am a resident of STC, having lived on the corner of Indiana and S 3rd Avenues for the last 36 years. I am not pleased with the proposed River East Lofts for the following reasons:

The building does not fit into the historical neighborhood...it is too tall, the architecture is not appropriate.

The effect on the neighborhood's property value, in my mind, will not increase the value. The Heritage Square complex that is up Indiana by Lincoln School DID increase my property value. The buildings were appropriate in architecture and ample parking was available without infringing on neighborhood parking.

The building will severely limit the neighborhood's view of the river, which is a reason why so many of us live here.

5 stories not only will cause huge shadow effects, break building codes, but also is simply not appropriate.

I would greatly appreciate your nixing this proposal. As we said before, we are not totally against a new building, but this "new"

Proposal simply isn't new...the changes are minuscule.

An architecturally appropriate building, adhering to city codes, and something that will increase, not decrease our neighborhood's beauty and charm would be applauded by the neighborhood.

Thanks for listening,

Suzi Myers
303 S 3rd Ave
STC
630-334-6358

From: Cathleen Kershner <kersh@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 2:07 PM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts

St. Charles Planning Commission –

We have just received and reviewed the new proposal for the River East Lofts and want to voice some of our thoughts. While we are grateful that this property is receiving some much-needed attention, and that some minor changes have been made to the plan, we feel this project does not represent the warm, welcoming gateway that our great city deserves.

According to the information we received in our packet, the Plan Commission shall not favorably recommend Special Use for a PUD unless they make findings that it is in the public interest based on certain criteria. Some of those criteria we address below.

First, this has not been a “collaborative process” among the developers, neighboring property owners and residents. We have never been approached by the developers to make this project desirable for all parties. And because of that, they are proposing an unattractive development that does not look like an integral part of the community. It stands out like a sore thumb, and impedes the river view, which is why many of our neighbors bought their homes here. With that thought in mind, a residential property in our neighborhood cannot exceed 32’ from grade out of respect for the rest of the neighbors, and to avoid exactly that situation. This 55-60’ tall building will most definitely diminish or impair property values and will not be preserving historic neighborhoods nearby. The majority, if not all, of the panel at the July 20, 2021, meeting voiced concerns that this project was either “massive” or “too dense” - just not right for this site. We don’t see anything in this new plan that would change that perception. It is still “massive”, “too dense” and simply out of place.

Secondly, we are very concerned about the traffic and parking situations. With 43 units, there is a potential of 86 more vehicles traveling on Riverside and 2nd Avenues. Add to that the vehicles traveling to and from the retail establishments on the lower level. Some of this traffic will eventually flow to 3rd Avenue also, which is already used as an alternative to Riverside Avenue for buses, landscape trucks with trailers, etc. This really has the potential of changing a neighborhood’s overall “feel” and diminishing one’s property values. The parking for residents of the new development is insufficient, and the developers are relying on existing spaces (some on Second Ave.) to fill the void. These spaces are already being used by the residents that live on 2nd Ave., which leaves people without a place to park at the end of their day. Obviously, these cars will filter onto other residential streets as well, also inconveniencing these residents. Where will residents park when there are events at the Arcada (which is frequently)? The 32-35 spaces in the flat surface parking lot will be full, and the project’s resident’s cars will be lining 2nd, 3rd and probably 4th Avenues. By chance, did any city officials walk 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Avenues to see the parking congestion on these streets during the filming of the movie recently? This was a snapshot of what our streets will look like every night when the project’s residents park on our streets whenever the bars are full or there is a special event downtown. The 32-35 public spaces will be full so they have no other choice. So, what is the solution? Fewer apartments.

While we are in full support of progress, redevelopment, and change, we feel that this plan, as it is now, does not preserve or enhance our downtown neighborhood. No matter what a great idea it is, or how beautiful, if it’s too big for the site, it’s too big and should not be approved. This project has the potential to be a wonderful addition to our city that we could fully support. We would ask that you please request the developer to, yet again, go back to the drawing board to do what you initially asked of them.

We thank you in advance for your consideration –

Bob & Cathi Kershner
316 S. 3rd Avenue
St. Charles, IL 60174

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Dear Plan Commission Members,

Date: 03/17/2022

I am asking you to make a recommendation to the City Council that the proposed River East Lofts project be cut back in size and scope so that the additional parking load and other negative aspects of the proposed development do not adversely affect the current neighborhood residents' property values and quality of life.

The River East Lofts project unchanged will make an already difficult parking situation in the neighborhood dreadful. Currently whenever there is an event downtown, show at the Arcada, and nearly on every weekend our neighborhood streets are filled with parked cars from people attending these events. Where are all of the cars associated with a new 43-unit apartment building going to find spaces when there are not enough spaces already in the area on many evenings and days of the year? If this project were not located in a CB1 zone, the required parking spaces that this proposed building would have to provide is **between 90 and 135 depending on the intended use of the retail space. (17.24.140)** **This project provides a negative one (-1) net effect to the current inventory of parking spaces.** The proposed plan has 52 parking spaces: 28 in the lot and 24 running east of the building and green space. Currently we have 53 spaces in the same area: 37 in the lot, 11 east of the building, and 5 east of the green space. These spaces are regularly used now by residents and customers of the downtown businesses.

In the PUD application it states that this project is in line with the "desired intent" of the Comprehensive Plan. What's not mentioned in the application regarding this site is that the Comprehensive Plan states, "Redevelopment of this site could vary based on the City's ability to address transportation and circulation". Page 91 paragraph Q. Additionally in the Comprehensive Plan on the topic of parking it states, "The City should continue to provide parking strategically in all areas of Downtown, and carefully monitor demand to ensure that both current and future needs are met. **The parking needs of each site should be taken into account as each site is being considered for development.**" Page 89. Additionally on Page 86 of the Comprehensive Plan it directs the city to, "Better manage parking capacity and access throughout Downtown, **especially as new development comes on-line**". Lastly regarding how this project is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the example depicted in the plan as a potential development is a four-story building, not a five-story building.

The facts regarding parking related to the proposed project and this area are:

- The area and neighborhood surrounding the proposed project is already challenged with parking issues regularly.
- The proposed development will result in less parking than we currently have.
- The proposed development will place a large additional load for parking spaces in the area. (90/135)
- The Comprehensive Plan advises the city to monitor and ensure that current and future parking needs are met before each site is developed.

After taking the above facts into consideration, the logical conclusion is that the River East Lofts project does not adequately address current and future parking needs as the Comprehensive Plan instructs the city to ensure. It is also clear to me that this project would result in a large additional flow of cars into our neighborhood streets seeking parking, which will be a constant eyesore, hassle to navigate, and negatively affect the current residents' home property values and quality of life.

The additional parking needs to service this building, up to 135 spaces according to city ordinance 17.24.140, will choke the downtown businesses of needed parking spaces. Who wants to walk four blocks to have a beer at Pollyanna or walk five blocks to have a meal at the Graceful Ordinary? I don't think too many people will want to do that, and that is why the authors of the Comprehensive Plan direct the city to monitor and manage parking especially as new development comes on-line. Page 86. The Comprehensive Plan does not instruct the city to react to parking needs after development occurred and after the harm has been done.

The size of the River East Lofts building will dwarf the nearby residential homes and properties. Who wants to live in the shadows of a 5-story building? Who wants to look at a 5-story brick wall constantly for their westerly view? I found the shadow study posted on the city's website as part of the application very concerning. At nine o'clock on July 20th, with the sun still in the sky, the proposed building cast a shadow so large that you can't see where the shadow ends! The study was done in three-hour increments and does not show when the shadows begin to encroach upon the neighborhood. Also, this study was just for one day when the sun is highest in the sky, casting the least amount of shadows. What does the shadow study reveal during the spring and fall time periods when the sun sets more on the angle? Common sense tells you that the shadows will be more severe. Below is a picture of our westward view from our dining room. If this proposed building goes in unchanged in scale our view will be 100% void of sky and become a brick wall. Other current residents living near the proposed building will have similar brick wall views depending on their directional relationship to the proposed building and/or have an ugly view of garbage containers and power generators which are planned to be located on the north east side of the apartment complex.



The massive scale of this building dwarfing the current structures located near it, the shadows cast by this building onto the neighborhood, and the constant westward view of a brick wall for many of the current residents and property owners will additionally erode the property values for many that live in the neighborhood near the proposed River East Lofts Apartment complex and be injurious to the enjoyment of our own residents.

Other local builders have developed entire city blocks successfully in our neighborhood utilizing three stories. I'm speaking of Heritage Square and the condo complex located between 5th and 6th Avenues and between Indiana and Ohio. So, it makes me skeptical that a five-story complex is needed to make this project financially viable as the developer claimed during a pleasant conversation with me and other residents of the neighborhood after the Historic Preservation Commission Meeting.

It seems that much of your work on this committee is to render judgements and recommendations based on opinions formed by your knowledge, experience, and common sense. During discussions regarding this project with family, friends, strangers, and petition signees the consensus was nearly 100% that this proposed project will be harmful to our neighborhood.

The River East Lofts project will decrease the property values and decrease the quality of life for several current long-term residents living near the proposed building because of the parking ills and issues related to its massive size detailed

above. These adverse effects are direct violations of two Special Use PUD Application Requirements. (iii b. Sufficient Infrastructure and iii c. Effect on Nearby Property) As a result I ask you to recommend to the City Council that this development be scaled back to a three-story building that would blend better with the residential neighborhood and would allow the 52 spaces identified in the PUD to satisfy the majority of the additional parking load placed on the area.

If the project is built utilizing the plans for the first three floors on the PUD the expected additional parking load would be only be 65.5 using the low-end rate for the retail space. $((7571/1000) * 4)$ retail + $(18 \text{ one-bedroom apartments} * 1.2)$ + $(8 \text{ two-bedroom apartments} * 1.7) = 30.3 + 21.6 + 13.6 = 65.5$

A three-story building of this type deviates one floor lower from the project depicted in the Comprehensive Plan. The PUD project deviates one floor higher from Comprehensive Plan. The three-story building allows the city better manage the parking load, eliminates the shadow concerns, helps lessen the density issue, and will add to the benefit of the existing neighborhood, and would not be built at the neighborhood's expense.

Gregory Taylor
211 S. 3rd Ave.
Saint Charles, IL

March 16, 2022

Dear Plan Commissioners,

I am writing to request you to recommend against the River East Lofts PUD / as they are currently proposed.

The PUD does not present any good arguments for not complying with the underlying zoning district.

- A creative design can be made that meets the zoning requirements – the development does not NEED to have the added height or population density for a creative design to be put forward.
- The PUD does not meet or address any of the factors listed in the Design Review Standards, Chapter 17.06 b. 1 through 9.

Compliance to the underlying zoning would reduce the population density from 43 to 21 apartments, and would reduce the height by 10'. Both of these are more favorable for the neighborhood and the City as a whole.

The PUD does not conform with the standards applicable to Special Uses. It does not take into account parking sufficiency or the effects on nearby properties.

- Please find attached my submission to the Historic Preservation Commission where I discuss the height and mass of the proposal as compared to the adjacent historic neighborhoods comprised of regular houses, and also deviations from the Comprehensive Plan.
- The developer submitted some renderings but none of them show the scale and mass of this building as would be seen by a motorist or pedestrian at 2nd Ave and Riverside Ave, looking northerly up the middle of 2nd Ave. I have requested for the City to ask for such a view from the developer that would show the buildings on the east side of 2nd Ave and include the large silver maple tree in the east parkway across from the proposal, and the entire development on the west side of the view. It's important to show the silver maple because that the tallest reference we have in the area. In the renderings provided, that large silver maple is eliminated and replaced by a new immature tree. Perhaps by the time of this meeting, such a view will have been provided.
- The developer submitted a shadow study in three-hour increments, for one day of the year where the sun is high. I submitted a shadow study for your review for one day also, and show the impacts for when the shadows would start falling on our neighborhood on March 12. I had never heard of a shadow study before the proposal stage of this project. One of you commissioners or someone on the Council recommended it for the obvious reason of looking at the quality of life of nearby residents. The study provided by the developer does not address the intent of that recommendation/ request.
- There are several points about parking insufficiency.
 - The developer eliminates 9 private parking spaces and is required to provide those elsewhere. Instead the developer asks the City to hand over property on the east side plus a city street for conversion into another 24 spaces.

- Per the Table 17.24-3, the City estimates that the PUD will need anywhere from 30-75 parking spaces for the proposed retail (depending whether it is used as retail v restaurant), and 78 residential space. Because the property is zoned CBD-1 it is relieved from having to provide all of this parking; the parking can be provided by nearby lots.
- The nearest lot is across the street to the north, it has 63 spaces, *not* all of which are 24-hour spaces. In fact, of the 63 spaces in the lot, only 39 are owned by the City, while the remaining 24 are owned by the developer. The parking agreement in force over the lot is set to expire on April 30, 2023 – before the PUD would even be complete. After that date, the developer is free to build two more buildings similar to this one (or one combined) on the two lots that comprise the south east portion of the city lot.
- The City is not required to evaluate the current occupancy rates of any of the nearby parking lots /structures that can be counted as available parking. The City should endeavor to understand the current parking load on city lots – including the de-facto city lot on the north side of the PUD.
- As a result of the insufficient parking, the neighborhoods east and south of the development will become the street parking for the tenants and clients. This will definitely have a negative effect on nearby properties.

The PUD includes the hand-over of City property.

- Concurrent with the hand-over of the east side City property for parking, the developer shows the hand-over of and closure of Indiana Ave, and the hand-over of the majority of the triangle green space. This property is put to use for private parking, and the developer paves over approximately half of the green space.

For these reasons, I request you to recommend against this PUD.

Martha Gass
211 S. 3rd Ave.
St. Charles

To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Martha Gass
Ref: River East Lofts
March 12, 2022

Dear commission members,

Thank you for taking the time to read why the River East Lofts will negatively affect our historic neighborhood.

I ask that you recommend to the City Council denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chapter 8 of our Comprehensive Plan discusses the downtown area. One of the downtown subarea goals is "Preservation and enhancement of the Downtown's historic architectural character." Some of the subarea objectives are: "Provide a high level of physical and visual access to the Fox River from all portions of Downtown", and "Require new development to meet high standards of site and building design that are compatible with the historic character". It also specifically addresses Image & Character. "Downtown is made up of several blocks of varying types of development forms and uses. Within these blocks, however, there is a clear hierarchy of "corridors" that provide the most character-defining experience. The value of traditional downtowns like St Charles' are most often derived from their intimate scale and focus on the pedestrian." The River East Lofts does not meet these goals or objectives. It does not preserve or enhance downtown's historic architectural character – it's located adjacent to an old neighborhood with houses over 100 years old and presents as a monolithic structure not at all compatible with the neighborhood. The scale is far from intimate. And instead of providing a high level of physical and visual access to the Fox River, it will prevent views of the river from east Illinois Ave and from the neighborhoods to its east, and instead present these areas with a view of brick.

It continues regarding the Historic District. "The City of St. Charles has adopted Historic Preservation Ordinances to foster awareness of the City's rich history including its historic sites and buildings. The City's Historic Preservation Commission is responsible for ensuring modifications and renovations, along with new development and construction, are consistent with the standards established for the historic district. The City's history is important in maintaining its cultural fabric and identity. This value is recognized by the City's residents and the City should ensure that this rich and unique history is not lost but rather complemented and enhanced with new downtown investment and development."

This Commission is charged with "preserving the distinctive historic architectural areas and structures that are significant to the City's history."

The project does not meet the General Architectural and Aesthetic Guidelines in that it is NOT "compatible with surrounding structures" in the Height and Scale criteria for the certificate. Nor does it meet the criteria for New Structures: "New structures in an historic district shall be compatible with, but need not be the same as, the architectural styles and general designs and layouts of the surrounding structures."

Height – The building is not compatible with surrounding structures. It towers over them by more than three stories. One building immediately east is two stories, but the other buildings immediately east are 1.5 stories, as are most of the buildings in the adjacent blocks.

Scale – The building is not compatible with the surrounding structures. Its mass at more than 57,750sf is more than 20 times the 2852 sf of the very largest building nearest it. The other buildings nearby range from 1760 to 1828sf. It dwarfs all neighboring properties. In fact, River East Lofts are *4.8 times larger than the combined 12,033sf of the entire building stock in the block east of the Chamber building*. The renderings do not provide a good perspective for how out of scale it is with the neighborhood. The first two renderings are from points high over the trees, thus hiding the scale. The third rendering obscures the view of my block with trees and does not show the Indiana/Ohio block. The fourth and fifth do not address it. I asked Rachel Hitzemann this on March 11/14: “ Would you request a simulated view of what a person would see while standing in the middle of 2nd Ave at Riverside Ave looking northerly up the middle of 2nd Ave that includes the current housing stock on the easterly side of the view and the entirety of the building on the westerly side of that view, and include the large silver maple tree that is in the easterly parkway between Indiana and Illinois Ave.?” Perhaps this view will have been provided us by the time of the meeting on March 16.

The River East Lofts are grossly not compatible to their surroundings in the Central Historic District. They would be more compatible if they were scaled back to two to three stories, and tapered on the south end. But as the project is proposed, it should be denied a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Martha Gass
211 S. 3rd Ave
St. Charles

Sun location at 211 S. 3rd Ave, looking west. In all of these photos, except possibly the 3:45 photo, the sun would be blocked from view by River East Lofts.

In March, starting around 4:00 pm the block east of River East Lofts would be in the shadow of the building for the remaining almost 2 hours of sunlight.

3:45 pm March 12, 2022



4:00 pm March 12, 2022



4:15 pm March 12, 2022



4:30 pm March 12, 2022



4:45 pm March 12, 2022



5:00 pm March 12, 2022



5:15 pm March 12, 2022



5:30 pm March 12, 2022



5:43 pm March 12, 2022



Here is a car parked on the north side at River East Lofts. In this view, to visualize the impact of the building, replace all of the sky with the side of the building.

Submitted by Martha Gass, 211 S. 3rd Ave, St. Charles.

Received 1/8/22 prior to current
application filing

From: Sue Peterson <suepete407@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, January 8, 2022 5:44 PM

To: Conti, Tracey <tconti@stcharlesil.gov>

Subject: For the city council consideration

Hello Tracey,

Please share my comments with the City Council and City Clerk. I request that the clerk read my comments into the minutes for the record at the next public meeting.

I am opposed to having the developer of the proposed River East Apartment project use Indiana Ave and the public land adjacent to Indiana Ave. for the development. The development should be a design that fits the area and doesn't use the public green space or the street for private use.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sue Peterson
407 South 10th Street
630.751.6655

From: Margaret Stiglianese <megstiglianese@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2022 1:12 PM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts Development

>
> To the Plan Commission:
>
> We are new residents of Downtown Saint Charles, living in the Viewpointe Neighborhood, since June, 2021. We previously lived in Saint Charles Township for many years.
>
> At least four times a week I walk to various locations in the downtown area. From what I understand there is a proposed River East Lofts Development, with 43 rental units and first floor retail.
>
> One of my concerns is the height of the building. It would visually detract from the beauty of the East Side waterfront. If I was seeking an apartment to rent, a very visible ATM location in the front of the building would be a deterrent. Plus it is obvious that there is not enough available parking. The adjacent neighborhood would have to deal with the overflow of cars.
>
> Another point of concern, might be the question of need for that many rental units, and retail spaces. Has a study been done? Already there is a new rental apartment building in the First Street Corridor near the vacated Blue Goose. Are those apartments all rented? Also from what I understand, the Sterling Bank Building condos are not all sold. There are empty storefronts on both Main Street, and on the First Street Corridor, and the previous mentioned Blue Goose building. Again, is there a need for more retail space?
>
> There is excitement in planning new development, but all spaces should be occupied before any additional building is undertaken.
>
> Thank you for your attention to this matter
>
> Margaret Stiglianese

From: Jo Krieger <jokrieger@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2022 7:35 PM
To: CD
Subject: Plan Commission Members re: Riverside Development

I would like to express my concerns regarding the negative effect constructing a five-story apartment building will have on a well-kept, historic family neighborhood.

The size of the building, closing neighborhood streets and the use of open city green space is unacceptable.

The traffic study should be redone. A true study would be done on school days during a normal work day.

How will this effect the response time for emergency vehicles? The additional traffic will be forced into a neighborhood that is already affected by cut thru traffic. Residents will have to wind around to exit their neighborhood while dealing with additional traffic.

This is an old neighborhood with narrow streets not designed for additional traffic. The plan to narrow Riverside for additional parking will further add to the congestion. I do not feel this is the place for a building of this size.

We seem intent on building a canyon downtown. First street, where it is open, is very narrow and the tall buildings cast a dark shadow over the area. Not at all inviting.

Jo Krieger

From: Bob Rassmussen
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 1:49 PM
To: CD
Subject: riverside east lofts

Community Development,

I would like to address a few concerns on the upcoming review of the "Riverside East Lofts" plan:

1) Comprehensive plan

The plan refers to the existing comprehensive plan several times in the findings of fact. The only aspect of the plan that conforms to the comprehensive plan is the use and I do agree this is appropriate for this lot; However in the comprehensive plan you will see the building was contemplated at 4 stories and there was an adjacent parking structure to help accommodate the desperately needed parking on the East side of the River. The mass of the building exceeds all guidelines in the zoning codes for CBD-1. The fact that this is a transitional lot that borders single family homes should be a significant factor when reviewing this project. A 3or4 story building would meet all zoning requirements and better transition to the adjacent neighborhoods and adjacent single story commercial buildings, the only benefactor of 5 stories is the developer.

2) Plat

The Revised Plat shown is misconceiving to the public as it only shows the proposed vacated portions of land to the South. As I understand the project there is a significant amount of vacated property proposed to the East and west to accommodate parking and private walkways. The assessors site shows the 2 PIN numbers to be a combined 23,555 sf of land and the "revised plat" shows 38,960.47 sf of land. If the assessors site is accurate it is important to be transparent in how much city property or easements are to be vacated and conveyed. It appears the development property would include more than 50% public property.

3) Conveyance of public property

I have developed property at Heritage Square and the Judd Mansion within 4 blocks of this site. Both of these properties have some street parking stalls required to offset the loss of street parking due to development entrances. The commission and council has historically required developers to develop these parking stalls in the right of way and keep them public. To set a precedence of giving public right of way to private developers could greatly impact how our existing neighbors park that have enjoyed the use of our public streets for decades. I do not see the benefit to our citizens in not keeping these parking stalls public.

The closing of Indiana Ave could be avoided by proper historical development. Perfect examples would be Walnut Street under the parking garage and Indiana Street in front of the Blue Goose. These streets were required to remain through streets in the development of First street. I do appreciate the developers revised plan for the intersection of 2nd ave and Riverside creating a much safer turning environment than the previous plan. Again I must ask is it safe to set a precedence to close streets and convey land for private development that is of no benefit to our current citizens.

4) Parking

The proposed plan only conforms to the parking requirements if it includes the street parking which amounts to 50% of all parking in the development. The downtown overlay district also allows for much less parking as public garages were intended to be in place. If the proposed garage in the comprehensive plan is in place the parking for this proposed building would be appropriate. To be reminded the developers of First Street were required to build the Plaza parking structure first in a joint venture with the city prior to any residential or

commercial spaces being built. You can currently witness the parking stress on the east side every Friday and Saturday as people circle for long periods of time and often resort to further away street parking. The current BMO drive through lot is full many weeknights and always on Friday and Saturday, where will these people go ? The Arcada is not up to full speed and 2 more bars are soon to be opened on the East side, it is time to be realistic on parking options.

I look forward to better understanding the details of the project and do hope we can find the proper answer to many development questions so this can be another great building in downtown St. Charles . The developer has done a tremendous job on the updated elevations , we have an opportunity as a city to have this site contribute to our vibrant downtown through proper development standards.

Sincerely,

Bob Rasmussen

From: marilyn shulski <mshulski@att.net>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2022 11:29 PM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts

Plan Commission Members

We are asking for your help by not approving the River East Lofts PUD proposal by Frontier Development Group. This 5 story building with more than twice the density allowed in the zoning laws would be completely out of character for this older well established neighborhood of 2 and 3 story homes and businesses and would negatively affect our way of life.

Having been a developer in St. Charles for many years, Mr. Hurst must have known the zoning laws before purchasing this property but wants the City to not only approve this massive building but to also give him the last block of Indiana Avenue and the triangular green space nearby. The City should not give away open green space and roads to a private contractor. These are public properties and there is no advantage to St. Charles citizens but several disadvantages. Rerouting Indiana Avenue would be a detriment to cars and school buses using this street and giving away the open green space would deprive citizens the use of this area. These giveaways would make a lack of parking spaces in the area even worse.

We would like to see this property developed appropriately to the surrounding area but this is not a good fit for this location and should not be approved.

Marilyn and Anton
304 South Second Avenue
St. Charles, IL

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: Dan & Maria O'Neill <danomaria@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 3:00 PM
To: CD
Subject: River East Lofts

We live at 10 Illinois St, St. Charles, IL 60174.

Concerns (not in any specific order of priority):

Traffic: If I read this correctly we are adding 43 rental apartments and retail space on the first floor to the Chamber location. Additional building next to Pollyanna? This will drive a lot more traffic into our immediate area, especially post COVID with Arcada and Graceful Ordinary having additional activity. Traffic studies during COVID w/restrictions, not sure they will be accurate as we move back to some semblance of normalcy. I personally bike, as do other residents in the building, along the path immediately across from the proposed development.

Parking: It mentions "private street parking". Our building has underground parking that takes care of 100% of the units. Is this an option? Also, I question the aesthetics of a parking garage right across the river from our building, seems like changing one eye sore for another and doesn't enhance our property value? Parking garage behind Pollyanna would drive further traffic into the immediate area.

Building in the parking lot next to Pollyanna? Assuming non-residential, do we need any more commercial space? Office space post COVID is readily available as many companies did not renew leases and are allowing more telecommuting / split time at office. I am against any more office space in the immediate area that has a risk of vacancy.

Retail space. There also seems to be a fair amount of space available along First Street already. Add additional space available just down the road with Geneva. Is this creating more space than is viable to keep occupied. Empty space does not enhance property values nor attract visitors. I question the level of expanded retail space. Rumor has it that Sammy's may move from the current west side location to this location. That would leave Blue Goose and his current property vacant, potentially his second location as well. We also are hearing BMO may be moving from the location next to Blue Goose. It seems to us that this part of town, with all of the investment and tax base from the surrounding riverfront residential properties, should be the priority. Real concern of over building.

Property values: The number of 1 bed/1 bath compared to the 2 bedroom units seems very unbalanced. If we look at Geneva and Dodson Place, which is downtown apartment rental, there is a much better balance and includes 3 bedrooms. The reduction in 1 bedroom and additional 2 and even 3 bedrooms would reduce the total number of units and therefore reduce the number of parking spaces needed as well as traffic. We pay a lot in taxes for our location. Additionally, there is new rental space next to the former Blue Goose. The values of the condo's we are in have already not kept pace with the general market appreciation, with the first street building having taken years to sell out (6 units available according to Zillow today).

In summary we have real concerns about the number of units in the proposed building, especially because it's rental. This seems like it will impact our values that have not already kept up with the general market. We pay a lot in taxes to have any development negatively affect our property values. Real concerns about the amount of additional retail space given the existing vacancies. Real concern about any office space in this post COVID telecommuting time we're likely to stay in. Real concern with looking at a parking garage right along the river, not sure where else I see this in a downtown like ours?

I do understand the need to develop the land and move the city of St Charles forward, but this proposal seems to be in the interest of the developers finances with the density and not in the current residents interest of preserving the value we bought into when we purchased and moved here. I hope we aren't allowing greed to cloud reasonable judgement.

Dan O'Neill