

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2011 – 7:00 P.M.**

---

Members Present:                      Todd Wallace, Chairman  
    Tim Kessler, Vice Chairman/Secretary  
    Brian Doyle  
    Curt Henningson  
    Thomas Pretz  
    Tom Schuetz

Members Absent:                      Sue Amatangelo

Also Present:                          Rita Tungare, Community Development Director  
    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 Chairman Wallace.

3.        Presentation of Minutes

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2011 and June 7, 2011 meetings.** Mr. Pretz seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes:                      Schuetz, Pretz, Henningson, Kessler, Wallace

Nays:                      None

Abstained:              Doyle

Absent:                   Amatangelo

Motion Carried.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**4.        General Amendment (St. Charles Park District)**

Application for General Amendment to Chapters 17.12 "Residential Districts", 17.14 "Business and Mixed Use Districts", 17.16 "Office/Research, Manufacturing, and Public Land Districts", and 17.22 "General Provisions" pertaining to the permitting and placement of Small Wind Energy Turbine Devices

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

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to close the public hearing.** Mr. Pretz seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

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

## **MEETING**

### **5. General Amendment (St. Charles Park District)**

Application for General Amendment to Chapters 17.12 “Residential Districts”, 17.14 “Business and Mixed Use Districts”, 17.16 “Office/Research, Manufacturing, and Public Land Districts”, and 17.22 “General Provisions” pertaining to the permitting and placement of Small Wind Energy Turbine Devices

Mr. Kessler discussed a motion to recommend approval for the non-residential district portion of the wind energy application and to table the residential portion. He referred to the staff report recommendation option #3 where the general amendment application would apply to all except the residential districts and CBD1 and CBD2, and that those will be addressed at a future date. Mr. Kessler noted option 3 entails staff applying for a second general amendment, and he asked if they were doing that.

(8:20 p.m. the meeting was temporarily interrupted by a tornado siren)

(8:32 p.m. The Plan Commission meeting resumed in the lower level of City Hall)

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to recommend approval of the non-residential portion of the General Amendment Application to Title 17, Chapter 17.14 Business and Mixed Use Districts; Chapter 17.16 Office/Research, Manufacturing, and Public Land Districts; Chapter 17.22 General Provisions pertaining to permitting and placement of Small Wind Energy Turbine Devices based upon the Findings of Fact, Option #3 of the Staff Report dated 6/17/11, and the following condition being addressed prior to final City Council action:**

- **Application for a second General Amendment for both tower-mounted and structure-mounted wind turbines in residential districts and the downtown districts be tabled to a later date**

Mr. Doyle asked for clarification on the motion and discussed considering Option #1 because there would be the ability to install micro structure mounted wind turbines in the residential districts. Mr. Kessler stated he wants time to research appropriate ordinance restrictions and needs more information on aesthetics in residential areas.

### **Voice Vote:**

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

### **6. Delnor Woods PUD (The Collins Group)(East of the intersection of Iroquois Avenue and North Fifth Avenue)**

Application for Final Plat

- Final Plat received 5/27/11
- Delnor Woods PUD Ordinance

Mr. Colby reviewed the staff report dated 6/17/11 and stated staff recommended approval.

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to recommend approval of the Delnor Woods PUD application for Final Plat received 5/27/11.** Mr. Henningson seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: Pretz, Wallace, Kessler, Doyle, Henningson, Schuetz

Nays: None

Absent: Amatangelo

Motion Carried.

## **7. Meeting Announcements**

**Plan Commission** Tuesday, July 5, 2011 at 7:00pm at 112 N. Riverside – Century Station

**Plan Commission** Tuesday, July 19, 2011 at 7:00pm in the City Council Chambers

**Plan Commission** Tuesday, August 2, 2011 at 7:00pm in the City Council Chambers

## **8. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members, Staff, or Citizens**

Mr. Colby updated the Commission on the Comprehensive Plan Task Force process and meeting schedule. Ms. Tungare encouraged the Commission members to attend as many Task Force meetings and workshops as possible. Mr. Schuetz asked how Task Force meeting information will be distributed for residents and Commission members. Mr. Colby said newsletters, press releases, mail inserts, along with posting on the website will be done. Commission members also suggested e-mail notification and an organized phone tree approach, similar to how past focus group information was distributed. Mr. Kessler asked if focus groups will be conducted. Ms. Tungare said they will be conducted and staff is currently looking at locations to hold the sessions. Mr. Colby advised that the first Task Force meeting will be held Wednesday, June 29<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm in Dens A and B at City Hall. Ms. Tungare said the consultant from Houseal Lavigne will also attend the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:53p.m.

CERTIFIED  
ORIGINAL

101

1 S59883

2

STATE OF ILLINOIS )

3

) SS.

COUNTY OF K A N E )

4

5

BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION

6

In Re the Matter of: )

7

)

General Amendment (St. Charles )

8

Park District) Application for )

General Amendment to )

9

Chapter 17.12, "Residential )

Districts," Chapter 17.14, )

10

"Business and Mixed Use )

Districts," 17.16, "Office/ )

11

Research, Manufacturing, and )

Public Land Districts," and )

12

17.22, "General Provisions" )

pertaining to the permitting )

13

and placement of Small Wind )

Energy Turbine Devices. )

14

15

CONTINUED REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the

16

hearing of the above-entitled matter, before the

17

City of St. Charles Plan Commission, taken in the

18

offices of City of St. Charles, 2 East Main Street,

19

St. Charles, Illinois, on June 21, 2011, at the

20

hour of 7:03 p.m.

21

22

23

24

1           **PRESENT:**

2           MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;

3           MR. TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman;

4           MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;

5           MR. CURT HENNINGSON, Member;

6           MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and

7           MR. THOMAS SCHUETZ, Member.

8

**ALSO PRESENT:**

9

          MS. RITA TUNGARE, Community Development Director;

10

          MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planner; and

11

          MR. MATTHEW O'ROURKE, Planner.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

103

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

4 Tim, roll call.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle?

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz?

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

12 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace?

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler,

16 here.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

18 Item No. 3 on the agenda is presentation of  
19 the minutes of the May 17th, 2011, and June 7th,  
20 2011, meetings.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Move to  
22 approve.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

104

1 and seconded.

2 Any discussion on the motion?

3 MEMBER DOYLE: I will abstain since I  
4 was not present at the prior meetings.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Does that  
6 mean we have to do a roll call vote?

7 MEMBER DOYLE: I don't know. I'm  
8 just --

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't know. All  
10 right.

11 All in favor?

12 (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Abstaining?

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Abstain. Doyle  
17 abstains.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

19 Item No. 4 on the agenda is General  
20 Amendment, St. Charles Park District -- this is a  
21 continued public hearing -- application for  
22 General Amendment to Chapter 17.12, "Residential  
23 Districts," 17.14, "Business and Mixed-Use  
24 Districts," 17.16, "Office/Research,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

105

1 Manufacturing, and Public Land District," and  
2 17.22, "General Provisions" pertaining to the  
3 permitting and placement of Small Wind Energy  
4 Turbine Devices.

5 Since this is a continued public hearing  
6 from last time, if there's anyone who is here in  
7 the room who was previously sworn in would now  
8 continue to be under oath.

9 If there's anyone who was not previously  
10 sworn in who wishes to speak, if you will let me  
11 know and I will swear you in.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Matt, are you  
14 ready?

15 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes, I'm ready.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Go  
17 ahead.

18 MR. O'ROURKE: Okay. Good evening,  
19 everybody.

20 At the last public hearing, we discussed a  
21 lot of research and kind of analysis that staff  
22 went into in formulating this general amendment  
23 for wind turbines.

24 I think one of the primary comments that

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

106

1           came out of the discussion here with the  
2           Plan Commission was that there was some concern  
3           that maybe there was some more information needed  
4           and more time to consider how these types of  
5           devices would be either allowed and/or considered  
6           in residential areas and in downtown areas.  
7           Things there are more dense and it's a little  
8           more tricky to figure out just how to locate  
9           these devices.

10                 So there was a number of items discussed,  
11           and one of the things was possibly some more time  
12           to consider the wind turbines in residential and  
13           downtown districts, and that after that meeting  
14           staff went back and thought about the discussion  
15           and looked at the proposed ordinance, and kind  
16           of what we have done tonight is put together  
17           three options for the Plan Commission to consider.

18                 One of them we'll get into in some detail,  
19           but the basic idea was that we wanted to -- we  
20           wanted to have a more thorough discussion now  
21           since the information was out there and fresh in  
22           everyone's mind, and staff is here presenting  
23           this and we have everybody ready to do it, so we  
24           want to be sure we've covered all of our bases

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

107

1 before we decided to continue any part of the  
2 public hearing to a later date.

3 With that being said, the first option is  
4 identical to the option that was already  
5 presented at the last meeting, if that would be  
6 the ultimate way the Plan Commission would decide  
7 to go. So none of -- the text in the ordinance  
8 hasn't changed, but we looked at some pros and  
9 cons of this option.

10 Excuse me.

11 This does allow for wind turbines in  
12 one form or another in all zoning districts,  
13 whether they be structure-mounted or both. It's  
14 there.

15 It does -- the intent of the option was to  
16 limit the impacts to surrounding property owners.  
17 Staff was trying to be somewhat mindful -- not  
18 everybody wants one of these in their backyard,  
19 so in trying to come up with a decent mix of  
20 allowing it but not overallowing it, for lack of  
21 a better term.

22 The cons to this is it does restrict  
23 residential property owners to the structure-  
24 mounted turbines, and it does so in a way that

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

108

1 kind of limits their access to nonturbulent wind.

2 Option 2 is probably the most generous of  
3 all the options.

4 What we've done is revised it to say that  
5 the tower-mounted turbines would be allowed in  
6 special uses in all residential districts. The  
7 devices do have to follow the setback  
8 requirements listed in Option 1, which means they  
9 have to be set back the height of the tower from  
10 the property line plus 10 feet.

11 The tower-mounted turbines would be allowed  
12 in -- or not -- excuse me -- they will not be  
13 allowed in downtown districts. Staff took a real  
14 long, hard look at this, and when you think about  
15 the -- the characteristics of the properties and  
16 the buildings in downtown, there really is no  
17 good place to do it based on the analysis that  
18 staff did and presented at the previous meeting.  
19 Everything is just a little too dense for the  
20 towers.

21 One other change that we made in this  
22 option is that the height of the  
23 structure-mounted turbines in the residential  
24 districts would be allowed up to 10 feet taller

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

109

1           than the highest structure on the property, which  
2           means, if it's sitting on the peak of a roof, it  
3           could go up 10 feet above that, so that would  
4           give it a little more access to wind instead of  
5           being blocked from view of the public street and  
6           be limited to a height below.

7           The pros and cons of this particular  
8           option, it does allow for the wind turbines in  
9           all the zoning districts. It's easier to situate  
10          these devices in nonturbulent wind.

11          Some of the cons we looked at were  
12          increased potential to create nuisances to  
13          surrounding property owners, increased visibility  
14          of the turbines in residential districts, and not  
15          all residents will want a tower-mounted turbine,  
16          so it does have that side-effect.

17          Option 3 was an option primarily discussed  
18          at the last Plan Commission meeting, where staff  
19          would bring forward a second general amendment at  
20          a later date if the Plan Commission feels that  
21          they need more time to figure out how the impacts  
22          in the residential areas would play out.

23          Some pros and cons of this are that it  
24          would allow you more time to consider the impact.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

110

1           It does allow the turbines in nonresidential  
2           districts, but we are still moving forward with  
3           that section of the amendment.

4           Some of the cons is, there would be an  
5           increase in staff time, in terms of proposing  
6           staff materials, doing more research. There  
7           won't be any standards in place for residential  
8           and downtown districts until a later date, and  
9           this -- this last one is -- I've been researching  
10          these for two years. I've attended a number of  
11          conferences, Web conferences; I've been to open  
12          houses; I have done a lot of research. The  
13          information has not changed that much in  
14          two years, except for the different types of  
15          technology evolved slightly since then, but in  
16          the next three to six months, I don't see the  
17          background information changing a real lot, so we  
18          would have more time to weigh out that  
19          information to be used in residential districts,  
20          but I don't see the information itself changing,  
21          so I just wanted to make sure we all were kind of  
22          on that same page.

23                 And that is the end of staff's formal  
24          presentation. We are recommending approval of

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

111

1           the general amendment tonight, and we placed this  
2           on the meeting portion of the agenda for a vote  
3           and have proposed recommended findings of fact to  
4           that matter.

5                   Staff is not stating which one of these  
6           options they feel is best. They all do  
7           accomplish the goal of allowing wind turbines;  
8           it's just which way everybody feels more  
9           comfortable allowing them at this time.

10                   And I'll take any questions or comments  
11           that you have.

12                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I just have a  
13           question, and maybe this is more for Rita.

14                   What option -- I mean, based on our  
15           discussion last time, we tended towards  
16           Option 3 just because of the -- we felt that we  
17           needed to digest the information for the  
18           residential and downtown areas.

19                   But do you foresee a problem having  
20           sufficient staff time within the next six months  
21           in order to deal with -- with that portion of it,  
22           because I knew it would be an additional  
23           application?

24                   MS. TUNGARE: It's a good question.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

112

1                   Quite honestly, based on all the research  
2                   Matt has done and has been doing extensive  
3                   research on this for about a year and a half --  
4                   is that correct?

5                   MR. O'ROURKE: A year and a half to  
6                   two years, somewhere around there.

7                   MS. TUNGARE: A year and a half to  
8                   two years and really extensive research, and what  
9                   he has presented is pretty much what is out there  
10                  today, so I don't see anything increasing  
11                  substantially what he has presented in terms  
12                  of research or additional data in the next  
13                  six months.

14                 If -- if the Plan Commission decides not to  
15                 move forward with an amendment for residential,  
16                 my advice would then be that we table the  
17                 residential piece so that we put that aside for  
18                 at least a year. Bringing it back in six months  
19                 is -- is really not going to provide any  
20                 information and additional data, and from my  
21                 standpoint, there is -- there's also the  
22                 administrative side of things, the administrative  
23                 costs, you know, the staff time and -- and costs  
24                 that are incurred; you know, doing the work,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

113

1 publishing of a notice, a legal notice, bringing  
2 it back before the Plan Commission.

3 So if the Plan Commission is leaning  
4 towards adopting regulations for nonresidential  
5 at this point and deferring residential, I would  
6 defer it for at least a year at this point.

7 Matt has pretty much presented everything  
8 that's out there.

9 My suggestion is with an amendment like  
10 this general amendment, it's pretty much we are  
11 pioneers, so to speak, in this area. Kane County  
12 has adopted some regulations, but if we look at  
13 other communities in our vicinity, I don't  
14 believe anyone else has adopted regulations  
15 recently.

16 Matt, is that correct?

17 MR. O'ROURKE: Batavia is the only  
18 other community that has one, but they -- their  
19 ordinance has been in effect for some time. It's  
20 kind of outdated when you look at it.

21 MS. TUNGARE: Okay. So having said  
22 that -- having said that, we have to start  
23 somewhere, and -- and if we're going to adopt  
24 regulations, that I would rather adopt them in

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

114

1           the form that staff has proposed, whereby, for  
2           the residential, we are really being conservative  
3           and discrete, because we don't know what impact  
4           it will have on surrounding property. It's best  
5           to start small. We can always revise those  
6           regulations in about a year and see where --  
7           where things are at.

8                     MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question.

9                     CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

10                    MEMBER SCHUETZ: You had mentioned  
11           Batavia has adopted some regulations.

12                    What about some of the larger cities around  
13           here like Naperville or Wheaton or Glen Ellyn  
14           or --

15                    MR. O'ROURKE: As far as I know, I  
16           looked at a lot of those communities that we  
17           would consider comparable, and I didn't -- I  
18           could not find any.

19                    The big 800-pound gorilla is the City of  
20           Chicago. They have allowed these in a variety of  
21           ways. They're one of the -- as far as bigger  
22           cities, they're one of the better examples that  
23           are out there, but, to be honest, there just  
24           haven't been a lot of communities in the Chicago

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

115

1 area that have come forward with an ordinance  
2 like this.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, if we're going  
4 to vote on the residential, I guess I'm a little  
5 unclear about the acre lot and all that kind of  
6 thing.

7 MR. O'ROURKE: In terms of  
8 residential uses specifically?

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

10 MR. O'ROURKE: Basically, all -- any  
11 tower in a residential area would have to meet  
12 the same standards that were presented last time,  
13 so it would have to be on a lot that's a minimum  
14 of an acre. Even in a residential area, it would  
15 be a special use.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: For a freestanding  
17 tower?

18 MR. O'ROURKE: For a freestanding  
19 tower.

20 For the structure-mounted towers, there's  
21 no -- there's no lot size limitation.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: But an acre is not  
23 that big.

24 MR. O'ROURKE: An acre is based on

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

116

1 staff's analysis of the bare minimum that you  
2 could really have to adequately try to site one  
3 of these types of devices.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, I live on just  
5 about an acre, and -- and I don't think that's  
6 big for a tower.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And it would  
8 exclude at least -- over half the lots in town.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, at least. But  
10 if you go north of town, there are a lot of lots  
11 that are that size.

12 MR. O'ROURKE: I think that's -- it  
13 could be true.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: If you have a  
15 70-by-150-foot lot, you're not going to get much  
16 of a tower on that property.

17 MR. O'ROURKE: No. It wouldn't be  
18 very tall.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think it's  
20 interesting that, you know, what you bring up and  
21 I think it's important to consider.

22 I also think that, you know, as you say, we  
23 are pioneers in this and this is a huge,  
24 important issue in any kind of renewable energy

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

117

1 ordinance that we're passing, and I know you've  
2 spent a lot of time on it, and I do believe  
3 you're right that probably the technology and the  
4 engineering of it isn't going to change  
5 significantly, if at all, in the next three to  
6 six months, but I think there's other issues,  
7 particularly residential areas, restricting it so  
8 that no in-town lots are possible to have a  
9 freestanding, you could only have  
10 structure-mounted, and you have a limit to how  
11 high you can put it.

12 But if you're in town and you're in an  
13 older neighborhood and you have nothing but trees  
14 around you, forget it. It's just not possible,  
15 and I don't think that that's what we're trying  
16 to promote here.

17 I think -- I think you're trying to -- and,  
18 you know, you're -- you're -- I think you're  
19 trying to embrace this in some way, but what  
20 we're doing is, we're eliminating most -- most of  
21 town. It's going to work on a commercial  
22 property and some big lots somewhere outside of  
23 town and that's it.

24 So I -- I'm not so sure I agree that we

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

118

1           should just, you know, keep this restrictive and  
2           then someday revisit it again, because we've been  
3           doing this -- we have been restrictive in  
4           renewable energy in this country for 20 years or  
5           longer, and we've got to quit doing it. We've  
6           got to just, you know, make the commitment to it,  
7           and I don't think -- you know, I don't think that  
8           it's "Let's just try this and see if it works."

9           I think -- I would go for Option 3, where  
10          we go ahead -- I think we've got the plan in  
11          place for the commercial, and I think we need to  
12          spend a little more time -- you know, we do,  
13          perhaps -- and come to you with some ideas on how  
14          to better incorporate this type of renewable  
15          energy into the residential districts that we  
16          don't have now and we won't have even if we pass  
17          the ordinance in the first form. We just won't  
18          have it.

19                 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And, I mean, are  
20          you talking along the lines of us actually, you  
21          know, possibly forming a subcommittee of the  
22          Plan Commission to look at this?

23                 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yep.

24                 In fact, I was -- I was asking, you know,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

119

1 earlier, you know, what kind of outside -- and,  
2 you know, I know you've spent a lot time, Matt,  
3 going to different, you know, Web seminars and  
4 you've talked with people, but my question was  
5 somewhat pointed. Who -- who is -- you know,  
6 there's got to be people who could advise us.

7 Right away I know Gordon. I mean, he  
8 worked in this industry with the Department of  
9 Energy for a long time, and perhaps just, you  
10 know, maybe we should come to you with some other  
11 options for this, and maybe a subcommittee is the  
12 way to go, but I think it's that important.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, I agree, and I  
14 don't -- I mean, I don't want any of at least my  
15 comments from last time to be construed as not  
16 wanting this option available in residential.

17 I just -- I mean, I want it to be in the  
18 most practical form possible, you know, and  
19 that's -- that's -- I mean, that's the reason for  
20 my -- for me, it's -- it's not -- I mean, I -- I  
21 appreciate -- I think you've done a great job in  
22 looking at this.

23 MR. O'ROURKE: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I know that you

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

120

1           have all the information. It's just -- I mean,  
2           it's -- it's almost more a matter of, you know, I  
3           want us to be able to digest the information, as  
4           well, because I do think that it's important.

5                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: Will we -- like Tim  
6           says -- exclude -- not intentionally -- but most  
7           of the people in town because the trees are  
8           large, the lots are small? What are our -- I  
9           mean, I -- I agree.

10                   What are our options?

11                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well -- and I  
12           can't -- well, under the proposed Option 1, at  
13           least in my area of town there would not be a lot  
14           that I can think of that would be appropriate,  
15           you know?

16                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: There's got to be  
17           some cities that have done something.

18                   MR. O'ROURKE: Just based on  
19           everything I looked at, you just don't see towers  
20           in dense neighborhoods for a variety of reasons  
21           because, one, the physical characteristics aren't  
22           conducive to wind energy; and, two, because of  
23           all these other property issues that you run into  
24           with having them -- you know, nuisances,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

121

1 attractive nuisances, you know, whether people  
2 just don't want them in their backyard -- all  
3 those things that -- staff really did try to  
4 create a balance on that.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Maybe somebody --  
6 maybe because you're all waiting for some other  
7 city to do something.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Can I -- I have a  
9 couple of questions here.

10 So the difference between Option 1 and  
11 Option 2 is the matter of 10 feet on the  
12 residential property; correct?

13 MR. O'ROURKE: No. The biggest  
14 difference between Options 1 and 2 is that  
15 Option 2 does allow tower-mounted turbines in  
16 residential districts as a special use, but they  
17 do have to meet the -- the use standards that the  
18 previous option had set up.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Correct.

20 MR. O'ROURKE: Which is a minimum  
21 1-acre lot, you know, to start with, and from  
22 there on.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Didn't it also say  
24 that the maximum height would be no greater than

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

122

1 10 feet above the top of the structure?

2 MR. O'ROURKE: Those are the  
3 structure-mounted specifically.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

5 MR. O'ROURKE: So one that's mounted  
6 on the roof of the home.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: So Option 2 would  
8 allow tower-mounted turbines on 1-acre properties  
9 provided that they meet all the setbacks?

10 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. In virtually all  
11 the zoning districts except downtown.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. And so the  
13 question I have about that, let me -- the height  
14 that's required, based on your introduction about  
15 siting and wind, states that you have to be at  
16 least 30 feet above -- 500 feet away, 30 feet  
17 above the -- any --

18 MR. O'ROURKE: Sure.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: -- major obstacles;  
20 trees, structures, et cetera?

21 MR. O'ROURKE: This diagram, I think,  
22 explains it really well.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Right.

24 So I just want to make sure we're clear,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

123

1           we're talking about towers that -- if the --  
2           what's the average height of a tree in a  
3           residential neighborhood?

4                   MR. O'ROURKE: Boy, this would be a  
5           pure guess but about 50 feet.

6                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have 50-,  
7           60-foot trees in my yard.

8                   MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So we're  
9           talking about towers that potentially are  
10          100 feet tall.

11                   MR. O'ROURKE: 120 seems to be the  
12          maximum.

13                   MEMBER DOYLE: Up to 120 is the  
14          maximum?

15                   MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

16                   MEMBER DOYLE: Which is different,  
17          you know?

18                   The reason -- that's why I brought up the  
19          10 feet because I thought that Option 2 was  
20          saying basically that you could have a  
21          pole-mounted turbine on -- on your structure up  
22          to the difference between the basically 10 feet.

23                   But now I understand you're talking  
24          about --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

124

1 MR. O'ROURKE: Right.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: -- free-standing  
3 pole-mounted turbines, as well.

4 I -- a couple of questions.

5 One point just in terms of your definition.  
6 I know you used a kilowatt. You say that  
7 structure-mounted don't -- shall not exceed  
8 100 kilowatts and tower-mounted shall not exceed  
9 10 kilowatts.

10 Are those inverted? Because --

11 MR. O'ROURKE: It's not. It's --  
12 one should be "kila" and one should be "kilo."

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

14 MR. O'ROURKE: It's something I have  
15 to fix.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So the point  
17 is, though, that the tower-mounted turbines  
18 provide more power?

19 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

21 MR. O'ROURKE: They're larger and  
22 they are, by definition, to be -- to have more  
23 energy capacity.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: And I didn't see

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

125

1 anything in here about -- for structure-mounted  
2 turbines that provide -- is it "kila" or "kilo"?

3 MR. O'ROURKE: For the  
4 structure-mounted, it would be "kilo."

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Kilo. Okay.

6 What's the benefit, in terms of energy  
7 conservation, to a household for a micro turbine?  
8 How would we quantify the benefit?

9 MR. O'ROURKE: You know, there was a  
10 gentleman here last time that -- that had a much  
11 better explanation for that than I can.

12 But what you can ultimately count on, you  
13 would never generate enough power to run your  
14 home. It would be more about slowing your meter  
15 down.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: And so even a  
17 structure-mounted -- even a structure-mounted  
18 turbine at 20 feet, does it still have the  
19 potential to facilitate energy conservation?

20 MR. O'ROURKE: It would, yeah.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: It would. It wouldn't  
22 be as effective --

23 MR. O'ROURKE: It's not as effective.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: -- as the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

126

1 tower-mounted that's 100 feet tall.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: And a lot of that is  
3 based on the kind of turbine. The vertical axis  
4 ones are much more -- they have a better ability  
5 to use urban wind, as they call it, instead of  
6 regular -- you know, the ones we're all used to.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. One more  
8 question in terms of facts.

9 In Option 2 you state that tower-mounted  
10 turbines in residential areas would need to meet  
11 all the requirements in Option 1 for business and  
12 commercial. Included in this setback, in  
13 addition to 100 percent of the tower height plus  
14 10 feet, is another provision that says, "and a  
15 500-foot setback from any residential district."

16 MR. O'ROURKE: Right.

17 MEMBER DOYLE: So if you're in a  
18 residential district, obviously, does the  
19 500-foot setback just not apply?

20 MR. O'ROURKE: That standard was  
21 meant only for when commercial districts abut  
22 residential districts.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So once you're  
24 in a residential district obviously you're there.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

127

1 MR. O'ROURKE: Right.

2 And part of that was the nature of -- in  
3 certain nonresidential districts this is going to  
4 be allowed as a permitted use; in residential  
5 districts it would be strictly a special use,  
6 so there would be a review each time one of  
7 these goes up by the Plan Commission and the  
8 City Council, so the 500-foot was put in more of  
9 a general guideline for those districts because  
10 of that -- they could just show up one day.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, may I  
12 make a couple of comments now.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So as far as  
15 the three options, I guess my thoughts are, I --  
16 I agree with Rita that Option 2 is a less  
17 conservative option and there are a lot of  
18 unanswered questions about the impact, and that  
19 would be preferable -- between Option 2 and  
20 Option 1 -- preferable to go with Option 1 to  
21 start.

22 My concern about Option 3 is that I think  
23 that, if we table this, it is going to get tabled  
24 indefinitely for residential use. It's not going

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

128

1 to come back to us and we're going to miss an  
2 opportunity to take a step forward.

3 My question about does a micro turbine  
4 provide any benefit to the homeowner to  
5 facilitate energy conservation? Are we giving  
6 the homeowner anything in Option 1? And the  
7 answer is yes, we are.

8 It's up to the individual homeowner or  
9 property owner to determine if the benefits  
10 justify the expense, but they still have that  
11 option to determine whether or not they want  
12 to -- to do this, and if we are pioneering this,  
13 it seems that we're making a balanced statement  
14 about taking a step forward but being cautiously  
15 optimistic about the impacts versus delaying  
16 action potentially indefinitely, unless, Todd,  
17 you're correct, that the Commission itself really  
18 needs more time for analysis, that we have all  
19 the information, we just don't have the time  
20 right now to analyze it.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well -- and one of  
22 the things that we asked last time was whether we  
23 would be able to table the entire application,  
24 and -- and the reasoning for that is because

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

129

1           there's one specific use that the -- at one of  
2           the parks, whether it's dependent upon grant  
3           funds. You know, they need to be moving.

4                     MEMBER DOYLE: Uh-huh.

5                     CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that was really  
6           our -- our reason for wanting to split it up, you  
7           know, to -- we -- to allow them to move forward  
8           with that, with that portion of it so --

9                     MS. TUNGARE: Mr. Chairman, can I  
10          make a couple of comments --

11                    CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12                    MS. TUNGARE: -- to supplement what  
13          Commissioner Doyle just said?

14                    Something to take into consideration is, if  
15          we move forward with a general amendment for  
16          residential in some way, shape, or form, it gives  
17          us an opportunity to educate and provide an  
18          exposure to the community and for our residents.

19                    If we do nothing, a year from now we might  
20          be in the same boat and have the same discussion.  
21          If we move forward even with the roof-mounted  
22          equipment, people get some exposure. There's a  
23          little bit of education there. There's a little  
24          bit of interest from other community members,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

130

1           and -- and -- and what that does is, there's more  
2           of an increase and an interest in being more  
3           environmentally sensitive.

4                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But I don't --  
5           I mean, I don't agree with that. I -- I don't --  
6           with all due respect -- I don't agree because,  
7           you know, yeah, it's going to create -- you know,  
8           it's going to create interest because we've  
9           recommended to the City Council to put, you know,  
10          an ordinance into place to allow it, but I think  
11          that we can also create interest by having -- I  
12          mean, if -- even if it doesn't involve additional  
13          work by the staff, I think there are a number of  
14          us that are interested in this, you know, to --  
15          to do a public forum or something like that.

16                   I -- I know that the attitude of a lot of  
17          people -- a lot of citizens -- you know, us all  
18          being citizens -- if we -- we have anger about  
19          "All of a sudden an ordinance goes into place  
20          that we didn't have any input or any idea about,"  
21          and I'm saying that it's our responsibility to do  
22          that, but I think that this is something we all  
23          agree is important enough where it -- you know,  
24          it could be publicized, and I don't think it's

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

131

1 the intent of anyone to sweep it under the rug  
2 and -- you know, and not deal with it.

3 I don't know. I mean, I don't know. That  
4 was my intent anyway.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: If we're to look at  
6 Option 1 and move that ahead, it would give the  
7 opportunity for the park to get their grant; is  
8 that correct?

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any of these  
10 options.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any of these  
12 options.

13 MR. O'ROURKE: All three options  
14 allow that to happen.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Option 1 basically  
17 is as presented. There would be structure --  
18 structure-mounted turbines would be allowed in  
19 the residential areas.

20 Option 2 would allow -- and would be even  
21 more expansive and allow tower-mounted as a  
22 special use and would allow them to be higher  
23 than the structure-mounted would in Option 1.

24 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

132

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And Option 3 would  
2 basically -- it would -- well, it would table the  
3 residential and the -- and the CBD-1 and 2 portions  
4 of -- of the --

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: What's the danger of  
6 going with Option 1 and then we -- we revisit it?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because we  
8 won't revisit it.

9 But I'm curious about something. I'm  
10 curious about something.

11 When we spoke last week, we weren't --  
12 one second.

13 We -- we were pretty clear that this wasn't  
14 going to be just tabled indefinitely. We would  
15 expect that this would come back to us in a -- in  
16 a period of time that we said it would come back  
17 to us, so it's not going to go away.

18 And that brings up another thing Rita said.

19 I don't know if you have ever had an opportunity  
20 to use it, but, you know, we had that whole  
21 facilitation group here in St. Charles, and there  
22 was a really good point made about advertising --  
23 you know, letting residents know that this is  
24 something that the Planning Department was

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

133

1 interested in wanting to do.

2 I don't know why we can't over the next  
3 three months have Brian Townsend and the focus  
4 group -- we have all those people in place, and I  
5 don't know if anybody has been used for any  
6 period of time.

7 MS. TUNGARE: I don't know which  
8 group you're referring to specifically.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: In about  
10 1999, there was a group of a dozen citizens --  
11 and I think there's 16 of them now -- who were  
12 trained by Arthur Andersen to facilitate focus  
13 groups for the City of St. Charles.

14 Arthur Andersen trained all of them and we  
15 held -- I can't tell you how many -- focus groups  
16 on different topics that were important and  
17 relevant to the City among residents from all  
18 over town, and people volunteered for it, and I'm  
19 pretty sure Brian Townsend knows about this, and  
20 there are a number of facilitators -- I was a  
21 facilitator -- there's a number of facilitators  
22 still around that could do a focus group which  
23 would draw attention to this issue, would get  
24 input from residents on what their expectations

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

134

1           are and desires are in this area, and give folks  
2           outside or give the Plan Commission some, you  
3           know, input other than the technical things that  
4           Matt has so diligently worked on.

5                   MEMBER DOYLE: A question for both  
6           Plan Commissioners and for the staff.

7                   For the Plan Commissioners, do any of you  
8           who are vying to be less restrictive know people  
9           in the community who you've heard, you know, say  
10          or express interest in -- in placing a  
11          tower-mounted turbine on their property?

12                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I've had a  
13          lot of discussion with many people about  
14          renewable energy on their property, not  
15          specifically tower-mounted wind turbines, but,  
16          yes, there are many people interested in that  
17          topic, and I think the focus here is  
18          specifically, you know, wind energy but --

19                   MEMBER DOYLE: Well, I just -- the  
20          question that I was going to ask staff was if  
21          they had any inquiries about tower-mounted  
22          turbines in residential properties, and, I mean,  
23          can we substantiate in any way that there is a  
24          public interest in -- in such an ordinance? Or

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

135

1 do we have to go out and solicit that public  
2 interest to -- to -- you know, I mean, if we have  
3 to go out and beat the bushes, then I'm not --  
4 you know, that -- that might be a point of  
5 concern for me, but if we're responding to  
6 interest that comes up from the public, that's a  
7 little different matter.

8 MR. O'ROURKE: The -- and I can  
9 state -- I can't tell you for the whole staff --  
10 but all the inquiries I have received and know  
11 about were all business owners wanting to look at  
12 this on commercial properties. I can't say that  
13 I've had one resident come to me and ask if this  
14 was allowed.

15 MS. TUNGARE: That would be my  
16 experience, as well. It would be mostly inquiries  
17 on commercial properties; nonresidential uses.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Gordon, did you  
19 have a comment?

20 MR. DRAWER: It's still public  
21 hearing so I can address you?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It is still a  
23 public hearing, yes.

24 You were sworn last time?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

136

1 MR. DRAWER: Yes, I was.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. If you  
3 could just state your name for the record.

4 MR. DRAWER: Gordon Drawer, Allen Lane,  
5 City of St. Charles.

6 Do you want the address?

7 THE COURT REPORTER: No, sir.

8 MR. DRAWER: I've been trying to come  
9 back with some of the information in answers to  
10 your questions and trying to keep in order, but  
11 you're going too fast.

12 The first thing is, people don't want a  
13 wind turbine or purchase them for aesthetic  
14 reasons. One is going to buy them. They do it  
15 to save money. And so the wind decides where  
16 you're going to site one, and if you don't have  
17 good wind like you saw the -- the obstructions of  
18 the trees or the other buildings, then it's not  
19 feasible to do it.

20 A wind turbine is -- is funny because the  
21 fuel is free. That's why people like it, but  
22 it's very capital intensive to purchase, so  
23 almost all of the decisions are going to be  
24 economically driven by "Is it -- is it

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

137

1           economically feasible to do this? Will there be  
2           enough wind to make it worthwhile?" And if it's  
3           not, "If I'm not going to get any advantage,"  
4           they are not going to do it, so for -- for that  
5           reason, you're probably going to eliminate a very  
6           high percentage of your potential residential  
7           part of it.

8                       Where could you do it? Obviously, the park  
9           district is bringing it up in their park, but I  
10          could envision maybe even a tower at the foundry  
11          area on the west side. Maybe some of the other  
12          business parks might come along. If they're  
13          trying to cut their energy or if they're looking  
14          at some new usage, they might want to generate  
15          their own free fuel to offset the increase,  
16          things like that.

17                      But you always do a test of the wind, and  
18          if the wind doesn't blow in your area, you're not  
19          going to put it in.

20                      And I -- I agree with your minimum of  
21          1 acre. In reality, it might work in some  
22          particular place, but, in reality, the 2-acre  
23          would probably be more feasible, and I really --  
24          I envision wind towers in residential wind in the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

138

1 county homes rather than in the city.

2 As far as the downtown, you're right.

3 There's nothing there. The only one that would  
4 strike me is the roof of the parking structure on  
5 First Avenue, and even then I'm not sure if  
6 the -- the natural valley dip wouldn't be too  
7 high.

8 I don't know what the winds do, if they  
9 would come down to that, so you can't preclude --  
10 you can't think of all the things that you don't  
11 want to ahead of time, but I think that  
12 you're very well addressing the question among  
13 yourselves is, "Do you want to be a follower or a  
14 leader?"

15 Now, this whole thing has been generated by  
16 the park district, and they're putting it in  
17 their environmental teaching center, examples of  
18 renewable energy.

19 They have the green roof, the solar, the  
20 photovoltaic, and solar thermal, and now they're  
21 asking for the wind, and so they're going to have  
22 classes and students and also visitors coming in  
23 there, and so they're doing the learning for  
24 you -- they're doing the teaching, I should say.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

139

1 People will see that and say, "What's that up  
2 there?"

3 "Well, that's generating electricity."

4 They'll be able to go over and see how much  
5 power is being generated by the wind.

6 They will have a display inside or outside,  
7 in the metering, things like that, so right away  
8 now you're educating the public and you're  
9 peaking their interest whether or not they want  
10 to have it.

11 So if you want to wait and see how the  
12 other communities do it, that's certainly a good  
13 approach to take; but if you want to really jump  
14 on this and say, "Well, we're going to have a  
15 display. We're educating the children. They're  
16 going to come home and talk to their parents,"  
17 then maybe you want to consider being a leader  
18 and saying, "We've already put in our zoning to  
19 allow this in the city." We realize it's not  
20 going to impact many people because it's just not  
21 economically and wind feasible, but nonetheless,  
22 you know, you could make a recommendation to the  
23 City for something like this to go forward.

24 I don't know what the Council's feel on

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

140

1           this is, either, as far as residential, but it's  
2           really kind of deciding "Do you want to make a --  
3           a green example for St. Charles for  
4           sustainability?" There's a lot of interest in  
5           that area in the last five years, and so this is  
6           a chance to step up and, at least on your level,  
7           make a recommendation that "Yeah. Let's go  
8           through with this and not just put it off and  
9           wait until there's an overwhelming group of  
10          people coming in." I think you've -- coming in  
11          asking for it.

12                 I think you have -- you've announced the  
13          public hearing, sent out the notices for the  
14          residential around the park district. I don't  
15          see any press here. I guess they don't bother to  
16          come to this anymore; but, you know, you could  
17          also do a press release or something, but I think  
18          it could tie it into Arbor Day or Earth Day or  
19          something like that, as -- as an example that  
20          St. Charles has stepped up and addressed this.  
21          It's something new.

22                 You know, maybe -- maybe the special use is  
23          the more restrictive way to do it so that people  
24          just don't run in, but, in reality, it's not

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

141

1 going to happen because -- especially on the  
2 tower. The reason people have towers is because  
3 it's a bigger unit. You're going to generate  
4 more electricity, and so it has to be  
5 economically feasible to pay for all that tower  
6 and equipment.

7 In reality, the most you can probably  
8 expect in St. Charles down the road is a  
9 building-mounted vertical one, which is what you  
10 described aptly as a -- the urban type of a wind  
11 turbine, and people might come to that if they're  
12 not surrounded by trees someday.

13 That would be easy to mount. It might only  
14 be 1, 2, or 5 kilowatts or something, and they  
15 might do that to step up and see how it is. But  
16 I don't think any salesman is going to get anyone  
17 to buy it unless they can prove and test that  
18 there is wind and the potential value to them to  
19 spend that money because, if there isn't, no one  
20 is going to take advantage of it. It's just not  
21 economical.

22 Did any of that make sense? Any questions?  
23 I mean, I'm trying to kind of pick up all the  
24 different things that you touched upon.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

142

1                   MEMBER DOYLE: What's your opinion  
2                   about the benefit of micro turbines on -- on, you  
3                   know, structure-mounted micro turbines at, you  
4                   know, the -- at the structural level?

5                   MR. DRAWER: There has been a lot of  
6                   interest in Chicago, and that's what your staff  
7                   referenced, and so I think that's where it's  
8                   going to start.

9                   St. Charles is very conservative, and it's  
10                  a beautiful area, so we probably haven't led  
11                  anything in the past. We wait until the people  
12                  demand it and then come in and ask for it.

13                  Is it ready yet? Technically, I'm not  
14                  sure. I know of a Federal building in Chicago  
15                  that put up some wind turbines and they didn't  
16                  work, and so they've already taken them down and  
17                  returned them to the -- to the manufacturer.

18                  So I think the technology still hasn't  
19                  proven how effective it is, but as far as size  
20                  and aesthetics and things like that, it's all  
21                  going to start small because of the economics  
22                  involved in -- in doing it, and I -- I wouldn't  
23                  think anyone would be able to sell it unless they  
24                  can do a wind test and show the potential

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

143

1 homeowner that there is a regular amount of wind.

2 Most of Illinois is what they call a  
3 2 level of wind. There's a smaller section near  
4 Springfield and Quincy that's Level 3, and that's  
5 a higher wind; and then there's a small area -- a  
6 couple areas of Level 1, and the Level 1 is not  
7 applicable for wind turbines, so if we're in an  
8 area that has been designated as Level 1, then  
9 probably we don't have anything to worry about.

10 But the Wind Level 2 now, the manufacturers  
11 have developed economical wind turbines to work  
12 in that level which is not a high wind.

13 Like you said, you don't want to have  
14 the -- how did you describe it? -- turbulent  
15 winds. Even the big wind turbines that you see  
16 out on the wind farms are geared to shut off at  
17 60 miles an hour or higher. They just lock in  
18 place because that could damage everything in a  
19 tornado or a turbulent wind.

20 And so the person that was here last week,  
21 who was -- who was selling those smaller ones in  
22 Chicago -- along with other renewable energy --  
23 he would probably be better to say how Chicago is  
24 adapting with it and how many people are doing

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

144

1           it, and I've seen pictures and results of all  
2           types of it, but that part of it is probably not  
3           really feasible right now; that I would be very  
4           surprised if anyone rushed to do any of them,  
5           even if you set -- the most lenient one was  
6           available. It's just -- you know, it's too  
7           expensive and everything.

8                     The only reason you put it in -- no one  
9           will put it in to show up. They're going to put  
10          it in because it's going to save them money on  
11          their power, and we have good rates here in  
12          St. Charles, but, obviously, in the future, the  
13          power rates are expected to rise, so that's why --  
14          that would drive people wanting to do it in  
15          businesses. The park district is an example or a  
16          demonstration.

17                    Anything else I could respond to?

18                           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think  
19          I agree with what you're saying, if having an  
20          ordinance in place is something that St. Charles  
21          would point to as being a leader -- and in either  
22          of the options that we're proposing tonight that  
23          would be the case -- there would be an ordinance  
24          in place.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

145

1 MR. DRAWER: I think it would show  
2 you're proactive rather than reactive.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I don't  
4 think that anybody on the Commission here --  
5 well, I speak for myself -- but I'll say that  
6 nobody here is going to sit and wait for somebody  
7 else to put an ordinance in place. I mean,  
8 that's not the intent. The intent is simply to  
9 spend more time looking at this.

10 The issue in front of us, I believe, has to  
11 do with the fact that we were -- Matt has spent a  
12 lot of time on this.

13 As it was brought to us, there is a time  
14 crunch here for the park district, and so for us  
15 to spend more time looking at this, we decided to  
16 split them so the park district wouldn't lose  
17 their funding, and that's simply what we're  
18 attempting to do right now.

19 MR. DRAWER: The park district is  
20 firmly what I'm in favor of.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Good.

22 Then they can get going and, in the  
23 meanwhile, don't say we're tabling it  
24 indefinitely, but that we have a time and place

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

146

1           that we come back after doing one of these things  
2           that we've talked about, to research.

3                   I mean, the technology may not change, but  
4           there's a number of things. The micro towers  
5           that can generate electricity in -- in up to, I  
6           think, 2- to 3-mile-an-hour winds, and maybe  
7           right this minute they're expensive, but that's  
8           not to say that the -- you know, vertical  
9           turbines.

10                   That's not say that in six months from now  
11           that won't even change because there's all kinds  
12           of things -- there's a lot of things, I think,  
13           that we need to consider before we just pass a  
14           blanket --

15                   MR. DRAWER: As far as wind turbines  
16           go, it's not the speed; it's the constant amount  
17           of wind.

18                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

19                   MR. DRAWER: So like you said, a  
20           small amount of wind but at a longer time would  
21           be effective for the type of equipment.

22                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And do we  
23           know? Are we a Level 2 here in St. Charles or a  
24           Level 1 or a Level 3?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

147

1 MR. DRAWER: Overall I think it's a 2.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: It's a 2 but it's a  
3 height of something like -- it's like a height of  
4 100 feet above ground level. That's what the  
5 ratings are based on.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So up on the  
7 hill we're going to be closer to Level 2 than  
8 down below?

9 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. It's 100 or  
10 150 or so feet up. I have to look at the maps  
11 that Gordon referenced.

12 MR. DRAWER: Your high points are the  
13 only places that it would be doable.

14 Thank you very much.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: I had a question for  
17 staff.

18 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: In Option 2 it says  
20 that for residential they would apply for a  
21 special use permit.

22 Can you just help me understand the steps  
23 that a resident would go through in order to get  
24 the approval?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

148

1 MR. O'ROURKE: Sure. Sure.

2 It would be like any other special use that  
3 comes before the Plan Commission. They would be  
4 required to fill out an application with staff,  
5 as far as -- we review it.

6 We would set up a public hearing, which  
7 means everybody within 250 feet of that  
8 residential property would be notified by  
9 certified mail. The public hearing is published  
10 in the paper, and then we go through the public  
11 hearing process in front of the Plan Commission,  
12 and, ultimately, each one would get approved  
13 individually by the City Council.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Thank you.

15 MS. TUNGARE: If I can supplement  
16 what Matt said is, we will put use standards in  
17 place, some criteria in place, that will have to  
18 be used for the Plan Commission to evaluate each  
19 and every special use.

20 So, basically, there would be a framework  
21 within which the Plan Commission would have to  
22 make a determination on the special use, and that  
23 is per the advice of our legal counsel.

24 Again, it's so subjective that, if we allow

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

149

1           it for one, there is a consistency that we allow  
2           it for someone else. If they meet the criteria,  
3           then the Commission has been consistent.

4                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That Option 2  
5           would be -- I said I think it would be bad idea.

6                   Just -- you know, no offense, but I -- I  
7           know the first time that we send notices out  
8           within 250 feet of the first person that puts in  
9           an application, there's going to be public uproar  
10          about "Well, how was this passed? Nobody knew  
11          about it," et cetera, et cetera. You know? I  
12          think we all know how those things go.

13                   MEMBER DOYLE: This -- I -- this is  
14          an important point. I was going to ask the Plan  
15          Commissioners to try to get a sense of how many  
16          of us would be inclined on further reflection  
17          to -- to consider that we might vote for  
18          Option 2?

19                   Now, if the sense of the Commission is  
20          that, you know, this doesn't have much of a  
21          chance, then whether the -- whether tabling it is  
22          definite or indefinite, it doesn't matter because  
23          we're saying now that our sense -- that we're not  
24          going to -- this doesn't really stand much of a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

150

1 chance of ever being approved in the future.

2 I don't know if that's what the sense is.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I just -- I don't  
4 like having a special use review.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: The special use part  
6 of it?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, the special  
8 use because then we would have to go through a  
9 special use review for everyone who puts in an  
10 application in a residential area. I just  
11 don't --

12 MR. O'ROURKE: Only for the  
13 tower-mounted.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

15 MR. O'ROURKE: I just point that out.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

17 MEMBER DOYLE: So you might approve  
18 of the basic concept without the special use.  
19 You might say it's --

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes. But it would  
21 have to take a different form than what we've  
22 already looked at.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: The second question,  
24 if the Plan Commission communicates to the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

151

1 Council and to the staff that it feels that this  
2 warrants further work on staff's part, and that  
3 we do want something more, we do want this to  
4 come back to us again at some point in the  
5 future, is there any reason why voting for  
6 Option 1 now and recommending it to Council now  
7 would in any way preclude or diminish the  
8 possibility of our loosening those -- those  
9 restrictions in one month or in two years?

10 MS. TUNGARE: It does not preclude  
11 that in any way procedurally. There are multiple  
12 times we've gone through general amendments  
13 and -- and -- and had to go back and refine  
14 those.

15 A prime example is our Zoning Ordinance.  
16 We adopted an entirely new Zoning Ordinance in  
17 2006.

18 A year into that we brought back some  
19 amendments to that Zoning Ordinance.

20 A couple of years after that we brought  
21 back some more amendments, and we do it on an  
22 annual basis now and multiple times a year, so it  
23 does not procedurally preclude staff or the  
24 Plan Commission from -- from initiating an

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

152

1 amendment if you choose to do so.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, yeah.

3 So just to rephrase my question, really  
4 what I'm getting at here, is this an either/or or  
5 a both/and proposition?

6 Can we consider the possibility of  
7 recommending approval of -- of model -- of  
8 Option 1 and indicate to staff possibly that we  
9 also want to investigate further some of the  
10 concepts that are presented in Option 2 at some  
11 point down the road? Or does any -- you seem to  
12 be, Tim, strongly -- you know, you seem to have  
13 the strongest concerns about this.

14 Do you feel that we would be losing  
15 anything if we were to recommend Option 1?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I'm  
17 afraid that if we recommended Option 1, that we  
18 would lose the impetus to -- to follow up on  
19 this, you know, in a -- in a reasonable period of  
20 time, and I think my biggest concern, Rita --  
21 honestly, my biggest concern is that I think it's  
22 too restrictive for most of town, and that's --  
23 to me, that's the biggest issue that I have with  
24 this, and I'm not sure without doing -- you know,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

153

1 I have done some research, but it's only been  
2 two weeks. It's just not enough time.

3 I want to figure out a way that we can make  
4 it less restrictive in residential areas in town,  
5 and I think that Option 2 is going to cause a  
6 problem.

7 As Todd points out, go ahead and approve  
8 the towers. If -- if I was sure -- and I think  
9 we should use this focus group idea. I think we  
10 need to spend more time on that residential  
11 portion.

12 If I knew it was coming back, that we said  
13 we would like it in three months and set a date,  
14 let's get together. Let's decide what we're  
15 going to do, how we're going to approach the  
16 continued research, and then set a date to come  
17 back.

18 MS. TUNGARE: Can I -- Mr. Chairman,  
19 can I respond to Mr. Kessler's comments?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 Let me ask a question, though.

22 Also included as one of the things that we  
23 discussed last time was the possibility of  
24 bifurcating the application and actually making a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

154

1 recommendation on the portion of the application  
2 and table the remainder for a period of time.

3 I think that that's a viable alternative.

4 That way, when we want to have public -- we -- we  
5 keep it on the agenda as -- as an item. I mean,  
6 we could keep the public hearing open, as long as  
7 it's continued on a -- I don't know enough about  
8 the -- what the notice requirements are, but I  
9 think, as long as we continue it regularly, it  
10 still remains before us.

11 MS. TUNGARE: I think procedurally  
12 that's possible, and maybe if I start off by  
13 responding to Mr. Kessler's comments.

14 From a timing standpoint, from an  
15 administrative standpoint purely, I have some  
16 concerns at this point in terms of allocating  
17 resources to this important initiative in the  
18 next few months, and especially if we're talking  
19 subcommittee -- staffing subcommittees or focus  
20 groups, and the primary reason for that is -- and  
21 Russell Colby will address additional business --  
22 we are embarking on rewriting our entire  
23 Comprehensive Plan. That process has already  
24 been initiated, with the blessing of

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

155

1 City Council, and that is going to be a  
2 significant effort on the planning division's  
3 part over the next several months.

4 So if we were to bring back a general  
5 amendment, if there has to be any additional  
6 research, any input from citizens, maybe input  
7 with the Plan Commission, my recommendation would  
8 be that -- that we bring it back within another  
9 12 months or so. I cannot commit at this point  
10 bringing it back within three or four months.  
11 You know, we just can't be in a position to  
12 allocate those kinds of resources right now, the  
13 Comprehensive Plan already having been initiated.

14 So to respond to your question,  
15 Chairman Wallace, here is my suggestion: I think  
16 you can definitely bifurcate the process for  
17 purposes of tonight. The Plan Commission --  
18 given the sentiment of the Plan Commission, you  
19 can make a recommendation on the nonresidential  
20 piece of it and we can move forward. The park  
21 district can move forward with that piece.

22 The residential piece of it, when we are  
23 ready to move forward with that piece of it, we  
24 will republish a notice and deal with it, but,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

156

1           again, at this point I -- I really feel  
2           comfortable saying that we could revisit that in  
3           a period of about a year. That will probably be  
4           more appropriate.

5                     There's no point committing to something we  
6           can't keep a commitment at this point.

7                     CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would --

8                     MR. DRAWER: Mr. Chairman,  
9           Mr. Chairman, I just thought of something.

10                    I can see what you're saying, and I'm not  
11           going to make any recommendation like the staff  
12           did -- it's your choice -- but if you want to  
13           just approve the section that allows the park  
14           district to go over, I think they're going to  
15           have their wind tower installed within  
16           six months, and they might have a kickoff or  
17           some publicity or something, and that might be  
18           your segue into revisiting it -- the part of  
19           it -- see what the reaction is, see what it looks  
20           like and stuff, and then it might be okay to drag  
21           it out sometime after that to see what the public  
22           says or have focus.

23                    CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well -- and I  
24           actually -- my -- my next thought was to continue

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

157

1           it to a certain date for status, and in that  
2           time, I would open up communication with someone  
3           on the park board about exactly that, whether  
4           it's something that they would -- I mean, I -- I  
5           don't know that there's any reason why it -- you  
6           know, something could not be done purely by  
7           Plan Commission and park board members, you know,  
8           hosted at the -- at the nature center, you know?  
9           I mean, hosting a public forum at the -- at their  
10          new center, I think that's extremely appropriate,  
11          and I think it makes it even more -- I think  
12          there's even more of an impact.

13                 One -- one of the things that I take  
14          exception to is that there won't be interest in  
15          the wind turbines in residential areas because of  
16          the economics.

17                 I don't think -- I -- I think that you  
18          discount my generation, and a lot of people who  
19          will want a wind -- personally, you know, a micro  
20          turbine, exactly because they want to show it off.

21                 MR. DRAWER: The more common they  
22          are, they drive the price down, so probably  
23          within some time period it's going to become  
24          more -- reasonable and feasible.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

158

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

2 MR. DRAWER: But I also want to just --  
3 I'm a great proponent of wind and renewable  
4 energy, but I've also been involved in a lot of  
5 construction and stuff.

6 Since we are going into something new  
7 here -- they have a schedule and everything --  
8 but I've learned that whatever can go wrong will,  
9 and so by not giving your zoning right away and  
10 waiting to see how this basic first one in the  
11 area goes, you're kind of protecting yourself  
12 until -- if something unforeseen happened. You  
13 know, let's not -- you know what I'm saying? If  
14 they fall behind schedule or something.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

16 MR. DRAWER: I think what you're  
17 saying makes a lot of sense. Just wait and see  
18 and see what the public policy is as far as  
19 pushing it in too much, but I think approval for  
20 the park district is a great first step.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
22 further comments? Questions? Anything?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you have

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

159

1 anything else, Matt?

2 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

3 Just sitting here and listening to the  
4 conversation, one question I have is, in  
5 three months or in a year, do we -- do we -- does  
6 the Commission envision an ordinance where we're  
7 allowing 120-foot-tall towers in every  
8 residential neighborhood in town? By right, I  
9 mean, are we holding this whole thing up  
10 because --

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. I don't think  
12 so. I don't think so.

13 MR. O'ROURKE: I guess my confusion  
14 is that they either have to be high or they're  
15 mounted on the structure, and that's kind of  
16 where we go. I don't understand why three months  
17 from now it's going to change that. I really am  
18 getting a little --

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It may not. I don't  
20 know.

21 MR. O'ROURKE: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that's what I  
23 don't know.

24 MR. O'ROURKE: I guess I just wanted

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

160

1 to kind of get that out there.

2 If we're just delaying it for three months  
3 to come back and do the same thing, what's the  
4 point?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, maybe  
6 it's going to be 10 feet higher than the tallest  
7 structure or within a certain distance, or maybe  
8 it's going to be on the garage and it's going to  
9 be 10 feet taller than the house, or maybe, you  
10 know -- I mean, there's lot of differences,  
11 depending on the property and the aesthetics of  
12 the property and the structures around the  
13 property. Something could change in the way  
14 we've written this first pass that you have spent  
15 so much time on, but I think -- I don't want to  
16 go back to the same thing.

17 We've brought -- we had this brought to us  
18 for the park district, and now they're in a time  
19 crunch, and we've had two weeks, and this is a  
20 big issue, and I think that's the most important  
21 thing to me is that there are a lot of other  
22 things we need to consider when we're writing  
23 this ordinance.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I will --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

161

1 I think -- I can only speak for one person -- but  
2 I think, for me, the difference would be, voting  
3 on this exact same thing three months from now,  
4 there is a chance I would vote for it.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: On which? Option 2?

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The residential  
7 component.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Which option?  
9 Option 2 or Option 1?

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, I don't know.  
11 I mean, if Option 1 or 2 came back three months  
12 from now in exactly the same form, I would be  
13 better educated to know -- to be comfortable with  
14 voting for it.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: What I'm hearing is  
16 two things here. If we come back in 3 months,  
17 6 months, 12 months, what I'm hearing from Tim is  
18 that we need to be more fine in detail as far as  
19 this option, that option, height, you know, like  
20 you just mentioned from this structure, that  
21 structure, or is it technology that you're  
22 thinking is going to change?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. I -- I  
24 don't think that it's going --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

162

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it has nothing to  
2 do with technology?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I would  
4 never say "never."

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Because we can't  
6 wait on technology, no.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't think  
8 it's technology. I think it's how we -- how we  
9 write the ordinance, what you can have.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I don't see the  
11 downside if we were to approve General Amendment  
12 Option 1. Like Rita had mentioned, it gets it  
13 going; it gets the public aware of what's  
14 happening; and when they find out more about it  
15 from the park district, then they come to the  
16 City if they want to place one.

17 I mean, this sounds a little backward. I  
18 know what you're going to think when I say what  
19 I'm going to say, that we put an amendment  
20 together to change it, add to it, that's what you  
21 don't want to do.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. But the  
23 question is who?

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Who?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

163

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The ordinance is  
2 already there.

3 Who is going to come back? How is it going  
4 to come back before the City?

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I don't know. I don't  
6 know how the process works.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, somebody has  
8 to bring an application.

9 MS. TUNGARE: Staff can also  
10 initiated an application. We always -- there  
11 have been various times we initiate an  
12 application.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I think what I'm  
14 hearing, we don't want the amendment or the  
15 general amendment like this, the residential, in  
16 stone, so if you don't meet it, forget it. Then  
17 we never hear back as an amendment.

18 That is probably a concern; correct?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That is a  
20 concern, yeah.

21 MS. TUNGARE: But it should only be a  
22 concern if the amendment that is in place is not  
23 working.

24 For example, if it precludes a specific

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

164

1 individual from doing what they want to do, it  
2 precludes a number of individuals from doing what  
3 they want to do, or truly poses some issues from  
4 a technical standpoint, where -- where, you know,  
5 there's -- there's just been some error in our  
6 judgment there, by all means, staff has and will  
7 continue to initiate general amendments to the  
8 ordinance. We do that.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I don't think we're  
10 going to find our answer unless people come  
11 forward and want to put one in.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: To Matt's question, I --  
13 you know, about Option 2, I'm not prepared to  
14 recommend it tonight. I'm not certain that  
15 1 acre is a sufficient size. I might be more  
16 comfortable if it was 5 acres, but in terms of  
17 what I understand based on the -- the information  
18 that's been presented to us, I think you're  
19 exactly right.

20 The question is: Are we prepared to  
21 consider, by right, 120-foot wind turbine towers  
22 to be installed in residential property? If  
23 we're serious about renewable energy, then we  
24 need to consider that question and say, "Yeah.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

165

1           Maybe we are."

2                   I don't think anyone -- my sense is that no  
3           one on the Plan Commission is prepared to  
4           recommend that tonight, and I sort of concur with  
5           Tom that -- that I -- I -- I think that Option 1  
6           is -- is a fine sort of incremental step to take,  
7           and then I would like to see it come back to us  
8           at some point that it is appropriate in relation  
9           to staff resources and other priorities, and,  
10          frankly, I don't mind waiting for members of the  
11          public to come to us and say, "I really want to  
12          do this. Why don't you allow it?"

13                   Say, "Well, put forward a -- work with  
14          staff to put forward a motion to amend."

15                   I think there should be something. Just as  
16          the park district has come forward and said, "We  
17          want to do this. Will you do something to make  
18          it -- make it happen?" You know, it seems  
19          appropriate that there should be a certain amount  
20          of pressure from the public to say, "This is  
21          something that we really think is good and we  
22          want you to help make it happen."

23                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I understand  
24          what you're saying. I mean, the -- the period --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

166

1 the opposite of that is, you know, the public is  
2 not -- not knocking down the doors to -- perhaps  
3 to, you know, have this done, but why put some  
4 restrictions in place that they have to change?

5 Why not -- why not -- if -- if we have  
6 time, take the time to put together an ordinance  
7 that is appropriate, that's going to -- that  
8 you're -- I guess I can say the same thing.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I agree with what  
10 you're saying, Timothy, but I'm afraid it's not  
11 going to happen for a year.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But you know  
13 what? Maybe -- what everybody is saying is we're  
14 not being -- we're not being inundated with  
15 requests.

16 Maybe that doesn't matter and maybe before  
17 the year is up, well, as Todd points out,  
18 bifurcate the -- where it continues to come up  
19 before us maybe before a year's time, and we've  
20 done enough research.

21 We say, "Okay. We'll go ahead and vote."  
22 That maybe it won't take a year, but by not doing  
23 it, you're going to force the residents -- it's  
24 one thing for the park district to come with an

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

167

1 application. It's another thing for somebody  
2 over on 13th Street to come with an application.  
3 It's a different thing.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Come with an  
5 application.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's too  
7 expensive and people don't have the resources  
8 and they don't -- they don't have the staff to --  
9 to come with an application, so let's -- let's  
10 take our time here. We don't have to rush into --  
11 there's no reason to rush into it, by what I'm  
12 hearing from, you know, staff and from you, so  
13 why rush into it?

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Do you want to be a  
15 leader or a follower?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We're going  
17 to be the leader because we're going to have an  
18 ordinance in place. We're not waiting to see  
19 what somebody else does. We're waiting to check  
20 it out. We're waiting to spend more than  
21 two weeks looking into it, you know, for our  
22 purposes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would like to  
24 make it something that would make people in

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

168

1 residential areas want to implement this type of  
2 technology.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I agree with you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Again, in the form  
5 it is right now, that's not going to happen, and  
6 I don't know how to make it happen. That's what  
7 I want to know. So that's -- I mean, that's my  
8 reason.

9 MS. TUNGARE: I think -- I think --  
10 I think I'm starting to recognize the sentiment  
11 that exists amongst some of the members of the  
12 Plan Commission. It's not that there's any  
13 opposition to having regulations in place for  
14 allowing or disallowing it for residential, it's  
15 just that I think there's -- Commission members  
16 feel that there needs to be a better  
17 understanding. They want to have a better grasp  
18 of the issues that surround residential.

19 One of the things I can offer -- having  
20 said that we would bring this back in one year,  
21 here are a couple of things that we can offer in  
22 the interim.

23 In the spirit of all of us collectively  
24 educating ourselves more on the residential piece

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

169

1 of it, is if we come across workshops, seminars,  
2 you know, any Web casts, any information that  
3 would be over the next several months, we will  
4 share it with the Plan Commission.

5 If we come across any speakers potentially  
6 who are willing to come out here and speak to the  
7 Plan Commission, any consultants, anyone who has  
8 got any expertise in this area, we can offer  
9 that, as well.

10 And, in the interim, if there is that  
11 resident out there, the adventurous resident, who  
12 comes in here knocking on our door saying, "I'm  
13 going to put up a tower in my backyard, and I  
14 want to file an application for a general  
15 amendment," they have a right to file an  
16 application, and we have an obligation to process  
17 the application.

18 So those are the -- the issues or the other  
19 suggestions I have to the Plan Commission to  
20 consider.

21 You know, the sense I'm getting is that  
22 there's some debate here between going with  
23 Option 1 versus bifurcating the process, and --  
24 and I agree with a couple of statements here that

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

170

1 we really don't have people waiting out there  
2 knocking on our doors for the residential piece,  
3 so by not adopting the residential piece of it  
4 today, are we specifically hurting anyone or are  
5 we holding anything back? It's difficult to say.  
6 I don't believe so. I don't believe that's the  
7 case.

8 So the only thing is, I can't commit again  
9 to bringing this back sooner because it doesn't  
10 give us that much time. It doesn't make sense.  
11 And, again, it's not a good use of our resources.  
12 So as long as we all agree to a reasonable amount  
13 of time, we can continue this dialogue and  
14 process of education. We can bifurcate the  
15 process.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
18 other questions?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Comments?

21 Anything?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then I  
24 guess the --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

171

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make  
2 a motion but I don't know exactly --

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I was going  
4 to say, I guess the two motions that would be in  
5 order would either be to close the public  
6 hearing, or to continue the public hearing as to  
7 a portion of the application and close as to the  
8 remainder.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is it  
10 necessary to keep the public hearing open?

11 MS. TUNGARE: At this point, my  
12 suggestion is it would be cleaner if you just  
13 close it because you don't want -- it's probably  
14 cleaner if we come back after a few months and  
15 just republish the notice. That way, no one can  
16 fault us for conducting a public hearing whenever  
17 we want.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So I would  
19 make a motion that we close this public hearing.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: I will second.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved  
23 and seconded.

24 Any discussion on the motion?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 06/21/2011  
GENERAL AMENDMENT (ST. CHARLES PARK DISTRICT)

172

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim, roll call.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle?

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz?

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

8 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Henningson?

10 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace?

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The  
15 public hearing is closed.

16 Thank you, Matt, and that concludes  
17 Item No. 4 on the agenda.

18 (Which were all of the  
19 proceedings had in the  
20 above-entitled matter at  
21 8:10 p.m.)

22

23

24

1           STATE OF ILLINOIS     )  
  ) SS.

2           COUNTY OF K A N E     )

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

I, Glenn L. Sonntag, Certified Shorthand  
Reporter No. 084-002034, Registered Diplomat  
Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in  
shorthand the proceedings had in the  
above-entitled matter, and that the foregoing is  
a true, correct, and complete transcript of my  
shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

11

12

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my  
hand on this 28th day of June, 2011.

13

14



*Glenn L. Sonntag*

15

Certified Shorthand Reporter

16

Registered Diplomat Reporter

17

Certified Legal Video Specialist

18

19

20

21

22

23

24