MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2011 – 7:00 P.M.

Members Present:	Acting Chairman Tim Kessler Sue Amatangelo Brian Doyle Curt Henningson Thomas Pretz
Members Absent:	Todd Wallace, Tom Schuetz
Also Present:	Russell Colby, Planner Matthew O'Rourke, Planner Colleen Johnson, Recording Secretary Sonntag Court Reporter

1. Call to order

A meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Acting Chairman Kessler.

2. Roll Call

3. Presentation of Minutes

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the April 19, 2011 meeting.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

4. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)

Application for General Amendment to Chapter 17.12, "Residential Districts" pertaining to the bulk requirements for one and one-half story structures and Chapter 17.30 "Definitions" pertaining to the definition of a "Story" and "Half-Story".

The transcript received 5/13/11 and prepared by Sonntag Reporting Service, Ltd., is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Ms. Amatangelo made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Doyle seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: Pretz, Henningson, Doyle, Amatangelo, Kessler
Nays: None
Absent: Wallace, Schuetz

Motion Carried.

PUBLIC HEARING

5. Foundry Business Park – 761 N. 17th Street, Unit 1 (Praise Ministries)
Application for a Special Use to allow a Church/Place of Worship.

The transcript received 5/13/11 and prepared by Sonntag Reporting Service, Ltd., is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Ms. Amatangelo made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Doyle seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: Pretz, Henningson, Doyle, Amatangelo, Kessler
Nays: None
Absent: Wallace, Schuetz
Motion Carried.

MEETING

6. Foundry Business Park – 761 N. 17th Street, Unit 1 (Praise Ministries)
Application for a Special Use to allow a Church/Place of Worship.

Mr. O'Rourke reviewed the staff report dated 4/29/11and stated staff recommended approval.

Mr. Doyle made a motion to recommend approval of the Foundry Business Park – 761 N. 17th Street, Unit 1 (Praise Ministries) application for Special Use to allow a Church/Place of Worship based upon the findings of fact and all staff comments being addressed prior to final City Council action. Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: Pretz, Henningson, Doyle, Amatangelo, Kessler
Nays: None
Absent: Wallace, Schuetz
Motion Carried.

7. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)
Application for General Amendment to Chapter 17.12, "Residential Districts" pertaining to the bulk requirements for one and one-half story structures and Chapter 17.30 "Definitions" pertaining to the definition of a "Story" and "Half-Story".

Mr. Colby reviewed the staff report dated 4/29/11 and stated staff recommended approval. He asked the Plan Commission for input in terms of any additions or clarifications to the requirements for consideration as conditions if this moves forward.

Mr. Doyle said he would like to see the analysis of the proposal that was made by the Mr. Dan Marshall with regards to relaxing the LCR, or Building Coverage standard. He commented that the design of dormers on many bungalows does not complement the house as it appears like an addition that does not belong. He noted this has always been a challenge even in the 1950's and 1960's, when families needed to add more living space. He said if current regulations encourage redevelopment in the historic neighborhoods, he questions how this would be addressed without a piece-meal effect. Mr. Colby said staff could look at options, however, before a General Amendment would be brought forward to modify the Building Coverage standard, staff would want feedback from the Council. He recalled when the Zoning Ordinance was rewritten in 2006, a major effort was to address the issue of teardown and infill in the older neighborhoods. One change was creating Building Coverage percentage and establishing what percentage levels were appropriate. He said he could not say specifically what analysis was done to compare the 1 ½ story percentage verses the 2 story percentage, but there was some basis in survey work that was done to establish the bulk requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. He said staff would need feedback on that issue before moving forward to see if there is interest in modifying the Building Coverage.

Mr. Kessler commented that if Building Coverage were to be changed, that would create a whole new issue. He asked the Commission if they had any comments for staff to take into consideration. Mr. Henningson asked if they had to take action at this time, as it appears there is a lot of confusion. Mr. Colby explained the Commission could table the item, but since the public hearing was closed some type of action will need to be taken. Mr. Kessler agreed stating no further testimony would be heard. Mr. Doyle asked Mr. Henningson if the confusion was about what the approval represents, or the proposed amendment to the Half-Story definition. Mr. Doyle said it does not appear there is confusion about what is being done as they are clarifying the Half-Story definition, but it appears this is not providing relief for the specific project discussed during the public hearing. Mr. Doyle suggested the Plan Commission convey to the City Council that they are willing to examine the concern regarding Building Coverage percentages. Mr. Doyle said he is in favor of this General Amendment and would convey through staff to the Council that he is open to looking at how to deal with teardowns. Mr. Henningson asked if more clarification can be added prior to sending a recommendation to the Council by looking at the LCR, or Building Coverage. Mr. Kessler said that is a different issue and could be looked at outside of this application but the Commission needs to make a decision on this application.

Ms. Amatangelo made a motion to recommend approval of the application for General Amendment to Chapter 17.12 "Residential Districts" pertaining to the bulk requirements for one and on-half story structures and Chapter 17.30 "Definitions" pertaining to the definition of a "Story" and "Half-Story" based upon the findings of fact and all staff comments being addressed prior to final City Council action. Mr. Pretz seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: Amatangelo, Doyle, Pretz, Henningson, Kessler
Nays: None
Absent: Wallace, Schuetz
Motion Carried.

8. Meeting Announcements

Plan Commission Tuesday, May 17, 2011 at 7:00p.m. in the Council Chambers

Plan Commission Tuesday, June 7, 2011 at 7:00p.m. in the Council Chambers
Plan Commission Tuesday, June 21, 2011 at 7:00p.m. in the Council Chambers

9. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members, Staff, or Citizens

Mr. Kessler said he would like to make a request that the prior discussions this evening regarding the 1 ½ story General Amendment be addressed with Council and get feedback as to whether this is an issue the City is interested in pursuing as an application. Mr. Colby said staff heard the Commission comments and will take under advisement.

The meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

CERTIFIED ORIGINAL

S59668A

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION

In Re the Matter of:)
)
General Amendment (City of)
St. Charles) Application for)
General Amendment to)
Chapter 17.12, "Residential)
Districts" pertaining to)
the bulk requirements for)
1 1/2-story structures, and)
Chapter 17.30 "Definitions")
Pertaining to the definition of)
a "Story" and Half Story.")

CONTINUED REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of the above-entitled matter, before the City of St. Charles Plan Commission, taken in the offices of City of St. Charles, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles, Illinois, on May 3, 2011, at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

RECEIVED
St. Charles, IL
MAY 13 2011
CDD
Planning Division

1 PRESENT:
2 MR. TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman;
3 MS. SUE AMATANGELO, Member;
4 MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;
5 MR. CURT HENNINGSON, Member; and
6 MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member.
7
ALSO PRESENT:
8
MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planner; and
9
MR. MATTHEW O'ROURKE, Planner.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We can get started. It's seven o'clock.

This meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission is called to order.

I'll call the roll.

Amatangelo?

MEMBER AMATANGELO: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle?

MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

MEMBER HENNINGSON: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

And this time we'll have the presentation of the minutes of the April 19th meeting.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there a motion?

MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor?

(The ayes were thereupon heard.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Opposed?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.

Now, let's move on to the public hearing portion of our meeting.

Items 4 and 5 on the agenda are public hearings, and Item No. 4 is a continued public hearing.

We'll start with that one, and I'll just read a few little pieces on our public hearing.

During the course of the public hearing presentation, the Plan Commission, which is commissioned by the City Council to hold public hearings and collect information regarding developments, will allow the Applicant -- Applicants in this case -- to present information, and then we'll ask questions and allow the public to ask questions and offer testimony either for or against the application.

As soon as the Plan Commission has determined that they have taken enough evidence regarding these applications in order to make a recommendation to the City Council, then a motion

to close the public hearing will be in order.

Now, at the close of these public hearings, on our agenda on both public hearings -- we do have on the agenda these both items -- and if we feel that we're in a position to make a recommendation one way or the other, we will; if not, of course we won't.

And are there any questions regarding our procedure?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Then anybody who intends on giving any testimony in either public hearing tonight, I ask you to now be sworn in.

If you would raise your right hands.

(Five witness were thereupon duly sworn.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

And I would ask anyone who is giving testimony tonight to please approach the lectern, speak into the microphone, and state your name and address, spelling your last name for the record.

1 Starting with Item No. 4, we have some
2 items of exhibits for the record.
3 And, first of all, we have Plan Commission
4 Exhibit A, the Application for General Amendment
5 dated 4/1/11; Plan Commission Exhibit B, staff
6 memo from Russell Colby dated 4/15/11; Plan
7 Commission Exhibit C, a letter from Dan Marshall;
8 and Plan Commission Exhibit D, staff report from
9 Russell Colby dated 4/29/11.
10 So let's begin.
11 Russell, are you prepared?
12 MR. COLBY: Yes.
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.
14 Go ahead.
15 MR. COLBY: Okay. The Plan
16 Commission will recall at the previous meeting we
17 held a hearing to discuss the half-story
18 definition of the Zoning Ordinance, and I'm
19 looking at the definition, as existed, and
20 considering ways to possibly rewrite it to
21 reflect what we see in existing neighborhoods in
22 St. Charles, and the Commission viewed a number
23 of photos of different buildings and provided
24 comments as to whether or not you believe there

1 were -- they were 1 1/2-versus 2-story
2 structures.
3 A little background on this.
4 What we're hoping to do with this amendment
5 is to create a new definition which will deal
6 primarily with the interior mass of a structure
7 to ensure that what we consider as a 1.5-story
8 house can be built and also continue to have a
9 differentiation between a 1.5-story house and a
10 2-story house so that you can distinguish the
11 two from each other, and we're presenting a
12 proposal this evening that's based on Plan
13 Commission comments at our previous hearing.
14 In the proposed definition, two items are
15 regulated in the definition. The first would be
16 the roof or eave height on the structure, and the
17 definition proposes that the intersection of the
18 wall and roof be no more than 3 feet above the
19 floor level of a half story.
20 That is the same as our current definitions
21 now, in terms of where the roof level starts, and
22 the element that we would add to the definition
23 would be regulation of projections out from the
24 roof.

Right now the way the definition is written, the projections are not allowed to extend through the roof, so you wouldn't be able to include window and shed dormers and still be able to meet the definition of a half-story dwelling.

In the projection standard, what's being proposed is 50 percent of the roof width, and then we measured at the point that's 3 feet up from the floor level of the half story.

That 50 percent width would allow dormers or other gable projections to come out from the roof surface, as long as their -- their cumulative width did not exceed 50 percent of the overall width of that roof surface on that side of the building.

There are some elements that were discussed by the Plan Commission that are not proposed to be regulated in this definition. Those are the roof or eave height above grade for the level that the roof starts relative to the -- the surface of the ground around the building.

Also, possibly reducing the overall ridge height of a one-half-story has now been proposed.

1 And, also, there were comments regarding
2 roof pitch, and we do not propose to regulate
3 roof pitch, either.
4 The reasons behind this, we didn't want to
5 be in a position where we were overregulating how
6 a house was designed, and we didn't want there to
7 be uniformity caused by any of these numerical
8 requirements being imposed.
9 And, finally, the older neighborhoods that
10 we're looking at that would be impacted by this
11 amendment have a variety of roof heights and
12 pitches because there's a whole collection of
13 different architectural styles, so it's difficult
14 to say that a certain roof pitch, for example, is
15 the maximum that you could be allowed when we
16 know there's in existence existing roof pitches.
17 This is the definition text, and the Plan
18 Commission has a copy of this in front of them.
19 And, basically, what I just presented is
20 included here, and it's spelled out in the actual
21 text form.
22 There was one slight modification to this
23 from what was included in the staff report.
24 The staff report in the -- in the

1 definition referenced basing measurements on the
2 longest ridgeline of the house and using that as
3 a determining factor for where the dormers were
4 to be -- or the dormers or roof projections would
5 be placed relative to that roof surface.
6 We realized that that -- that restriction
7 did not work in this definition because you could
8 have houses that had complex roof plans where you
9 had cross gables. That would present a problem
10 in terms of coming up with a calculation, so that
11 has been pulled out of the definition and
12 otherwise remains the same.
13 Here is a diagram just to show very simply
14 how this requirement would work.
15 What you see here is a house that's built
16 with one story and has a partial story on the
17 second floor with a gable roof, a side gable
18 roof, and there's a dashed lined in the diagram
19 that shows the 3-foot level, and that would be
20 3 feet above the floor level of that half story;
21 and when you look at the front elevation of the
22 house, you will measure the dormer width off of
23 the diagram as shown here, where the dormers
24 actually intersect that line with the 3-foot line

through the house, and what's been proposed is a 50 percent standard, so it would be 50 percent relative to the width of the house.

And here's another example showing a house with the cross gable. This would be one that has a roof running in two different directions, and you can do the same calculation here, as well.

And this one shows a house that's been constructed slightly higher, utilizing that -- that 3-foot allowance to extend the walls up 3 feet. This is how a house that -- that meets that definition could appear, also.

To go through some -- some photos, and these are all photos that were looked at at the previous hearing as to whether or not these different houses would meet the definition that's proposed.

These two, obviously, would meet the requirements because they have little or minimum or no projections from the roof; actually, started right at the top of the first-floor level.

We looked at some Cape Cod-style houses, and the examples that are shown here actually

have -- have roof projections that are probably in the 60 to 75 percent range, and that's primarily due to the fact that there's a shed dormer that runs across the rear of those houses, so these types of structures would not meet the definition of a 1.5-story, as it's being proposed now, and these would be considered two-story.

The same is true for these bungalow houses and primarily the two on the top.

The one on the bottom, the yellow one, I don't have an exact measurement, but it could be close, but just visually it looks like probably only the 60 to 75 percent range of a projection percentage for the window dormers, so these would also be considered two-story structures.

Here are a few other pictures that were presented at the last hearing, and these are -- are examples that would meet the definition because they have a roof that starts low enough on the structure, and they also do not have dormers or projections that exceed that percentage that's been proposed.

These are examples that would meet the

1 definition.
2 And, also, here are a couple of newer-
3 construction houses that were utilized in the
4 provision, as well, but then, again, would
5 probably be in the 60 to 75 percent projection
6 range based on the amount of dormers that are
7 there.
8 So to conclude, what we've come up with for
9 the Plan Commission's consideration, we think, is
10 a workable definition, but it's by no means
11 perfect. Regulating this half story is putting
12 in place requirements. It's very difficult to
13 do. It's difficult to -- to come up with a
14 definition that we think captures what we're
15 trying to regulate without overregulating it, and
16 there doesn't seem to be a foolproof way to do
17 this.
18 We've looked in other neighboring
19 communities, and it's done in different ways.
20 Some do regulate projections, as we're proposing,
21 but for the most part, there doesn't seem to be
22 a -- a uniform way that it's regulated.
23 What we're proposing, I think, meets what
24 the Plan Commission had discussed at the previous

1 hearing, looking for feedback on whether you
2 think it's too restrictive, if you think it's not
3 restrictive enough, and, also, if you think
4 that -- that you would like more information on
5 any of the requirements.
6 This is certainly a working definition, and
7 we would be open to -- to suggestions on how to
8 improve it.
9 With that, I conclude my presentation.
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.
11 Thank you, Russell.
12 Let's start with the Plan Commission.
13 Any questions or comments on the proposed
14 text changes?
15 Go ahead.
16 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I was just going
17 to say "Nothing more than what we discussed at
18 the last meeting."
19 MEMBER DOYLE: I spoke with Russell
20 before the meeting, and the only thing that I'd
21 like to suggest that we take a look at is the --
22 the 3-foot wall portion of the -- of the draft
23 language, particularly as it relates to a couple
24 of the structures in the slide -- slide show.

1 The bungalows that Russell pointed out,
2 which would not meet the requirement -- would not
3 meet the definition -- particularly the yellow
4 one on the bottom -- to me is a classic example
5 of a 1.5-story house.
6 The ones on the top, now that I'm looking
7 at them again, I think I could probably concede
8 that they're two stories, just because of the
9 amount of living space there.
10 When I go to the -- I think it's the next
11 slide, Russell, that -- that brown house to me is
12 definitely a two-story house.
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which one?
14 Which on the right?
15 MEMBER DOYLE: At the top.
16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.
17 MEMBER DOYLE: On the top.
18 And it now meets the requirement of a
19 1.5-story house, as I understand it, because
20 there are no -- there are no dormers, and the
21 outer wall is only 3 feet off the -- off the
22 floor.
23 So when we're granting that additional
24 footprint space to a house, which is of this

size, I do have a question. That might not be a little bit too lenient?

And, conversely, if we go back to the slide prior, if -- if the yellow house shown there were to -- were to exceed the 50 percent criteria in the front dormer, that might actually perform -- you know, result in the opposite result that I would be looking for, which would be, it would allow the yellow house to -- to meet the requirement and the brown house on the next slide to -- to fall outside the requirement.

So one question would be, is there a -- what -- what would the implication be of limiting the 3-foot wall allowance and saying that -- that the -- it's basically reducing it to 0?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And then -- and then --

MEMBER DOYLE: And then possible -- possibly compensating by increasing the amount of dormer -- dormer space allowed, up to, say, two-thirds, 66 percent or something like that?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Interesting. I mean, it's an interesting -- looking at it, my -- my only concern with the dormers -- and I

could see that because I've always been concerned about the height of the walls on this.

MEMBER DOYLE: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Depending on -- if you go back a slide -- could we go back one, Russell?

I'm sorry. Forward. Thank you.

To the top one, there's a place on the back of that house that you've got a two-story wall essentially, and that concerns me that you have a 1.5 where you have that width of the house, a two-story -- well, you've got a 16-foot wall, you know, from the first floor to the top of that straight wall.

One second. We'll get to you -- you're going to have to something say.

And then -- so that's a concern of mine.

And, additionally, then, I thought that could be controlled by saying "Okay. A 3-foot -- you know, 3 feet above the wall," but when I see massing of dormers, shed dormers, that take up, you know, two-thirds or more of the roofline of that second floor, that practically becomes a two-story building to me. I mean, it's a huge

1 mass.
2 And if we're going to allow more, I think
3 you could break that mass up by saying there has
4 to be some break in between the dormers. Instead
5 of having a continuous shed of 75 percent, for
6 example, across the roof, you would have to break
7 it up somehow, or, you know, you're essentially
8 eliminating the 3-foot wall rule.
9 You could also have one of these structures
10 that -- and I've seen it before where, on the
11 front of the house it meets all the requirements
12 of the 3-foot above the -- you know, the roof
13 wall, but that in the back -- they push the wall
14 out so that now you don't have any roofline
15 across the back and it's straight up so -- and if
16 you looked at it from the front, it would meet
17 all the requirements.
18 So do these requirements have to meet --
19 do they have to be met on all four sides of the
20 building? So there's another consideration, if
21 you were to eliminate that to 0.
22 MEMBER DOYLE: There are a couple of
23 different questions out there.
24 You know, I guess, could we go back a slide

again, please?

You know, if I look at these houses here, the blue house and the house on the top, which have fairly generous shed dormers, the massing there doesn't really bother me that much.

You know, I -- I -- like I said, I -- I could concede that it may indeed be a two-story house. I mean, the blue house is not a -- not a small house by any means, but I think that it is definitely in keeping with the historic character of these neighborhoods.

And so the -- the roofline coming down to basically the floor level of the -- of the second floor is what -- so that -- that eave -- those eaves is what, to me, aesthetically speaking, sort of renders these houses 1 1/2-story houses, and it's precisely that -- that tall wall, you know, that goes up to -- and I'm not certain whether it be 16 feet or 12, you know, how high it would be we're talking, but that, to me, the height of the wall and the massing of the wall is what suggests a two-story structure.

I'm not certain either of these are going to be fine but that's --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I agree. This is such a difficult question because then that blue house on the left, it does exactly what I'm saying.

First of all, the front part of that is a porch, so the actual house wall does go straight up through the two stories. If you took the porch off the front of that house, it's a two-story house in the front.

MEMBER DOYLE: It has -- so, actually, that has a 3-foot wall, is what you're saying, in a way.

MEMBER AMATANGELO: The same could be said for the yellow.

If you take off the porch --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

MEMBER AMATANGELO: -- the roofline on the porch --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It runs straight through, so, you know, that -- it's -- it's a problem.

MEMBER DOYLE: In that case, what we're really talking about are architectural forms and not the massing, in which case --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And how far do we want to go?

MEMBER DOYLE: It may not be worth it to do.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah.

MEMBER DOYLE: I am curious if there are comments from the public.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Same here. Any others from the Plan Commission? Go ahead, Tom.

MEMBER PRETZ: Russ, in the simple definition, does this definition meet the need of our -- your department in really determining it's a 1.5-story versus a 2-?

MR. COLBY: Well, you know, from staff's perspective, the need for this amendment was really to clarify our existing definition which we thought did not actually regulate what it was supposed to.

The half-story definition in the Ordinance was really designed or is really intended to regulate building mass of a structure because it's used as a basis to determine what building coverage is allowed for a certain house.

The way that the definition is written currently, it regulates the interior square footage of the house, which does not have a relation to the exterior mass necessarily, so from our perspective, whichever type of definition we can come up with that we think will properly regulate the mass is really meeting our needs in amending the Ordinance. We think what's proposed does that.

But, again, it's not the only solution. It's not a perfect solution. It's one idea.

MEMBER PRETZ: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay? Anyone else?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thanks, Russell.

MR. MARSHALL: Hi. My name is Dan Marshall. I'm from Marshall Architects, 812 East Main, St. Charles.

I'm an architect and I'm the one that has to deal with these rules that come down.

I want to say Russell has been great with working with me. Frank and I have been working

on a project, and this project has been sort of a test case for the Zoning Code for this 25 percent, 30 percent LCR rule.

We've had meetings with the building department and with Russell, and we've been trading e-mails with Rita and Russell now for a month, and our project on Fourth Street has identified two problems.

It identified the problem of the definition that you're talking about, and it identified the problem that, for the RT-3 zoning, 25 percent LCR is not enough. 30 percent sort of works.

There are very small lots, so as the lot sizes go down on a percentage basis, your footprint shrinks substantially.

If you notice in the Zoning Code, the RS-3 allows for 30 percent LCR, which is a medium-density zoning. RT-3 for some reason, which is designed as maintaining a higher density, goes down to 25 percent. I'm not sure why that is. I identified that as a problem and really recommended strongly a number of times that instead of trying to define "story and a half," which you've shown is extremely difficult

to do, I think it's going to enshrine misconceptions and you have unintended consequences of creating houses that look funny.

There -- you're not going to be able to find a perfect definition. Russell is trying. He's working hard at it. I just -- I don't think that's going to be the right path to go.

I think really working off the LCR is a better path to go; that this definition -- we're just going to go around and around in circles, and what it's really going to come down to, is it a nice-looking house? I don't know.

Russell, can I go back on this? I want to go back to that Cape Cod.

MR. COLBY: There you go.

MR. MARSHALL: Thanks.

I'm looking for the Cape Cod.

The Cape Cod on the bottom, the little gray house and the top house, those are quintessential story-and-a-half houses, always have been considered one of the smaller houses in the neighborhood, story and a half, and for that to not fit into the definition would be, I think, a big mistake.

I agree that the -- that the brown house looks too tall, and that's because I don't think it would fit in the definition. That wall height is halfway up those windows, and as you said, it's a 16-foot wall, which would mean it's probably at least a 5-foot plate above that second floor, and that's why when you're looking at it it looks too big.

Really, what it comes down to is a two-story house has a two-story eave on it. Anything less than that is -- is -- is going to look smaller.

But what it really comes down to is breaking down the scale of a house, breaking down the massing of a house, and you could do that in somewhat different ways, and as Russell pointed out and what he's trying to do is to not overlegislate it so that it doesn't -- we don't end up with the same formula because what we like about older neighborhoods is the variety of masses and scales.

So I'm just -- I don't want to start to pick apart a definition. I don't think the definition is perfect yet. I think it's -- it's

simpler than it could have been, but it still has a lot of -- it could have a lot of unintended consequences, and that Frank's house doesn't fit into it, as we had planned -- and Frank's house is not a big house -- that's -- it is -- this definition would -- would push him into doing a two-story house, and in the end the difference in the square footage between 25 percent and 30 percent on the first floor is about 200 square feet.

But if we take that into a two-story house, I think it's going to be more massive at 25 percent LCR as a full two-story than 30 percent as a 1.5-story, with even meeting the definition, because it's going to be -- you know, it's going to be taller and bigger and a full two stories.

So I -- I will continue to work with Russell on it, and you guys can continue to knock your heads against the table about it, but I really don't think you're going to come up with a perfect solution for this, and I think the better thing is to look at the LCR and realize we're trying to get people to fix up these little

1 houses.
2 It is hard financially to fix these houses
3 up. It is a tough thing to do. It's -- they're
4 not that much cheaper when you buy them, and then
5 to increase the size of it costs a lot of money
6 to do. If we want families to live in these
7 houses, we need to give them more space.
8 The garage counts in the LCR. Frank's
9 proposing a 1 1/2-car garage. There's not that
10 many people who could live with that. They want
11 two-car garages.
12 People want at least three bedrooms in
13 their house. Frank is proposing three bedrooms
14 in this house, and it's -- they're not big
15 bedrooms. They're all under the sloping roof,
16 so these things still don't fit, which makes me
17 think that we need to run some other test cases,
18 at least on this definition.
19 We need to look at some other examples,
20 and, you know, every person we talk to is going
21 to have a different opinion of what a 1-story,
22 1 1/2-story house looks like, and it's also going
23 to depend on the architecture you show them, I
24 think, really is what it comes down to, so I

1 think we're barking up the wrong tree.
2 MEMBER DOYLE: Could you describe
3 what you want to do in terms of your plans that
4 this new definition does not accommodate?
5 What -- what -- what are the plans that you have?
6 MR. MARSHALL: Well, I had a hard
7 time understanding how it would apply to my house
8 to start with -- or Frank's house -- sorry -- the
9 design, and Russell and I -- Russell was kind
10 enough to get an e-mail shot back to me today
11 with the diagram of how that would work, and
12 if -- if his interpretation is -- sticks, it
13 would be just the amount of projections, although
14 on one side of the house, we're over the 3 foot,
15 but that's crossing that -- that -- that's on the
16 cross gable, so essentially it's a dormer; it's a
17 dormer pushed all the way to one side, so it's
18 kind of like a cross gable, actually. It's a
19 90-degree perpendicular to the main ridge, and
20 the right side of the house is -- starts at a
21 6-foot plate and then quickly shifts into a shed
22 dormer that's a full second-story plate because
23 we're trying to get a bedroom right over against
24 that.

1 It's a three-bedroom house. There's
2 two bedrooms under the main peak, and then
3 there's one bedroom running front to back. It's
4 a small footprint.
5 So -- but the -- the diagram that Russell
6 sent back to me today indicated mostly that he
7 didn't think it fit because of the percentage of
8 projections.
9 I could see him coming back and saying "Oh,
10 also, it doesn't fit because of this side up
11 there," you know? But, again, this is the
12 trouble with definitions, and this is the trouble
13 that I live with every day when these things
14 are -- are complex, and I really appreciate the
15 incentive that the zoning is trying to give you,
16 and I like incentives, like the front porch
17 incentives and detached garage incentives.
18 I think those are good things, but the -- the
19 complexity of these, it's just too hard to
20 predict how that's going to come out formwise.
21 MEMBER DOYLE: So your -- your
22 recommendation is that we relax the LCR?
23 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
24 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: That, I think, would be a simple -- just get rid of the whole story and a half versus two-story thing. As much as I like the incentives, I would recommend you just say, "It's too hard to design. Let's just go with 30 percent LCR," 1 story, 2 story, 1 1/2, whatever to want to call it, and set a maximum ridge height.

I do a lot of work in Glen Ellyn, where they have a ton of teardowns and they've basically said, "Maximum ridge height. Give me an LCR footprint and run with that."

They have some incentives for front porches and detached garages, as well, but it just seems simpler and easier for them in the long run. It's easier for people coming into town to renovate, when you're buying a house, to know what you can get out of that house.

It's very hard to look at a formula like that when you're buying a house and saying, "I could get three bedrooms out of this house." You have to go through the whole design process.

That's why it's hard for Russell to take a formula and really play out what that's going to

do as a -- as a case study. That's what is unfortunate that we've been doing with this one house, which is really kind of a case study, and right now the house doesn't work for that definition, and -- and I'm afraid that without it working this house isn't going to get renovated because it's just -- it's going to cost too much to get too little out of it, and we want to get at least three bedrooms out of it, and we want to at least have a kitchen, foyer, dining room. He doesn't even plan a living area. It's just got a great room concept and 1 1/2-car garage so --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And that's a whole different application. That's not --

MR. MARSHALL: That's not something to be voted on tonight.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's not even part of what we're discussing so --

MR. MARSHALL: I understand.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And, you know, it's interesting, Dan, because I know what you say, and I run into the same LCR situation in Elmhurst, for example, and I suspect that in different communities there's different -- you

1 know, different -- some people go after the
2 definition, and some people go after the LCR.
3 Every community is a little bit different.
4 I don't know that we'll ever be able to --
5 I mean, I have some recommendations that I would
6 make to this but that we may not agree with so --
7 MEMBER DOYLE: One more question.
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Sure.
9 MEMBER DOYLE: Does this
10 recommendation move in the right direction? Does
11 it do any harm, in your opinion, for us to
12 approve it and move in the direction that you
13 would want it to go, you know, if we -- what --
14 what would the consequences be of us voting it
15 down, as far as your project is concerned?
16 MR. MARSHALL: It -- it certainly
17 doesn't help our project in any way.
18 MEMBER DOYLE: To vote it up?
19 MR. MARSHALL: To vote -- to vote it
20 in.
21 To vote it down doesn't help us, either.
22 Really, what -- what the -- because, as
23 it -- as the definition stands, the project that
24 we're proposing doesn't fit into it, either.

It's -- there -- the form of the house does fit into it, but the existing definition has this criteria about 60 percent of the floor area, so we'd have the same form but would have leftover space in the attic that couldn't be used, and that's the existing definition.

So we could -- you know, to me, it's -- it's -- I don't want this to seem negative to Russ because he's been very helpful and is working hard at this and -- and bumping his head against this, but I -- I think it's going in the wrong direction.

I would say that, you know, we need to look at putting a new request for LCR changes on this. I don't know if that will ever happen or not. It's up to them.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You just said that -- did you mean that you think, if we approve this proposed text change, it would be in the wrong direction?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It would be better just to leave it the way it is, as far as you're concerned?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Anything else?

MEMBER HENNINGSON: Dan, do you have any opinion on how this may impact future new construction in the area? I know we don't have too many projects, but I was thinking of Lexington -- the potential Lexington project and how it may impact new construction or affordable housing.

MR. MARSHALL: As I understand it, it's in the RT-3 district only that we're talking about, which are very small lots, in-town lots, so it really -- new construction, as far as teardowns, it would affect the same way basically as rehabs would because it would still control that size that you can build out, but I would say that, for rehabbing or new construction in the RT-3 district, clarification is always better.

Right now the rule is very vague, but, again, the best thing, if you want to try and encourage -- encourage some development, would be to relax the LCR to 30 percent.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which we have

to remember is not anything that's in front of us. It has nothing to do with anything we're talking about.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, it has something to do with what you're talking about, in that you're going to continue to try to define this thing and you're --

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This may be the end of it tonight.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But the LCR is not part of the items we're discussing.

MR. MARSHALL: Right. It's not something you're going to vote on.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. I have a question.

We asked the public; we asked Dan what he thought about this amendment, the text change, and how it would, you know, affect his project, and, you know, would you say leave it the way it is or move on? You're the Applicant. You're proposing the text change.

1 Do you think that -- do you believe that
2 making this change is moving us in the right
3 direction towards making either a definition or
4 relaxing the existing definition?
5 MR. COLBY: Well, the -- the
6 definition that's been proposed that's before the
7 Plan Commission we think, from a technical basis,
8 is simpler to apply and is -- is easier to
9 explain.
10 The existing requirement that includes the
11 60 percent finished area, it's our opinion that
12 that does not have a direct relation to the
13 actual mass of the house, so we think, at a
14 minimum, that requirement should be removed, and
15 we think that the -- with the addition of the
16 dormers, at least we get to define what kind
17 of -- of projections you can have outside the
18 roof form, which we don't have right now, so it
19 would -- at least will take out a part of the
20 definition we think is a problem and introduce
21 some requirements that we think will be helpful
22 in explaining the definition and applying it to
23 plans.
24 That isn't to say that the definition

1 necessarily -- the outcome of it will be to, you
2 know, solve the concern about the size of houses,
3 but we think it clarifies it.
4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All
5 right.
6 Are there -- go ahead, Sue.
7 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I have a
8 question.
9 Russell, if it -- if this is intended to
10 clarify it, why all of a sudden do they think
11 that there's an issue here? If -- if what we're
12 doing is clarifying what's currently in place,
13 then I guess I'm not understanding why we feel
14 that this is a step backwards or a step away from
15 what you think would be beneficial for this.
16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And she is
17 asking you, Dan.
18 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Dan, it's for you.
19 MR. MARSHALL: I think it does
20 clarify the rule, but any kind of rule like this
21 with percentages and measuring 3 feet above the
22 floor -- they are complicated rules and they are
23 going to have unintended consequences that I
24 can't predict here without doing quite a bit of

1 studying, and every house that you do is going to
2 come out -- could end up where it promotes, you
3 know, everyone to do 50 percent shed dormers on
4 the front of their house. It's not a pretty
5 thing.
6 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So, Dan, what
7 you're saying is, by us trying to clarify, it's
8 making it more difficult for you? Is that -- is
9 that --
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: In this
11 particular -- yeah, in this particular case or
12 overall --
13 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Overall.
14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- or to any
15 project?
16 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I mean, as
17 someone that would have to abide by these.
18 MR. MARSHALL: Right.
19 MEMBER AMATANGELO: You're -- we're --
20 MR. MARSHALL: What I'm saying is I'd
21 like it to be simpler -- even yet -- simpler, if
22 possible.
23 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So, Russell, my
24 question, then, is, is there something else we

could do to clarify and yet not make it more difficult?

MR. COLBY: Well, I think that we can all agree that that 60 percent finished area inside does not make sense. At a minimum, I believe that should be removed because it doesn't relate to what we're trying to regulate.

I think the question is, to what extent do you regulate, firstly, the roof form, in terms of where the roof starts and how restrictive you are, in terms of whether or not you can have walls that exceed that -- that roof level? That's -- that's one aspect.

The other aspect is projections or things sticking out of the roof structure.

Do you want to regulate that at all? I mean, it's possible you can have a definition where that's not even regulated, but, then again, you don't have any limits in place as to, you know, how that -- how the building could be constructed.

So what we're trying to do is work within our existing definition, which has that requirement for the 3-foot wall as a maximum, and

1 sort of leave that in place on the basis that
2 it's a standard that -- that we have established
3 for some time.
4 You know, whether or not it was actually
5 used in practice, I can't say, but it has at
6 least been part of our ordinances for a while, so
7 we're trying to work within that framework.
8 But if you were to -- to take out those
9 restrictions on what happens outside of that,
10 then you could have, you know, larger dormers --
11 possibly -- you know, you could -- you could
12 increase these -- these percentage limits if you
13 choose and not have a regulation of that at all.
14 So what we're suggesting was that we wanted
15 to keep some differentiation between the -- the
16 1.5-and the 2-story house only because it relates
17 to the building coverage, if that answers the
18 question.
19 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Thank you.
20 MR. MARSHALL: I would agree to
21 taking the 60 percent out. That would help a lot.
22 MEMBER DOYLE: I have one more
23 question here.
24 When -- when you suggest that we should

1 relax the LCR, am I correct that you are --
2 you're also suggesting that defining a 1.5-story
3 house is really not -- it's not important?
4 MR. MARSHALL: Exactly.
5 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.
6 MR. MARSHALL: That we shouldn't be
7 trying to define 1 1/2 stories. It's too tough
8 to define.
9 MEMBER DOYLE: Right. Okay.
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Any
11 comments from the Commission? Go ahead.
12 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.
13 I -- my comment is that I think that there
14 are two separate questions proposed.
15 One question is, how do we define a
16 1 1/2-story house which is currently part of
17 the -- of the Ordinance? And the other question
18 is whether or not we should -- we should define
19 such a thing and what that would -- what the
20 relationship is to the LCR.
21 I don't think that the Plan Commission can
22 contemplate right now removing the definition --
23 that the basic premise of the -- of the Ordinance
24 without findings of fact about what that would --

1 you know, what it would mean to remove that
2 definition, what it would mean to relax the LCR,
3 and so we're not prepared at this point to really
4 pursue that.
5 In the meantime, we do have an ordinance
6 that is based on -- on this definition, and the
7 definition is flawed. I think we are agreed on
8 that.
9 And so long as we have an ordinance that
10 has that definition in it, I think we need to
11 make the definition as clear as possible and --
12 and then address the -- the -- the other question
13 of whether or not we should have that on a
14 separate basis.
15 How that gets initiated I'm not certain,
16 but I think we have a question in front of us
17 that needs to be answered because the Ordinance
18 has a definition, and if it's bad, we can't just
19 sort of table it.
20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I
21 agree; and I think that, Dan, the unintended
22 consequence of your test case is that the issue
23 in front of us isn't addressing your test case,
24 but we have to answer the question that, when you

1 brought this to the Plan Commission -- or to the
2 Planning Department and Russell, you said, "This
3 isn't working," and you said, "You know what?
4 You're right. That doesn't work right. I'm
5 going to recommend that we make a change here by
6 making an application to change it so it's easier
7 for people to understand it."
8 It doesn't happen to address the issue that
9 you brought before us, but at the same time, as
10 Brian says, it was discovered that we believed
11 that the text -- the Applicant believes that the
12 existing text is flawed and that it needs to be
13 corrected.
14 So I think the question in front of us
15 tonight is, is this text change, the proposed
16 text change, something that -- it's all we can
17 address. We can't address the LCR.
18 Is this something that we believe is going
19 to help clear up the definition of a 1.5-story?
20 So any other comments?
21 (No response.)
22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Do we
23 believe we have enough testimony to close the
24 public hearing? If so, I would hear a motion.

MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor.

(The ayes were thereupon heard.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Let's see. Amatangelo?

MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle?

MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes. Okay. That closes that public hearing.

(Which were all of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at 7:35 p.m.)

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
2 COUNTY OF K A N E)
3
4 I, Glenn L. Sonntag, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter No. 084-002034, Registered Diplomate
6 Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in
7 shorthand the proceedings had in the
8 above-entitled matter, and that the foregoing is
9 a true, correct, and complete transcript of my
10 shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.
11 In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my
12 hand on this 12th day of May, 2011.
13
14
15 Certified Shorthand Reporter
Registered Diplomate Reporter
16 Certified Legal Video Specialist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CERTIFIED ORIGINAL

1 S59668B

2

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
3) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

4

5 BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION

6

In Re the Matter of:)
7)
Foundry Business Park)
8 (Praise Ministries) Application)
for a Special Use to allow a)
9 Church/Place of Worship.)

10 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of
11 the above-entitled matter, before the City of
12 St. Charles Plan Commission, taken in the offices
13 of City of St. Charles, 2 East Main Street,
14 St. Charles, Illinois, on May 3, 2011, at the
15 hour of 7:44 p.m.

16

RECEIVED
St. Charles, IL
17
MAY 13 2011
18
CDD
19
Planning Division

20

21

22

23

24

1 PRESENT:
2 MR. TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman;
3 MS. SUE AMATANGELO, Member;
4 MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;
5 MR. CURT HENNINGSON, Member; and
6 MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member.
7
ALSO PRESENT:
8
MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planner; and
9
MR. MATTHEW O'ROURKE, Planner.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And we move on to Item No. 5, Foundry Business Park.

Again, everybody is sworn in, and we do have some items to read into the record here.

This is an application for special use to allow a church/place of worship, and the exhibits are: We have Plan Commission Exhibit A, the Application For Special Use dated 4/5/11; the Plan Commission Exhibit B is the staff report from Matthew O'Rourke dated 4/29/11; we have Plan Commission Exhibit C, which is an e-mail from Rob Phillips dated 4/26/11; and Plan Commission Exhibit D, which is a parking layout.

And I think that's all we have. Right?

MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And so we would like to hear from the Applicants.

MR. O'ROURKE: I think in this case, based on the nature of this application and the Applicant, it might be better for staff to kind of go over the facts and then you can ask any supplemental questions to the Applicant that you might have.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

MR. O'ROURKE: Praise Ministries has submitted a special use application to have a church at 761 North 17th Street, Lot 3. This is in the Foundry Business Park.

To provide a little bit of history on this development, the original PUD was approved in 1997 and it was subsequently amended in 1999.

The purpose for that amendment was more just to add territory to the development; it didn't change the fundamental use and layout of the PUD necessarily except to add more territory, some more building space, but that Ordinance did restate all the bulk and use requirements that were originally stated when the development was approved.

The Praise Ministries is looking to locate in one of the buildings on Lot 3 that was built in 2004.

Staff has included some information on when they hold services there at various times during the week, but most of the traffic would be Sundays from 10:30 a.m. until noon, and about 30 to 50 people attend.

What staff looked at this for the analysis

was really -- since the building's already built and everything has been approved, there's only a couple of items in looking at this that staff wanted to look at, the first one being the use.

Is it allowed? When this PUD was approved, it contained a list of permitted uses, but it also stipulated that anything allowed in the M1 limited manufacturing zoning district from the old Zoning Ordinance, either permitted or special use, would also be allowed in this PUD, and "Church" was listed as a special use in the old Zoning Ordinance, so, therefore, through the PUD, it is listed as a special use in this area.

The other concern that staff wanted to -- to look at, in terms of meeting the findings of fact, was the off-street parking requirements.

You know, the -- this PUD also looked at the old Ordinance zoning requirements, so staff decided to take that old Zoning Ordinance, look at all the old requirements and match that up with all the existing tenants, and staff has included a chart that kind of details that analysis.

When we did that, we did find that there

was a sufficient number of parking spaces within Lot 3, and, also, it's important to note that most of this PUD -- the entire Foundry Business Park -- is under common ownership, and per Ordinance, should there be the need for overflow parking, they can use the other lots in that development to do so.

With that, that concludes all of staff's remarks for this portion of the meeting and that the Applicant has asked that the item be placed on the meeting agenda -- which we did -- for recommendations tonight, and if the Plan Commission so chooses, they have permission to do that.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Any questions?

(No response.)

MR. PHILLIPS: Robin Phillips, Praise Ministries, pastor, 1731 South Seventh Avenue, St. Charles.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And you're currently at that location?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, we are.

We're looking to relocate because of the

1 condition of the building that we're actually in
2 and for a little bit better location, better
3 location parkingwise and everything else.
4 Though where we're at meets the
5 requirements, we're just looking for a better,
6 newer-looking facility so we can attract more
7 people, hopefully.
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.
9 I don't know who this question is for, but is
10 staff aware of any complaints from tenants in
11 their existing location about parking or crowds
12 or hours or anything like that?
13 MR. O'ROURKE: No. I personally have
14 not been made aware of any issues that -- with
15 ingress or egress or anything like that at the
16 current location so --
17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.
18 Nothing else from the public?
19 (No response.)
20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any
21 questions?
22 (No response.)
23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Testimony?
24 Do we have enough testimony to close the

public hearing?

Is there a motion?

MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

MEMBER DOYLE: Seconded.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All in favor?

(The ayes were thereupon heard.)

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Let's do a roll call.

Amatangelo?

MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle?

MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

Okay. That concludes that public hearing.

(Which were all of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at 7:49 p.m.)

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
2 COUNTY OF K A N E)
3
4 I, Glenn L. Sonntag, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter No. 084-002034, Registered Diplomate
6 Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in
7 shorthand the proceedings had in the
8 above-entitled matter, and that the foregoing is
9 a true, correct, and complete transcript of my
10 shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.
11 In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my
12 hand on this 12th day of May, 2011.
13
14

15 Certified Shorthand Reporter
Registered Diplomate Reporter
16 Certified Legal Video Specialist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24