

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY OCTOBER 4, 2011 – 7:00 P.M.**

---

Members Present:            Todd Wallace, Chairman  
                                     Brian Doyle  
                                     Curt Henningson  
                                     Tom Schuetz  
                                     Sue Amatangelo  
                                     Thomas Pretz

Members Absent:            Tim Kessler, Vice Chairman/Secretary

Also Present:                Rita Tungare, Community Development Director  
                                     Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager  
                                     Matthew O'Rourke, Planner  
                                     Thomas Good, City Attorney  
                                     Sonntag Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

A meeting of the St. Charles Plan Commission was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chairman Wallace.

**2. Roll Call**

**3. Presentation of Minutes**

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the September 20, 2011 meeting.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**4. Lexington Club PUD (Lexington Homes LLC)(North of Dean and State Streets, east of 12<sup>th</sup> Street, west of 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and south of the railroad tracks)**

Application for Map Amendment (M-1 Special Manufacturing to RT3-Traditional Single Family Residential and RM-2 Multi-Family); Application for Special Use as a Planned Unit Development; Application for PUD Preliminary Plans

Supporting Documents:

- PUD Preliminary Plans
- Traffic Study – Revised 9/27/11
- Water Modeling
- Sanitary Sewer Evaluation

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, October 4, 2011**

**Page 2**

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

Exhibits:

- M. Traffic Study by KLOA, dated September 27, 2011
- N. Recognized Environmental Conditions plan by Huff and Huff submitted October 4, 2011

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

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

Voice Vote:

Ayes: Doyle, Pretz, Henningson, Schuetz, Amatangelo, Wallace.

Nays: None

Absent: Kessler

Motion Carried.

**MEETING**

**5. Meeting Announcements**

**Plan Commission** Tuesday, October 18, 2011 at 7:00pm at Council Chambers

**Plan Commission** Tuesday, November 8, 2011 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers

**Plan Commission** Tuesday, November 22, 2011 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers

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

None.

**7. Adjournment at 9:50 P.M.**

1 S60345

2 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 ) SS.  
3 COUNTY OF K A N E )  
4

BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION

5

6 In Re the Matter of: )  
 )  
7 )

Public Hearing of )  
8 Lexington Club PUD )  
(Lexington Homes LLC) )  
9 (North Dean and State )  
Streets, east of 12th )  
10 Street, west of 5th )  
Street, and south of the )  
11 railroad tracks). )

12

13 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of  
14 the above-entitled matter, before the City of  
15 St. Charles Plan Commission, taken in the offices  
16 of the City of St. Charles, 2 East Main Street,  
17 St. Charles, Illinois on October 4, 2011, at the  
18 hour of 7:04 p.m.

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

**PRESENT:**

MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;

MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;

MR. CURT HENNINGSON, Member;

MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member;

MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member; and

MS. SUSAN AMATANGELO; Member.

**ALSO PRESENT:**

MS. RITA TUNGARE, Community Development  
Director;

MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager;

MR. MATTHEW O'ROURKE, Planner; and

MR. TOM GOOD, City Attorney.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

140

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The St. Charles Plan  
2 Commission will come to order.

3 Call for the roll call.

4 Wallace. Here.

5 Doyle.

6 MR. DOYLE: Here.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

8 MR. PRETZ: Here.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Kessler. No.  
10 Henningson?

11 MR. HENNINGSON: Here.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

13 MR. SCHUETZ: Here.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Amatangelo.

15 MS. AMATANGELO: Here.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 3 on  
17 the agenda, presentation of the minutes of the  
18 September 20, 2011, meeting.

19 Motion to approve?

20 MS. AMATANGELO: So moved.

21 MR. SCHUETZ: Second.

22 MR. DOYLE: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?  
24

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

141

1 (The ayes were thereupon  
2 heard.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes.

6 Item 4 on the agenda is the Continued  
7 public hearing, Lexington Club PUD, Lexington  
8 Homes, north of Dean and States Streets, east of  
9 12th Street, west of Fifth Street and south of the  
10 railroad tracks.

11 Application for Map Amendment (M-1 Special  
12 Manufacturing to RT3-Traditional Single Family  
13 Residential and RM-2 Multi-Family.)

14 Also Application for Special Use as a  
15 Planned Unit Development and Application for PUD  
16 Preliminary Plans.

17 Supporting documents: PUD Preliminary  
18 Plans, traffic study revised 9/27/11, water  
19 modeling and sanitary sewer evaluation.

20 Last time, we had Exhibits A through L. We  
21 have one additional exhibit for the record. And  
22 that is Exhibit M, the revised traffic study by  
23 KLOA dated September 23, 2011.

24 All right. Anything else before we begin?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

142

1 MR. COLBY: Yes. I just wanted to make  
2 a couple brief comments.

3 At the last hearing on September the 20th,  
4 there was discussion of the traffic study. I  
5 wanted to clarify that that study was conducted by  
6 KLOA who is a traffic consultant working on behalf  
7 of the developer, Lexington Homes. And KLOA will  
8 be presenting more information on that traffic  
9 study this evening.

10 The scope of that study, the methodology,  
11 and the findings were all reviewed by the City's  
12 traffic engineer, H.L.R. And we have a  
13 representative from H.L.R. at the meeting as well.

14 Secondly, there was discussion at the  
15 previous meeting about the affordable housing  
16 proposal.

17 I wanted to direct the Plan Commission to  
18 consider the recommendations of the Housing  
19 Commission that were included in the staff memo  
20 for the previous meeting and to consider those in  
21 your review of the affordable housing request.

22 That is all.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

24 All right. I think unless there are any

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

143

1 objections from members of the Plan Commission I  
2 would like -- since a lot of the discussion and a  
3 lot of the requests for additional information  
4 from the last meeting had to do with the traffic  
5 study -- I think once we give an introduction to  
6 the public hearing we should go with commentary  
7 from the person who -- that did the revised  
8 traffic study. And then after that, we will  
9 proceed with questions and comments.

10 Does that sound okay to everybody?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right. So  
13 this is a continued public hearing. For those of  
14 you who have been here before, you are going to  
15 have to hear me again on this.

16 The Plan Commission is commissioned by the  
17 City Council to hold public hearings on  
18 applications that come before us -- that come  
19 before the City.

20 We hold a public hearing. We take  
21 testimony from the Applicant and from anyone else,  
22 any member of the public who wishes to offer  
23 evidence to us either for or against the  
24 application. During this time, members of the



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

144

1 public are allowed to ask questions or make  
2 comments regarding this application.

3 Once we feel that we have enough  
4 information, the public hearing will be closed.  
5 And the Plan Commission will make a recommendation  
6 for either approval or denial to the City Council.

7 The last time, we went through a portion of  
8 that process. Because there were multiple members  
9 of the public here who wished to make comments and  
10 ask questions, basically we did primarily that  
11 last time. We will do some more of that this  
12 time. But also, Plan Commission members I  
13 understand have additional questions and comments  
14 that we wish to make as well.

15 So as soon as we feel that we have enough  
16 information, then there will be a motion to close  
17 the public hearing. And then we will at a later  
18 date vote on whether to recommend denial or  
19 approval of this application to the City Council.

20 Any questions from members of the public  
21 regarding procedure?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

24 Because of the way that the public hearing

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

145

1 is set up -- and sometimes we kind of allow these  
2 two things to bleed into each other. But because  
3 of the way the public hearing is set up, what I  
4 would prefer to do is to take testimony and then  
5 allow people to ask questions specifically  
6 regarding that testimony.

7 After we have all those questions asked,  
8 then we can make comments or offer evidence that  
9 doesn't have to do with that testimony. And I am  
10 going to be a little bit more strict about that  
11 this time just in the interest of efficiency.

12 So at this point in time, anyone who wishes  
13 to offer any testimony, including asking any  
14 questions, I would ask that you be sworn in.

15 If you would, raise your right hands.

16 (The witnesses were duly sworn.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

18 And just to remind everyone, there is a  
19 court reporter here that is here taking down  
20 everything that is being said here tonight. And  
21 therefore, only one person can talk at a time.

22 So I will remain in control of who can and  
23 can't talk. I would ask that you respect that.  
24 If I haven't recognized you, please don't shout

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

146

1 out anything from the back of the room.

2 And when you do wish the speak, approach  
3 the lecturn, state your name, spell your last name  
4 for the record, and also state your address.

5 All right.

6 So if we could proceed with the Applicant,  
7 if you would like to tell us about the traffic  
8 study.

9 MR. STILLWELL: Again, just for the  
10 record, my name is Henry Stillwell, 300 East  
11 Roosevelt Road, Wheaton, Illinois. Last name  
12 S-t-i-l-l-w-e-l-l. I am the attorney for the  
13 Applicant.

14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the guidance.  
15 And I would like to suggest that if it pleases the  
16 Chairman and Commission what we will do is first  
17 have two witnesses provide some supplemental  
18 testimony.

19 First, as the Chairman has indicated, there  
20 were questions about the traffic report. There  
21 has been a revised report submitted pursuant to  
22 the discussion at the last hearing. And so  
23 Mr. Luay Aboona from KLOA will address that with  
24 the Commission.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

147

1                   In addition, one of the Plan Commission  
2 members requested that Mr. Huff, who is the  
3 environmental consultant, overlay the  
4 environmental locations identified on his plan  
5 onto the site plan so that you could better see in  
6 relationship to the known sites how they relate to  
7 the plan itself. So that has been done. I don't  
8 have that electronically. But Mr. Huff will  
9 address that and hand out paper copies for you to  
10 take a look at.

11                   We thought we would start by covering those  
12 two areas and then, as you said, allow the public  
13 questions to ensue and subsequent comments toward  
14 the later part of the meeting.

15                   Then if I could, once the public has had an  
16 opportunity raise questions and ask comments, I  
17 will conclude with my summary including addressing  
18 the standards. There were some specific comments  
19 made at the last meeting which I want make sure we  
20 address, especially with the PUD standards and how  
21 this plan interrelates with some of the objectives  
22 of those standards. I would conclude with  
23 comments.

24                   So if that is acceptable, I would ask

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

148

1 Mr. Luay Aboona to step forward and testify  
2 relative to the revised traffic study.

3 MR. ABOONA: Thank you. Good evening.

4 My name is Luay Aboona, A-b-o-o-n-a. I am  
5 a traffic engineer with KLOA.

6 And as was indicated, we submitted a  
7 traffic study with a revision date of  
8 September 27. The study, even though it is a  
9 revision, it is -- the methodology and the  
10 analysis and the conclusions that were included in  
11 the original study have not changed.

12 What we -- what we did with the revised  
13 study is address a couple of comments or issues  
14 that were raised at the last hearing.

15 One was to correct a typo in terms of Table  
16 2 on Page 12 which compared the traffic that would  
17 be generated by the Lexington Club with the  
18 industrial use that was or could occupy the site.  
19 There was some typo in terms of the numbers  
20 between Table 1 and Table 2. We corrected that  
21 and now they match.

22 That table, as you see, still indicates  
23 that the traffic from Lexington Club would be 50  
24 to 60 percent less than it would be if it was an

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

149

1 industrial use. So obviously, that is a  
2 considerable reduction in the impact.

3 And we also included on Page 7 a  
4 description of the traffic count summary sheets  
5 that were included in the appendix of the report.  
6 It goes into the detail in terms of what page the  
7 summary sheet corresponds to. But as it is  
8 included in the report, we rely on the 60-minute  
9 count summaries. That is the snapshot that we  
10 look at, the one-hour peak in the morning and  
11 one-hour peak in the evening, to ascertain the  
12 operation of the street system and the impact of  
13 the development.

14 So you know, we do these counts. We count  
15 them at 15-minute intervals and summarize them at  
16 60-minute intervals. But as is the practice in  
17 the industry and as is accepted by the City, the  
18 City's consultant, and other agencies, we look at  
19 60-minute intervals to analyze the impact of the  
20 development.

21 And then finally, I believe there was a  
22 question of whether we looked at the intersection  
23 of Main and 7th. And as you can see in the  
24 report, both the original report and the revised,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

150

1 we have. That was one of the intersections that  
2 we conducted counts and then looked at the  
3 operation of that intersection. So that was part  
4 of the study and part of the analysis that we  
5 conducted.

6 And those are really the only changes in  
7 the revised study. Like I said, everything else  
8 remains the same and our findings have not  
9 changed. With that, I would conclude and answer  
10 any questions.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

12 MR. ABOONA: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

14 MR. STILLWELL: Mr. Chairman, I will  
15 hand out copies of a document that I would like to  
16 have marked as, I believe it would be, Exhibit N.  
17 This would be the overlay prepared by Huff & Huff  
18 of the environmental locations on the underlying  
19 site plan.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

21 Any objections?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So be it.

24 MR. HUFF: Good evening. James Huff,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

151

1 H-u-f-f, Huff & Huff, Incorporated.

2 I was asked two questions at the end of the  
3 last hearing. The handout Exhibit N is the  
4 response to one which was the overlay of the 11  
5 recognized environmental conditions that have been  
6 identified on this site on the proposed  
7 development plan. And so you have that.

8 The second question which was a little more  
9 abstract was something along the lines, "What if  
10 the remediation fails?"

11 And I am not quite sure where you are going  
12 with that question. And in this case, our plan is  
13 to excavate and take off site the contaminated  
14 soil. We will rely on the City's Groundwater Use  
15 Ordinance that has been adopted community wide and  
16 then meet the other remedial objectives toward a  
17 No Further Remediation letter.

18 So I think the question is what if our  
19 estimate is -- underestimates the extent of the  
20 contamination. And we have got what I think is a  
21 pretty good contingency on our estimate. We have  
22 not fully defined any of these areas. There is  
23 still additional investigation.

24 And I think the answer is if there is



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

152

1 additional contamination we are going to remove it  
2 is the direction that Lexington Homes is prepared  
3 to take.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.  
5 Anything else?

6 MR. STILLWELL: That would conclude it.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: First of all,  
8 questions from the Members of the Plan Commission.  
9 I would say let's specifically start with the  
10 evidence that was given tonight. And then we will  
11 move on to things that were saved from last time.  
12 Does that sound okay?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian, you looked at  
15 me as though you had something to say.

16 MR. DOYLE: No. Thank you for asking.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any questions?

18 MR. PRETZ: I wanted to say that you did  
19 answer the question.

20 MR. HUFF: Thank you.

21 MR. PRETZ: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. We can go  
23 to -- did you have something?

24 MR. HENNINGSON: No.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

153

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I will  
2                   move to the members of the audience for questions.

3                   Anyone have any questions at this time?

4                   Yes, sir.

5                   MR. WARDEN: How are you doing? My name  
6                   is Jason Warden, 517 Cedar Street, St. Charles.

7                   This is in regards to the traffic study,  
8                   the most recent one, September the 27th.

9                   And a couple of -- just looking through  
10                  it -- and I am not a professional on traffic  
11                  studies. So I have a couple of questions and  
12                  things I want to bring up.

13                  One of the items being is the -- the times  
14                  that the traffic study was done. And if you go to  
15                  their times, it starts at 4:00 o'clock in the  
16                  afternoon. The morning is good. But the  
17                  afternoon starts at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon  
18                  and goes beyond that.

19                  The main peak hours for school are, you  
20                  know, from probably 2:30 probably up until 4:00.  
21                  The local schools get out at 3:00. I think there  
22                  is 3:00 o'clock and 3:20. So they didn't really  
23                  take that into account, the hours of -- you know,  
24                  the main school hours.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

154

1                   And this is specifically addressing the  
2                   area at 7th and Main. I will give you some page  
3                   numbers that you can reference here.

4                   Well, the traffic study doesn't -- the  
5                   summary doesn't have all the page numbers. I am  
6                   sorry. It does. Page 7. If you look at that,  
7                   there is no commentary on 7th and Main at all  
8                   regarding the traffic -- you know, the traffic  
9                   issues there.

10                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can you tell me which  
11                   page?

12                   MR. WARDEN: Page 7. It references 9th  
13                   and Main, but it doesn't reference 7th and Main.

14                   If you are familiar with the area, it is an  
15                   extremely busy intersection. And the time that  
16                   this study was done, it was done on Wednesday,  
17                   December 2nd, 2009, between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m.

18                   Now, that is in the middle of the winter.  
19                   There is not a lot of kids walking to school at  
20                   that time. And at this area, which is going to be  
21                   one of the main arteries going into the proposed  
22                   development, there is a lot of kids walking there.  
23                   And the kids are actually what cause the problems  
24                   with the traffic.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

155

1                   Now, last Thursday at 3:20, we had a local  
2                   resident go in front of Thompson Middle School.  
3                   And if you are on the south side of 64 going  
4                   northbound --

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me stop you for a  
6                   second.

7                   Were you the one that did this?

8                   MR. WARDEN: No.

9                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is the person that  
10                  did this in the room?

11                  MR. WARDEN: Yes.

12                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Well, in that  
13                  case, I will ask him to give the evidence.

14                  MR. WARDEN: Okay.

15                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't want it to be  
16                  objected to as hearsay.

17                  MR. WARDEN: Okay. That is fair enough.  
18                  Fair enough.

19                  So he will address the -- you know, the  
20                  amount of traffic and getting through the lights  
21                  this time of year with that many children walking.

22                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me stop you for a  
23                  second.

24                  Would you like for the traffic engineer to

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

156

1           come up and respond as we go through each of the  
2           questions regarding the traffic report?

3                   MR. WARDEN:  If that is what you would  
4           like.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  I would prefer that  
6           since we are asking questions right now.

7                   MR. WARDEN:  Absolutely.

8                   MR. ABOONA:  The counts were done from  
9           6:00 a.m. until 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 7:00  
10          p.m. simply to capture the highest amount of  
11          traffic on the street system.

12                   There is no doubt when the schools are  
13          letting out, you know, there will be a spike in  
14          the traffic.  But based on our experience in this  
15          field, even though there is a spike, it is not  
16          going to come close to what the traffic is when  
17          the commuters are either going to work in the  
18          morning which coincides with the school traffic  
19          and coming back in the evening which is normally  
20          much higher than it is in the morning.

21                   So even though there is the school traffic  
22          and there will be interaction of traffic in the  
23          area, the 4:00 to 7:00 will capture the highest  
24          amount of traffic.  So we are looking at a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

157

1           worst-case scenario.

2                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me stop you.

3                       I understand that that is a  
4           generally-accepted practice, the time periods.

5                       Does proximity to school ever change -- or  
6           to multiple schools -- ever change the time  
7           period?

8                       MR. ABOONA: Only to a certain extent.  
9           When you have a route like 64 that is being --  
10          influencing the area, influencing the traffic, you  
11          know, that really carries the day as far as the  
12          traffic volumes and design conditions in the area.

13                      And then, similarly, given that this is a  
14          residential development, the characteristics of  
15          the residents, future residents, is going to  
16          mirror what happens on the street system.

17                      They are going to leave in the morning and  
18          will coincide with the morning peak hour and  
19          return coinciding with the evening peak hour.

20                      So if we can address those critical time  
21          periods, the rest of the time -- even though there  
22          might be slightly different traffic patterns --  
23          but the overall volume is going to be lower.

24                      And then regarding the question for the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

158

1 intersection of 7th and Main on Page 7, we do cite  
2 it as an intersection that we studied. And then  
3 on Page 20 of the report, we go into a discussion  
4 of what the operation of the intersection is and  
5 the impact. So we have it addressed in the  
6 report.

7 MR. WARDEN: Thank you. Okay. I  
8 understand what he just stated. And this is I  
9 believe some of the revisions they made at Page 20  
10 where he says they did address 7th and Main.

11 What it says on their report is, "the  
12 amount of delay in the queue will increase for the  
13 southbound approach. However, the queue analysis  
14 for year 2015 conditions shows that the southbound  
15 queue on 7th Street will not spill back to State  
16 Street.

17 It already does every single day. It is  
18 already down to State Street. So unless the new  
19 development is going to bring down traffic, then  
20 maybe they are right. I don't see that happening  
21 because there is going to be more people living  
22 down there. It already spills down to State  
23 Street. And I just know this because I live right  
24 in there.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

159

1                   So you can just any morning feel free to go  
2 over there and see it does spill down to State  
3 Street. Where they did address it, it goes go  
4 down to State Street. I know the document says  
5 otherwise but --

6                   MR. DOYLE: Yes, sir. Would you just  
7 clarify which portion of the report you are  
8 referring to?

9                   MR. WARDEN: Page 20.

10                  MR. DOYLE: Regarding 7th and Main  
11 Street?

12                  MR. WARDEN: Correct. If you look at  
13 the second sentence --

14                  MR. DOYLE: Thank you.

15                  MR. WARDEN: It says it won't spill  
16 back. Okay. So just addressing where he  
17 mentioned that it did care of that, it is not  
18 accurate. Okay.

19                  If you want to stay up here, I have got  
20 some other --

21                  MR. ABOONA: I am right here.

22                  MR. WARDEN: Give me a minute here. I  
23 will get you some of the other questions that I  
24 have here.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

160

1                   Okay. Another one that I had is Page 12,  
2                   Table 2, which was another one of their revisions  
3                   regarding Comparison of Former and Proposed Land  
4                   Use Traffic Volume.

5                   Basically, the way I interpret this -- if I  
6                   am wrong, please correct me -- this is a  
7                   comparison of what the old site was and then what  
8                   their subdivision will be providing as far as  
9                   traffic goes.

10                  Now, they had -- I think they are just  
11                  using a standard use code of a light industrial  
12                  220,000 square foot building has the potential of  
13                  1500 cars daily.

14                  Well, based off of the people that live  
15                  there, the other businesses around there, and  
16                  actually based off of the satellite images that  
17                  you can pull up on the Internet and you can still  
18                  go walk there and find out where the parking is,  
19                  there is no more than about 225 spots there at the  
20                  Applied Composites site.

21                  So if you take 225 spots, you are telling  
22                  me that it is at capacity every day and they are  
23                  going in and out seven times a day to make that  
24                  1500.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

161

1           Now, anyone that lives around that area and  
2 works around that area, they are running three  
3 shifts over there with about 30, 35 cars a shift.  
4 That is how many cars were -- and then you  
5 obviously have some trucks coming in and out.

6           You have 35 cars per shift or 30 at that  
7 site. Comparing that, they are saying that it is  
8 going to be -- he just said 50 to 60 percent less  
9 than that. If it is 50 or 60 percent less than 50  
10 cars every eight hours, I am all for it. I have  
11 no issues with that. But I don't see that  
12 happening.

13           So that is based off of Page 12, that  
14 Table 2. Instead of just using a general rule of  
15 thumb, I think you need to take a look at what the  
16 actual traffic is -- or I should say was --  
17 compared to what they are going to have.

18           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I guess my question  
19 for the traffic engineer would be: Was there a  
20 traffic count done while the former site was  
21 operating?

22           MR. ABOONA: No, there wasn't.

23           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the numbers that  
24 you are taking, what are the source of those

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

162

1 numbers?

2 MR. ABOONA: Those are based on the same  
3 source that we used to generate the traffic for  
4 the Lexington Club. And those are trip rates  
5 published by the Transportation and Trip  
6 Generation Manual. That would be an industry  
7 standard.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that is based on  
9 the Land Use Code multiplied by the number of  
10 square feet.

11 MR. ABOONA: Right. Trip rates in the  
12 morning and trip rates in the evening and then  
13 daily traffic.

14 MR. WARDEN: Okay. So that is just  
15 addressing the actual traffic that was there.

16 All right. 9th and -- well, one other  
17 thing. I didn't see anything in the traffic study  
18 regarding Mark Street which would be the street  
19 that runs west and east along the north side of  
20 the property and where that is going to dump to  
21 and how you are going to get out because State and  
22 2nd, State and 31 is already terrible. And there  
23 is nothing that addressed 4th Street, 5th Street,  
24 6th Street.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

163

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me clarify what  
2 you are asking.

3                   Are you asking if there is a plan for Mark  
4 Street to do anything other than it is doing right  
5 now which is basically hitting 4th Street at a  
6 90-degree angle and the traffic from Mark would go  
7 onto 4th?

8                   MR. WARDEN: Exactly. And not just  
9 there. I mean, already 31 and North Avenue is --  
10 I mean, you can't get down State onto 31. If you  
11 are one of the lucky ones, you are one of the four  
12 cars making the turn.

13                   So you are going to have a lot more traffic  
14 that is heading down -- I do it. I cut down any  
15 road I can to get out of there. It is 4th, 5th,  
16 6th are all going to be impacted -- and 3rd -- are  
17 all going to be impacted, you know, hugely.

18                   And I don't see any study, any counts, or  
19 anything of that nature taken shown on this report  
20 which I think it needs to be because people  
21 already use those sidestreets to cut through  
22 anyways. So it is going to be even worse. So I  
23 would like to see something addressing the other  
24 main streets leading to that area.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

164

1                   And then maybe you can answer this again.  
2                   On Page 20, that chart, also, it is showing Main  
3                   Street. The first line item on Table 5, it is  
4                   showing the existing giving it a "B" rating. You  
5                   know, they give the ratings. It explains what  
6                   they are. And then they show it in year 2015  
7                   being a 22. This is at 7th and Main.

8                   Again, it is addressing the traffic on 64,  
9                   not the traffic on 7th. 7th is the real problem.  
10                  You know, 64 is going to be -- you know, it will  
11                  keep moving. But 7th is going to continue to back  
12                  up farther and farther in each direction because  
13                  you are not going to be able to get out because of  
14                  all the kids.

15                  And then if have a Lexington Home  
16                  subdivision with a lot more kids, you are going to  
17                  have a lot more foot traffic walking to the  
18                  school. It is actually the kids that cause the  
19                  backup. There is a crossing guard that comes out  
20                  there. You are going to get a couple cars through  
21                  on that turn and that is it because there is kids  
22                  non-stop walking through.

23                  So I would like -- I don't see any of the  
24                  information there on 7th Street. It is giving you

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

165

1 a grade for Main Street, not 7th Street which is  
2 the road that is going to be impacted most. So I  
3 would like to see something on that, or maybe they  
4 have something they can explain.

5 MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

7 MR. DOYLE: Could we hear from the  
8 traffic consultant on that point right now? As I  
9 am reading that, those grades, my understanding is  
10 that the grade is based on delay times on 7th  
11 Street, not delay times on Main Street. I would  
12 like clarification on that.

13 MR. ABOONA: For signalized  
14 intersections which is the case of Main and 7th,  
15 the level of service and delay is the average for  
16 the overall operation of the intersection. So it  
17 is not only Main. It is all four approaches of  
18 the intersection.

19 For a stop sign controlled intersection, the  
20 level of service and delay is for the approach  
21 that is under a stop sign.

22 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So -- so it is  
23 overall performance of the intersection in all  
24 four directions.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

166

1 MR. ABOONA: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is it possible -- I  
3 mean, I know, for example, on that street, it  
4 is -- I mean, there is a significant difference  
5 between if you are heading east or west on 64  
6 versus north or south on 7th Street -- to give an  
7 average of what really is that telling us?

8 MR. ABOONA: Well, you are right. It  
9 depends on which approach you are coming from,  
10 which movement, the left through or the right and  
11 what time of the day. You know, we can go into  
12 the analysis and -- you know, there is enough data  
13 that will tell us for each individual movement  
14 what the level of service and the delay and  
15 everything else is.

16 But this gives kind of an indication of how  
17 the intersection is operating overall. "B" and  
18 "C" is a very good operation. There is no doubt  
19 on 7th Street there is a delay because these  
20 vehicles have to wait longer to get out onto 64.

21 IDOT, which controls 64 and controls the  
22 signal, they favor the green light -- the green  
23 light favors the traffic on 64.

24 And minor streets suffer because of that.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

167

1           And they have to wait sometimes a cycle,  
2           sometimes two cycles. That is why those queues  
3           are filled up.

4                       But for a signalized intersection, the  
5           standard way of looking at it is the operation of  
6           the intersection.

7                       For a stop sign intersection because the  
8           through traffic doesn't stop and they don't have  
9           any delays, then you look at the approaches that  
10          have to wait and -- you know, to get -- to turn  
11          onto the main line.

12                      CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So would I be correct  
13          in saying that on the same chart, last one, 2nd  
14          Street and State Street where we are only  
15          measuring the performance of the stop sign heading  
16          eastbound on State Street, the delay almost  
17          doubles with that; is that correct?

18                      MR. ABOONA: Yes.

19                      CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It goes from 32  
20          seconds to 58.3 seconds. That would be an  
21          accurate representation of one particular movement  
22          and the delay that will be caused.

23                      MR. ABOONA: On an average, yes.

24                      CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

168

1 MR. ABOONA: So sometimes if you are  
2 here and there is a gap available, you can make a  
3 turn without any delay. Other times, you will  
4 have to wait.

5 Now, I just want to point out again this is  
6 a 2015 condition. This assumes the occupancy of  
7 the existing industrial building and also factored  
8 in a growth factor in the background traffic. We  
9 brought that traffic level higher as well.

10 So this is not just purely the impact of  
11 Lexington Homes. There are other factors that  
12 impact that as well.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And on that, if I  
14 may, I have one other question. Under the raw  
15 data, back at the existing traffic count section,  
16 am I reading this correctly that these counts were  
17 actually taken on December 2, 2009?

18 MR. ABOONA: Yes, they were.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

20 Questions?

21 I am sorry. Did you have anything else,  
22 Brian, first of all?

23 MR. DOYLE: I am going to wait until  
24 this gentleman is --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

169

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

2 MR. WARDEN: I will find the page. But  
3 again, it addresses 9th and State also which is  
4 the other -- other street right there by Dairy  
5 Queen. It states --

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Page 21.

7 MR. WARDEN: Page 21. Thank you.

8 It states it will continue to operate at an  
9 acceptable level of service under year 2015  
10 conditions.

11 Well, currently the traffic at that  
12 intersection is not that heavy because nobody goes  
13 onto it because you can't get out onto 64. That  
14 is the bottom line. If you live around there, you  
15 don't go up 9th and try to get out on 64 unless  
16 you are going at 2:00 or 3:00 o'clock in the  
17 morning.

18 So what is going to happen is you are going  
19 to have the backups on 7th. And if you have  
20 increased traffic on Main Street, it is only going  
21 to make trying to get out onto 64 worse.

22 And I believe it says in here that it  
23 doesn't see a need for a stoplight of any sort.  
24 With a stop sign, it will be like Frogger trying

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

170

1 to get out. You are not going to do it.

2 So that was just something I wanted to  
3 address about 9th and State Street. It says it is  
4 going to operate at acceptable levels into 2015.  
5 It says no roadway or control improvements are  
6 needed at that intersection. And I just -- nobody  
7 uses it because it is almost a useless  
8 intersection because you can't get out onto 64.  
9 That is probably something that probably should be  
10 addressed without Lexington Homes. But that is  
11 for another time.

12 One thing that I saw that I was kind of  
13 confused about -- and maybe I am reading it wrong,  
14 but it kind of jumped out at me -- was at 9th and  
15 State if you look at -- this is the eastbound  
16 approach. It is from 12/3/09. I don't know if  
17 there is a page. It is on these charts. There is  
18 no page number on it.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on. I am sorry.  
20 Yeah. That is in the appendix, the traffic  
21 counts.

22 MR. WARDEN: Correct.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

24 MR. WARDEN: Okay. This is for -- on

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

171

1 the top it says 10/7/15. That is the page I am  
2 looking at. It is State and 9th. And it is  
3 showing the eastbound approach of the four cars at  
4 State and 9th.

5 So I don't know if you guys are familiar  
6 with where that is at. It is one street east of  
7 Dean Street. State kind of comes and then turns  
8 into Dean there. And then if you look at the Dean  
9 and State eastbound approach -- now, again, if you  
10 are familiar, I would say from State -- I am  
11 sorry -- from State and 9th to Dean and State is a  
12 distance of about 200 feet. There is two houses  
13 there.

14 And they are showing at State and 9th a  
15 total of four cars heading eastbound. At Dean and  
16 State, which is 200 feet away to the east, you  
17 have got 397 cars coming.

18 Now, I don't know if they have got really  
19 big garages and there is a lot of cars coming out  
20 of there. But it doesn't make any sense. There  
21 is two houses between the two streets and showing  
22 a change of 400 cars coming across, unless I am  
23 reading it wrong.

24 MR. ABOONA: I am not sure what you are

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

172

1 looking at. But I would suggest if you look at  
2 Figure 4 in the report it shows very clearly what  
3 these counts are. It summarizes at 60-minute  
4 intervals.

5 MR. WARDEN: Right.

6 MR. ABOONA: So, you know, you have got  
7 westbound. You have 115 in the morning; 120 in  
8 the evening. Going eastbound at 9th, you have 235  
9 in the morning and 120 in the evening. And, you  
10 know, it is similar to what you would see turning  
11 in and out of Dean and 9th Street. So these  
12 numbers are reflected in Figure 4. That is what  
13 we used for our analysis.

14 MR. WARDEN: I am just going off of your  
15 chart here. You have 4 cars, and you have 397  
16 cars.

17 MR. ABOONA: These are 15-minute counts,  
18 like I said.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I couldn't hear.

20 MR. ABOONA: He is looking at a sheet  
21 that is a 15-minute count. And like I said  
22 earlier in my presentation, we look at 60-minute  
23 intervals.

24 MR. WARDEN: I am okay with that. You

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

173

1 can multiply it, you know, times four. But what I  
2 am saying is there is a difference of 400 cars.  
3 There is not 400 cars coming out of two houses.  
4 What I am saying is there is a discrepancy in the  
5 report.

6 MR. ABOONA: Figure 4 clearly shows that  
7 these volumes balance and these numbers are  
8 accurate if you go eastbound or westbound on State  
9 Street between 9th and Dean Street.

10 MR. WARDEN: So then, obviously, their  
11 charts and their reports are different and they  
12 contradict. That is what I am seeing. So maybe  
13 we should, you know, have them so they sync up.

14 So those are just some of the major issues  
15 that kind of stand out with the intersections that  
16 they are talking about and then also some of the  
17 intersections that they are not addressing that  
18 need to be addressed because -- there is also  
19 parking on all of those sidestreets currently.  
20 And if you add more traffic to it -- you have to  
21 wait for cars to come through already on all those  
22 sidestreets to get through. You know, wait for  
23 one so you can get through. If there is more  
24 traffic, it is going to be even worse.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

174

1                   And they don't take into account any of the  
2                   festivals or any of that stuff. But that is all  
3                   right. That is why we like living here.

4                   That is all I have. Thank you.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

6                   Other questions?

7                   Yes.

8                   MR. AMUNDSON: My name is David  
9                   Amundson, A-m-u-n-d-s-o-n, 500 Cedar Street in  
10                  St. Charles.

11                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Did you want to ask  
12                  questions or give --

13                  MR. AMUNDSON: I was going to dovetail  
14                  off of what Jason was saying in part because he  
15                  was citing my evidence. Should I save that for  
16                  later?

17                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would prefer that.  
18                  Let's go with the rest of the questions right now.  
19                  And we will get back to that later, I promise.

20                  All right. Any other questions?

21                  MR. DOYLE: I have a question about the  
22                  traffic study.

23                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just a minute.

24                  Go ahead, Brian.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

175

1 MR. DOYLE: So on the top of Page 21,  
2 discussing the intersection at 9th Street and Main  
3 Street, the narrative says that that intersection  
4 will operate at an unacceptable level of service  
5 for the future condition; however, that this level  
6 of service for a minor approach intersecting a  
7 major arterial is typical.

8 I think the intersection at 2nd and 31st  
9 was similar, an minor approach to a major  
10 arterial. It is typical that it has an  
11 unacceptable level of service.

12 I think my question really is -- and it  
13 then goes on to -- so -- to talk about spillback  
14 and -- as sort of a mitigating consideration as to  
15 how we factor what I guess we would term "net  
16 acceptability."

17 What I am wondering is if the -- the  
18 grading on the capacity analysis says that it is  
19 unacceptable and we are asked -- what we are  
20 trying to do here is determine whether or not  
21 there is sufficient capacity, what criterion --  
22 and I would really like to hear from the City  
23 consultant on this as well -- what criteria are we  
24 to use to determine that unacceptable capacity is



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

176

1 acceptable for the purposes of our findings of  
2 fact?

3 MR. ABOONA: Let me -- let me attempt to  
4 explain that.

5 The analysis that we have done normally  
6 looks at an isolated condition. In other words,  
7 it doesn't take into account the availability of  
8 traffic signals upstream and downstream. So it  
9 assumes that the traffic is arriving randomly as  
10 opposed to in platoons because signals, what they  
11 do is regulate the flow of traffic. What happens  
12 if traffic is stopped at a nearby traffic signal  
13 is it creates those gaps in the traffic stream  
14 allowing people to enter and exit into the flow of  
15 traffic.

16 This analysis assumes everything is random.  
17 Therefore, it is more difficult for traffic to  
18 enter and exit the traffic stream. So that is a  
19 very conservative approach to the analysis.

20 The other thing is, as I indicated earlier,  
21 we looked at other factors in the analysis so the  
22 industrial building across the street and the  
23 additional background traffic. So we brought a  
24 lot of additional conservative assumptions into

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

177

1 the analysis.

2 And even though it shows an "F," if you  
3 look at Table -- bear with me for a minute. On  
4 Page 19, if you look at the definition of level of  
5 service under the unsignalized intersection, the  
6 threshold for "F" is over 50 seconds. So you  
7 know -- so we are very close to that threshold.  
8 If this was in the hundreds of seconds of delay, I  
9 would definitely be concerned about the capacity  
10 of those intersections and the ability of traffic  
11 to enter and exit safely.

12 I think we are close enough -- even though  
13 it is "F," it is indicating that people will have  
14 to wait on average less than a minute under  
15 those conditions where we looked at, you know,  
16 random traffic arrival and conservative  
17 assumptions in terms of what the background  
18 traffic conditions are.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.  
20 All right.

21 Ma'am, did you have a question?

22 MR. DOYLE: I am going to do one  
23 follow-up with our third-party consultant here. I  
24 am sorry. You probably need to --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

178

1 MR. GARBE: Alexander Garbe, G-a-r-b-e,  
2 with Hampton, Lenzini & Renwick, 380 Shepherd  
3 Drive in Elgin.

4 MR. DOYLE: My basic question for you  
5 here as the expert consultant is based on  
6 questions in the exchange we just had.

7 Would you concur that the mix of factors  
8 here with an unacceptable grade combined with the  
9 other mitigating factors that were just introduced  
10 into evidence -- would you concur that there is  
11 sufficient capacity at these intersections for the  
12 future conditions?

13 MR. GARBE: Yeah. I think we would.  
14 Yes.

15 One of the things -- one other point that  
16 he didn't bring up is the level of service grades.  
17 There is a lot of discussion going on in our  
18 industry right now, actually, that the grade  
19 letter system is kind of unfortunate that we have  
20 chosen to use that. Because those higher levels  
21 of delay, the "Ds" and "Es" and "Fs," when you  
22 think about comparing it to a school report card,  
23 that sounds pretty bad.

24 But in reality, especially in

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

179

1 highly-populated areas like Chicago and Chicago's  
2 metropolitan area, those kinds of delays are  
3 typical for sidestreets, especially along a street  
4 like Route 64. It is not to say that it is  
5 perfect, obviously. But it is typical. It has  
6 grown to be more accepted.

7 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

9 Anything else?

10 Okay. Ma'am.

11 MS. ROESNER: Wendy Roesner,  
12 R-o-e-s-n-e-r, 712 West Main Street.

13 This is the first time I have been here  
14 since the project first started. I was living in  
15 the area. And I moved out. And I am back in the  
16 area. So I am kind of blind on what is going on.

17 As far as the traffic and stuff, I am a  
18 school bus driver for the district, also. So the  
19 traffic as far as 4:00 o'clock -- the schools let  
20 out over there by 3:05, 3:15. Traffic is backed  
21 up all the way around 7th onto 64. It is backed  
22 up on north, south, east, and west.

23 The other thing that I wanted to bring up  
24 is the fact that there is a new school bus garage

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

180

1 through a different company that is over there off  
2 of Dean and Randall Road. It houses the old  
3 Siegle's and the BMW.

4 There is so much traffic with those new  
5 buses. I don't know if they have ever considered  
6 anything like that. This is something new that is  
7 in the area. You look and all you see is this  
8 Illinois Charter Bus system.

9 I have a couple other questions that is not  
10 related to it, but because I haven't been here I  
11 don't know if I could ask it and if you could  
12 answer it at the answering session.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, what types of  
14 questions?

15 MS. ROESNER: I was just wondering what  
16 this is -- what this is going to cost the  
17 taxpayers? Are we held responsible for any of the  
18 projects that are going on -- the surveys, the  
19 removal of any contaminated dirt?

20 Also, do they plan on widening Route 64  
21 again and 7th Street to make up for all of the  
22 traffic and sidestreets?

23 And the other question was with the housing  
24 prices that are falling so drastically and our

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

181

1 properties are not worth hardly anything any more,  
2 what do they plan on pricing those? Because I  
3 know what the houses are being sold for in my  
4 area. And I am just wondering what value they are  
5 placing on them.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And of those  
7 questions, half of them are within our purview.  
8 And perhaps, Mr. Stillwell, there could be a  
9 couple quick answers to those questions.

10 But beyond that, really anything -- the  
11 last time that the TIF financing came up, that is  
12 not really in the Plan Commission -- that is not  
13 anything that we consider.

14 And perhaps, our counsel could give more  
15 guidance on that. But that is something that is  
16 the subject of a completely separate hearing  
17 before the City Council itself.

18 MR. GOOD: To summarize, what you  
19 indicated last meeting and was one of the topics  
20 of discussion, the Plan Commission's role by  
21 statute and the City Code is to consider matters  
22 relating to development of property, specifically  
23 the zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinances,  
24 relief requested both with respect to new zoning

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

182

1 or zoning and deviations from any zoning  
2 requirements. That is their role to make  
3 recommendations by law.

4 TIF issues -- and it may not be a direct  
5 apples-to apples comparison. But TIF is a form of  
6 financing mechanism. It does involve property tax  
7 moneys that are collected. But it is a financing  
8 mechanism. It does not relate to the development  
9 of the land itself.

10 There is a specific statute regarding TIF  
11 requests. And it does not mention the Plan  
12 Commission as a body having any jurisdiction over  
13 a TIF request. That process involves the City  
14 Council in its legislative capacity and also  
15 involves what is known as the Joint Review Boards  
16 which has representatives from the other taxing  
17 bodies that are impacted by TIF.

18 And there will be at a future date an  
19 opportunity for the public to comment on the TIF  
20 either at a Joint Review Board meeting or before  
21 the Council when they are considering the matter.

22 Typically, on the agenda of the City  
23 Council, there is an opportunity for the public to  
24 address the Council and ask questions.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

183

1                   With respect to remediation -- and  
2                   Mr. Stillwell can certainly jump in and add -- the  
3                   Applicant has indicated there a number of sites  
4                   that are contaminated. And there is a process  
5                   under Illinois statutes -- again, under the  
6                   jurisdiction of the Illinois EPA -- known as the  
7                   Site Remediation Program. And in that process,  
8                   the Applicant has indicated that it is cleaning up  
9                   the site. And the intended result of doing that  
10                  is to get what is called an NFR letter, No Further  
11                  Remediation.

12                  That letter when issued indicates the  
13                  property has been decontaminated to acceptable  
14                  levels. And that letter will indicate that --  
15                  what type of land use is permitted by that level  
16                  of remediation.

17                  So the NFR letter they will obtain in order  
18                  to build on the site must indicate the IEPA has  
19                  indicated it is safe for future development.  
20                  Future purchasers are notified that an NFR letter  
21                  must be recorded in the chain of title so there is  
22                  notice to the world that this was a -- it is  
23                  called a brownfield site and has been remediated.

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

184

1 Any further questions?

2 MR. AMUNDSON: David Amundson,  
3 A-m-u-n-d-s-o-n, 500 Cedar Street, St. Charles.

4 If this is a -- if this is continued or if  
5 you would be willing to or the Plan Commission  
6 would be so generous, I have a colleague at Judson  
7 who is -- has spoken nationally on new urbanism  
8 and smart urban development. And he is an  
9 urbanist. This is what he lives and breathes and  
10 does and thinks about and lectures on.

11 And if -- his interests dovetail perfectly  
12 with what this site is about. It is about how to  
13 work to regenerate and rejuvenate and restore and  
14 add onto an existing area in a way that is very  
15 sensitive to that. His entire -- that is his  
16 thing professionally.

17 Would the Commission entertain taking  
18 outside professional testimony? I don't know what  
19 to call it. Obviously, it can't be tonight  
20 because he couldn't be here.

21 But if there was continuation or add  
22 testimony or maybe type a letter or something to  
23 communicate to you -- he can review the plans --  
24 they are all on-line -- and have input in terms of

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

185

1 a professional who thinks about urban development  
2 from an urbanist -- sustainability, walkability,  
3 all those kind of things -- mixed use -- that is  
4 what he lives and breathes.

5 And the question is is there any way to  
6 enter into the record or enter into your  
7 consideration some information from him?

8 MS. TUNGARE: If the Plan Commission --  
9 I don't know if my microphone is working.

10 If the Plan Commission wishes to consider  
11 any other information in a generic sense, maybe a  
12 presentation for educational purposes, that would  
13 be fine.

14 But at this time, the Plan Commission has  
15 an obligation to consider the plan that has been  
16 presented by the Applicant. And to try to review  
17 that in the form of an academic exercise would not  
18 be appropriate, in my opinion -- in my  
19 professional opinion.

20 I believe staff has conducted a review of  
21 the plan from a technical standpoint and has  
22 applied all the City's codes, ordinances, and  
23 regulations that would be applicable to a project  
24 such as this one.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

186

1                   And after consideration of all the  
2                   testimony presented by the Applicant and staff's  
3                   analysis, I would urge the Plan Commission to  
4                   consider that and make the recommendation.

5                   I do value what Mr. Amundson has presented.  
6                   And from an educational standpoint, I believe if  
7                   there is a resource out there that the Plan  
8                   Commission can benefit from in a larger sense, we  
9                   would be happy to schedule a separate presentation  
10                  before the Plan Commission at a future date.

11                  Thank you.

12                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just so I am clear on  
13                  what you are suggesting, are you suggesting  
14                  keeping the public hearing open?

15                  MS. TUNGARE: I am suggesting  
16                  considering the Applicant's plan as-is with all of  
17                  the testimony and staff's review that has been  
18                  presented.

19                  But in the spirit of this resource being  
20                  available, generally speaking, that could be  
21                  considered as one of the training sessions that  
22                  the Plan Commission has conducted in the future  
23                  separate from the application.

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

187

1 MS. TUNGARE: That is what I am  
2 suggesting.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

4 MR. AMUNDSON: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on one second.  
6 Right over here. This gentleman right here. And  
7 then you are next.

8 MR. VANDERHEYDEN: Tony Vanderheyden. I  
9 am a resident.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How do you spell your  
11 last name?

12 MR. VANDERHEYDEN: Vanderheyden,  
13 V-a-n-d-e-r-h-e-y-d-e-n.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Can you pull the mic  
15 down?

16 MR. VANDERHEYDEN: Sure.

17 My statement is I live right on Cedar and  
18 7th, the northeast corner. And just this morning,  
19 quarter to 8:00, the bus -- three, four buses --  
20 go by and the traffic is backed all the way back  
21 to State Street. My son couldn't come in the  
22 driveway to come to work this morning.

23 We can't get out -- it takes us five  
24 minutes to get into 7th Street to go anywhere we

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

188

1 have to go. So the traffic is already bad. I  
2 don't understand how it is going to get better  
3 with this unless they widen the street some more.

4 And in fact, we call it the Chernobyl  
5 7th Street. Okay. That is my statement.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

7 Yes, sir.

8 MR. SHELY: My name is William Shely,  
9 S-h-e-l-y. I work at 602 North 12th Street in  
10 St. Charles. I live just outside the community,  
11 just off Randall Road. I have lived here for 35  
12 years.

13 I just moved my company from Chicago,  
14 Foster Avenue, not too far from Wrigley Field out  
15 here to get away from the congestion and the  
16 housing.

17 Now, I don't know if you know where my site  
18 is. Let me show you on the diagram here. This is  
19 the building I occupy. Three shifts now. And I  
20 have houses backed up to it now closer than when I  
21 was in the city. I had an alley behind here.

22 I had no idea that Lexington was doing this  
23 development. When I saw 142 units on 26 acres, I  
24 had to laugh. I have got a daughter that lives in

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

189

1 Manhattan. She lives in a lot more spacious area  
2 than that.

3 I feel like I am in the Wizard of Oz.  
4 Trying to put that many units in that situation is  
5 a no-go. We sat in on the planning committee,  
6 compressive planning committee, when they talked  
7 about open space. This committee must be on  
8 closed space.

9 I would have not moved out here into that  
10 building had I known that there was an effort to  
11 rezone that M-1 property exclusively into this  
12 development. I didn't know about Lexington Homes.  
13 I am sorry.

14 But I have been there now just under two  
15 years. I even see there is a proposed drive  
16 across my parking lot. I don't know how that gets  
17 there.

18 I don't own the property. I have  
19 significant moneys down on an option to buy that  
20 property. But I am absolutely dismayed by the  
21 concept of that parcel going in.

22 And then the traffic problems, I -- I have  
23 lived here a long time. I know, too, the traffic  
24 problems. My wife is a Dairy Queen fan. We get

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

190

1 stuck in that property at all hours of the night.

2 That is all I have to say.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

4 Thank you.

5 Ma'am? Yes.

6 MS. PENZANO: My name is Barb Penzano,  
7 P-e-n-z-a-n-o. I live at State and 6th Street  
8 right at the stop sign.

9 And I don't know. If the traffic study was  
10 done in 2009 -- as of this year, I have two kids.  
11 One in first grade, and one in third grade. They  
12 are now getting bused. This is the first year  
13 that busing has happened from the north side of 64  
14 over to the school.

15 So I can't believe how many buses are  
16 coming down my road every day. And St. Pat's  
17 isn't even there any more. It has to be -- the  
18 buses are lined up around the corner. So I just  
19 wanted to make mention of that that as of this  
20 year it is new that there is more busing. Kids  
21 are being bused from this side of town over to the  
22 school. So there is more bus traffic compared to  
23 2009.

24 There are no left turns onto 64 going east

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

191

1           except for at the three main stoplights which are  
2           already backed up.

3                       I go down State Street and try to get out  
4           onto 2nd Street most of the time. But I am out at  
5           7:00 o'clock in the morning primarily to avoid the  
6           8:00-to-9:00 traffic which when it is backed up on  
7           2nd Street to turn east onto 64, there is about --  
8           two cars can get in because 64 has taken all the  
9           spots they can. And turning left, there is  
10          actually no room to go. We have to wait through  
11          another light, and it is the same thing again.

12                      So turning left going eastbound, which is  
13          most of the morning traffic -- I don't go onto 31.  
14          I go straight down State Street a couple blocks  
15          from 31. I can't turn right onto 31, let alone  
16          turn left on 64 from 31.

17                      If I go the other way at 7th Street, it is  
18          the same thing. The buses are so backed up they  
19          are backed up to State Street and around the  
20          corner down State Street towards Dean just to get  
21          out of State Street to cross the road to go to  
22          school.

23                      So I can only imagine that all the moms  
24          that are going into that subdivision are going to



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

192

1 take their kids to school and pick up their kids  
2 after school trying to get through that  
3 intersection.

4 The 3:00-to-5:00 time slot I think is  
5 worse, not just the commuters that are working  
6 4:00 to 6:00 which is bad enough.

7 But the 3:00-to-5:00 time slot and the  
8 morning time slot, too, for the parents who want  
9 to drive their kids and take them to after-school  
10 activities -- there is a lot going on with the  
11 football fields there, too.

12 I think that whole time period we need take  
13 in to account some of the buses and moms and kids,  
14 junior high kids walking down the street. There  
15 are all kinds of junior high kids walking down my  
16 street, State Street, at 7:00 in the morning  
17 because they have before-school activities. I  
18 can't imagine having more traffic than there is  
19 now.

20 And the -- I heard some phrasing saying  
21 that in the traffic study it is "typical" to be  
22 unacceptable. Since when is unacceptable okay  
23 just because it is typical in other places? I  
24 don't get that at all. You know, this is a good

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

193

1 town. So I don't think we need to be typical.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank  
4 you.

5 Anything else? Other questions?

6 Ma'am, in the back row.

7 MS. SCHWENDNER: My name is Carline  
8 Schwender, S-c-h-w-e-n-d-n-e-r. I live at 615  
9 Cedar Street, one block -- one house, I should  
10 say, east of the corner of Cedar and 7th. And I  
11 have lived there 25 years.

12 And in the morning the traffic -- there  
13 is -- it does go back to State Street. I actually  
14 have to go right in order to go west. So I get up  
15 to that corner. I can't get out onto 7th because  
16 of the buses. So I go right. I go down to State.  
17 I turn left. And head out Dean in order to go  
18 west.

19 In the afternoon -- it happened just  
20 yesterday -- I had to sit through two lights in  
21 order to go right because of the crossing of  
22 children when Thompson and Haines let out.

23 The crossing guard stops the traffic, of  
24 course, as the kids are coming across the street

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

194

1 heading north. And so we sat there waiting to  
2 turn right because he has it stopped.

3 That is all.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

5 Yes.

6 MR. WALSH: My name is James Walsh. I  
7 live at 21 North 5th Street. W-a-l-s-h.

8 I just want it noted for the record that  
9 St. Pat's still has a preschool functioning there.  
10 And there is also pre- and after-school enrichment  
11 programs to take into consideration that also  
12 brings traffic in and out of the area. And there  
13 also could be some safety considerations being  
14 that there are small children in the area at those  
15 times of day that they did the traffic study.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17 Any other questions -- any other questions  
18 from any member of the audience?

19 MR. AMUNDSON: Save comments for later;  
20 right?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Right.

22 All right. Plan Commission?

23 MR. SCHEUTZ: I needed a clarification  
24 or a common sense answer, I guess, here. What I

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

195

1 put together here on Table 2, Page 12, if you look  
2 at the Lexington Club, the amount of rides, cars  
3 coming in and out daily, you have 1,043. And if  
4 you have 142 homes, units, whatever you want to  
5 call them, with I am guessing a couple cars and  
6 they make -- I figured out that they would make  
7 852 in and out daily if they make three -- three  
8 trips. Say somebody leaves, comes back, maybe  
9 goes shopping or something. I am guessing here.  
10 But I figured out maybe three trips. Kind of  
11 guessing what I do daily.

12 And then if you look at the light  
13 industrial, there is a gentleman over here who  
14 made a comment there was 225 parking spots. Well,  
15 if they make -- if they have three shifts --  
16 correct? Somebody made the comment? -- that would  
17 come out to 675 trips daily.

18 So my comment, I guess, is that Lexington  
19 Club appears to be very comparable, a little bit  
20 higher, 852 versus 675. These are just  
21 guesstimates. And it looks to me as though it is  
22 possibly lower than what you are using as a  
23 formula. I was interested in your comments.

24 MR. ABOONA: Well, the first

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

196

1 clarification is those daily trips are in and out.

2 So you know -- so it is 1043, if -- it is  
3 about 500 and some change in and 500 and some  
4 change out for the Lexington Club. And the 1500,  
5 half of it is in, half of it is out for the  
6 industrial if it would be industrial.

7 But I didn't catch the question.

8 MR. SCHUETZ: The question is generally  
9 it appears as though your in and outs are a little  
10 higher than what I am estimating a normal person  
11 would do.

12 MR. ABOONA: Well, I mean, for  
13 residential, we have got -- I mean, you have  
14 got -- you could -- if the parents both work and  
15 each drive, each is a trip. You know, you have  
16 got deliveries. You know, garbage, school buses.  
17 You know, all the trips associated -- that you  
18 would see typically in a subdivision.

19 And then for industrial, you have got  
20 employees. You have got different shifts. You  
21 know, there is contractors coming in, visitors.  
22 You know, truck traffic, deliveries both in and  
23 out. So those all go into the calculation of the  
24 daily traffic.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

197

1 MR. SCHUETZ: All right. I didn't  
2 consider the trucks coming in and out.

3 MR. ABOONA: That is typically a very  
4 important element of industrial use.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

6 Brian?

7 MR. DOYLE: Are you talking about  
8 questions about the presentation thus far? There  
9 are a couple other items that we are going to hear  
10 from the Applicant. I have questions. But I want  
11 to wait to hear from the Applicant about, for  
12 instance, the PUD points.

13 So are we -- are we -- I guess my question  
14 is, in terms of agenda, are we -- is the Applicant  
15 finished with his presentation? Are we moving  
16 into our general questions?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

18 Are you finished? Do you have anything  
19 else to present?

20 MR. STILLWELL: Normally what would  
21 happen is, in response to your comments, I would  
22 wait until the general public has completed all  
23 their questions and comments and anything the Plan  
24 Commission has. And then I would provide my

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

198

1 summary as well as an overview of the standards  
2 and how they relate to the elements that have been  
3 brought forward in the hearing. So I don't  
4 usually interject at this juncture.

5 Are you asking me --

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think what he is  
7 asking is there any additional testimony or any  
8 additional presentation --

9 MR. DOYLE: I am trying to figure out  
10 when to ask my questions. If we are in the  
11 general question period, I still have some  
12 questions that may be answered later on when the  
13 Applicant makes his summary. So I am going to  
14 hold off on that question right now.

15 One question that I have concerns the staff  
16 analysis regarding the building forms in the plan.  
17 There was a comment there that although the  
18 building forms differ from direct recommendations  
19 of the Comprehensive Plan -- and then there is  
20 some bullet points there that talk about some of  
21 the characteristics of the plan -- I was just  
22 trying to find those direct recommendations to  
23 understand what the recommendations of the  
24 Comprehensive Plan are in terms of the building

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

199

1 form.

2 MR. COLBY: Yes. There is a section of  
3 the staff memo that discusses building  
4 architecture. And primarily, it highlights the  
5 fact that the townhome buildings that are proposed  
6 are more of what you consider a suburban-style  
7 townhome versus what you might consider a  
8 urban-style row home where you typically have the  
9 front of the home facing the street and the garage  
10 and automobile access is usually in the back or  
11 hidden somewhere else on the property.

12 The Comprehensive Plan Amendment discusses  
13 in sort of generic terms using more of an urban  
14 style of development and includes as an appendix  
15 to that amendment with pictures of the types of  
16 units that we envisioned. So that includes  
17 townhomes that are primarily with garages located  
18 in the rear so that they are more oriented to the  
19 pedestrians than to the streetscape. So those are  
20 different than the types of townhomes that are  
21 being proposed primarily by the Applicant. The  
22 purpose of that comment was to highlight that  
23 discussion.

24 But I would refer to those photos in the



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

200

1 Comprehensive Plan for comparison.

2 MR. DOYLE: So it is the front-loading  
3 driveways -- front-loading garages as well as  
4 maybe some aesthetic aspects of the --

5 MR. COLBY: Yeah. Primarily, the  
6 orientation of the garages and the proportion of  
7 the garage door and driveway opening relative to  
8 the width of the front of the building.

9 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So -- and again, this  
10 is sort of a quick comment for the Applicant.

11 One of the things that I will be looking  
12 for as we approach your summary and our discussion  
13 is for the Commission's findings of fact. Again,  
14 the basis of the factors that we need to consider  
15 in looking at the PUD application, one of which  
16 is, I believe -- well, actually the PUD  
17 application -- does it reference the Comprehensive  
18 Plan? Is that one of the findings of fact that we  
19 look at?

20 MR. COLBY: It is one of the factors.

21 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So this is one of the  
22 things that I will want to just sort of be  
23 thinking about as we progress.

24 MS. TUNGARE: And if I could also

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

201

1 comment, the Comprehensive Plan amendment that we  
2 are referring to is in the executive summary.  
3 There is a link attached to that off of the  
4 executive summary if you want to review those  
5 things that he was referring to.

6 MR. DOYLE: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

8 Additional questions? Curt? Do you have  
9 anything?

10 MR. HENNINGSON: No.

11 MR. PRETZ: Is this general?

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

13 MR. PRETZ: This would be in reference  
14 to Exhibit L, the vinyl siding sample. I am not  
15 sure who I should address from your group?

16 MR. STILLWELL: What kind of question is  
17 that? Then I will know --

18 MR. PRETZ: My question is the rationale  
19 for the presentation of that exhibit in your  
20 development as it relates to the ordinance from, I  
21 believe, it is 2006.

22 MR. STILLWELL: One of the things that  
23 we will address when I get into the summary and  
24 some of the standards is the fact that any time

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

202

1           you come to a site there are certain guidelines  
2           that you are seeking to incorporate into the plan.

3                     Invariably, you come upon conflicting  
4           objectives and limitations. And you try to  
5           balance some of these suggestions. I will go into  
6           more detail with that.

7                     But specifically, the siding issue. You  
8           will recall that we were first before this body  
9           four years ago, approximately -- three years  
10          ago -- with the initial concept plan. And that  
11          had a totally different product concept.

12                    And I don't want to go through the detail.  
13          We did show you that 175-unit plan. That was what  
14          we originally started with. We also had the  
15          neo-traditional with all the motor courtyards.

16                    As time evolved and we were working with  
17          various competing issues, including working with  
18          staff and other interested parties, it became  
19          clear that with the site constraints, some of the  
20          complications with this site relative to  
21          topography, as well as just economic parameters,  
22          the neo-traditional didn't lend itself to  
23          accommodating the bigger-picture goals of the  
24          Comprehensive Plan relative to redevelopment of

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

203

1           this site with a mixed style of residential  
2           components. And so we then moved away from the  
3           motor courtyards.

4                     What was happening is you were -- you ended  
5           up with a much higher level of improvements on  
6           this site by incorporating the motor courtyards.  
7           So by going with the more traditional townhomes,  
8           except for what is referred to as the row homes in  
9           the northeast portion where we have the  
10          neo-traditional design, we -- we ended up moving  
11          back.

12                    Now, in relationship to that, we then have  
13          to look at the broad picture of economic  
14          parameters. And one of them was, "Where do you  
15          get equal benefit and a cost element that made  
16          sense given all of the parameters?"

17                    One way was the vinyl siding. It is our  
18          position and belief, as we testified earlier, that  
19          vinyl actually provides a quality exterior at a  
20          better price that lends itself to the objective of  
21          this site as long as it is of the quality that  
22          gives the continuity and serviceability and  
23          appearance that you would receive with any other  
24          siding.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

204

1                   Now, that is what the architect discussed  
2 when we went through the exterior building plans.  
3 That is why we submitted a sample so that you  
4 would have an opportunity to touch and see what we  
5 are dealing with, why we think this is an  
6 appropriate material because it is a heavier-gauge  
7 material. It has proven itself worthy of  
8 utilization in a numerous number of settings  
9 throughout the industry. So that is why we have  
10 gotten to that.

11                   There has just been a myriad of issues over  
12 the last four-and-a-half, five years in working on  
13 this project that have had to be balanced. And  
14 that was one of them, along with a lot of others.

15                   MR. PRETZ: Thank you.

16                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17                   Sue?

18                   MS. AMATANGELO: So I guess I am still  
19 not understanding why we went from 125 units in  
20 2009 to 142.

21                   MR. STILLWELL: Well, there are a few  
22 reasons for that. One of the reasons is that  
23 early on in the design plan we were looking at a  
24 park contribution. That eventually came out of

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

205

1 the plan when the park elected -- the park  
2 district elected to acquire what is referred to in  
3 the Staff Report as the Belgian Town Park site.  
4 And that is located south of the Holm Industry  
5 facility.

6 As a result of that, we met with the park  
7 district board representatives to see where they  
8 were at that point. And we were advised that they  
9 would rather shift to cash contributions. So that  
10 opened up available additional land for  
11 development. So that had an impact upon the unit  
12 count.

13 It was also a matter, then, of laying out  
14 the site plan in determining what worked based  
15 upon the product that was proposed and also  
16 addressed all the economic parameters that drives  
17 any development. Density generates revenue as  
18 long as it is done within the guidelines that are  
19 established by the community.

20 I am positive we were guided by the  
21 Comprehensive Plan in the identification of  
22 two-and-a-half to six-and-a-half units per acre.  
23 The Plan expressly says that that should be an  
24 overall average density. It says there is

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

206

1 portions that can be greater than that so that  
2 ultimately on a project-wide basis it doesn't  
3 exceed 6.5. And this project comes in at 6 units  
4 per acre which is identified in the staff summary.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6 Any other questions for the Plan  
7 Commission?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If  
10 anyone from the public wishes to offer testimony  
11 either for or against the Application, including  
12 comments, you can do that at this time.

13 I would just ask that if anything has  
14 already been said, we are -- the purpose of the  
15 Plan Commission is to take evidence and consider  
16 that evidence. So if it has already been said, I  
17 would just ask that you hold off on repeated  
18 evidence and comments.

19 But if anyone wishes to say anything at  
20 this time, this would be the appropriate time for  
21 that.

22 Mr. Amundson.

23 MR. AMUNDSON: David Amundson. Again,  
24 A-m-u-n-d-s-o-n. 500 Cedar Street. And I suppose

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

207

1 I should probably preface my comments tonight. To  
2 be very clear, I sit on the Housing Commission. I  
3 am not speaking for the Housing Commission in any  
4 capacity. I am speaking as a concerned resident.  
5 It is my neighborhood. We care.

6 I have a laundry list. So I apologize for  
7 the length I will be standing here.

8 First is a comment on the -- you know, the  
9 discrepancy of car traffic on and off the site in  
10 the past. And I am the one who sat there and  
11 counted the spaces. I paced off what used to be  
12 the parking lot. It is 225 cars. I have yet to  
13 find a resident whose memory -- that I have talked  
14 to directly -- whose memory predates 1985.

15 So at some point in time, there was a  
16 potential of 225 cars to park on that lot whether  
17 they were running with one, two, or three shifts.  
18 I haven't found -- and if there is anyone whose  
19 memory does go back that far, I would like to hear  
20 from them tonight.

21 What I do have testimony on is going from a  
22 business owner who is on 6th Street who says he  
23 has been there from 1986 until things were winding  
24 down in the early 2000s. The most he was ever



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

208

1 aware of was about 35 cars per shift, three shifts  
2 a day. So again, we are talking about a miniscule  
3 fraction of what they are saying the site used to  
4 handle.

5 Unless somebody can say there were three  
6 shifts with 225 cars, this is conjecture at this  
7 time. It has the potential. Historical records  
8 going back to '86 indicates far, far, far less  
9 than that. And if you go through other mitigating  
10 factors -- that 64 wasn't as busy then as it is  
11 now, 31 wasn't nearly as busy then as it is now --  
12 if there were cars coming and going from the  
13 factory, they would have had a much easier time  
14 getting out of the secondary and arterial streets  
15 to get away from the site. Not the congestion and  
16 gridlock that we already have. So that is one  
17 point.

18 The other point is the standardized way of  
19 looking at signalization of an intersection. I  
20 don't think -- I understand and I appreciate the  
21 position of, you know, this is the professional  
22 rationale of the way we analyze things.

23 But I don't care about the cars flowing  
24 through 64 at the intersection of 7th. I care

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

209

1 about what happens at 7th. 7th is already a mess.

2 And two examples I can give you. Today  
3 walking home with my boys, cars were trying to  
4 head south on 7th. 30-second green light. Two  
5 cars got through because the lead car was trying  
6 to turn right on green. You can't turn right on a  
7 green because there is a crossing guard telling  
8 him he can't do it.

9 The second car wants to turn left. But he  
10 is competing with all the cars that are turning  
11 left onto Main and doesn't want to do it from the  
12 cars that are headed northbound.

13 That intersection does not work now,  
14 period. And when you add to it more walkers --  
15 because all of the kids who will live in Lexington  
16 will be walkers to Richard, Davis, and Thompson --  
17 they will slow down and clog that intersection  
18 even more because of the crossing guard.

19 They are doing a very important job. I say  
20 "thank you" to that crossing guard twice a day  
21 every day. And I have been walking there six  
22 years now. Unless it is raining or below zero, we  
23 walk. That is our house rule.

24 So again, I understand the professional way

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

210

1 of looking at it; that the intersection as a whole  
2 works fine. We can deal with some "F" ratings on  
3 secondary streets. But the secondary streets are  
4 the important ones. Those are the ones that are  
5 under discussion. Those are the ones that will be  
6 impacted.

7 In terms of delays, last Thursday at 3:20  
8 there were 18 cars stacked up I counted on 7th  
9 Street trying to head northbound. First signal, 8  
10 of them got through. Second signal, 9 of them got  
11 through. The ninth got through only by running  
12 the red. And not just sort of coming close. It  
13 was a full red before he entered the intersection.  
14 He clipped it that short. That meant car number  
15 18 sat through three full 130-second cycles. That  
16 is a long time to sit and wait for a light. That  
17 is what we are dealing with right now.

18 And yes, that is only during school comings  
19 and goings. But it is something -- we are part of  
20 the neighborhood, and we are part of the comings  
21 and goings. We have to go pick up our kids, drop  
22 off our kids, or whatever. We have got to get in  
23 and out of our own neighborhood to do those tasks.  
24 That is already kind of difficult right now. I

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

211

1 have heard nothing on the table to try and relieve  
2 that problem. So that is the traffic issue.

3 And I really don't even like talking about  
4 the traffic issues because that is not the heart  
5 of the matter for me.

6 I am going to spend the rest of my time  
7 talking about the PUD application, the findings of  
8 fact. I will start out with Point I, Subpoint 1.  
9 And these are the things that we have to find in  
10 the positive to be able to give the PUD a proper  
11 recommendation.

12 Point 1, "To promote a creative approach to  
13 site improvements and building design that results  
14 in a distinctive, attractive development that has  
15 a strong sense of place, yet becomes an integral  
16 part of the community."

17 That last phrase jumps out at me because in  
18 a neighborhood that is egalitarian -- it is  
19 grid-like, it is not a suburban enclave -- to  
20 build a suburban enclave with a sign in front that  
21 says, "Lexington Club," does not say integration  
22 to me. It says segregation to me. It says, "We  
23 are different. We are distinct. We are away from  
24 you. You have to enter our neighborhood to be

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

212

1 part of our neighborhood."

2 You know, walking down the street, walking  
3 my dog, "Whoa. Can I go back there? Is it  
4 legitimate for me to walk my dog back there?"

5 I live in St. Charles. I don't live in a  
6 club. I don't live in an enclave. I live in the  
7 city. And that is not integration.

8 A strong sense of place? Yes. It has a  
9 strong sense of place. But the strong sense of  
10 place it has is that it is not part of everything  
11 else. That is the only strong sense of place it  
12 has.

13 Point 2, "To create places oriented to the  
14 pedestrian that promote physical activity and  
15 social interaction, including but not limited to  
16 walkable neighborhoods, usable open space, and  
17 recreational facilities for the enjoyment of all."

18 Jane Joyce, if you look in here, the front  
19 porch is where it is at. Getting rid of the  
20 garages in the front is where it is at. You have  
21 to encourage people to interact with one another  
22 other.

23 The townhomes have no front porches and  
24 front-facing garages. The homes, only three of

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

213

1           them have front porches.

2                       These are intended to be secluded,  
3           suburban. "I drive in. I drive out. I never  
4           meet my neighbors."

5                       There is no life on the street. It is a  
6           dead street. It is devoid of life. That is what  
7           is being designed right now. So it does not  
8           encourage social intersection. It physically  
9           actively -- and research can prove this --  
10          discourages social interaction.

11                      It is not a walkable neighborhood. You  
12          need to be on a grid. You need to have lots of  
13          places to turn. You need to not have dead-end  
14          streets.

15                      You need to give people options for  
16          movement. The site plan has a little bit of that  
17          but not a whole lot. So it is not really a  
18          walkable neighborhood, again, because it is a  
19          dead-end zone. I can't walk through it to  
20          anywhere. I can only walk into it and then come  
21          back out of it. It doesn't make for an  
22          interesting or enjoyable walk.

23                      Point 3, "To encourage a harmonious mix of  
24          land uses and a variety of housing types and

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

214

1 prices."

2 We can debate all night about harmonious  
3 use. Land uses? There is no land use mix. It is  
4 pure residential with no respect really for the  
5 industrial.

6 The gentleman we heard from earlier -- we  
7 have an industrial owner who is terrified of his  
8 new neighbors because what we are going to have is  
9 a classic situation of someone moving in next to  
10 the pig farm complaining to the City Council that  
11 it stinks like pigs.

12 So you buy in next to an industrial site,  
13 and the neighbors say to the City Council, "It is  
14 too bright. His trucks come and go and they make  
15 noise at night. Shut this guy down. Regulate  
16 him."

17 He is a business that provides tax dollars  
18 and provides employment. There are people in our  
19 neighborhood who work and live in our neighborhood  
20 and walk to work in our neighborhood. That is the  
21 way a city is supposed to work.

22 We have talked about sustainability, green  
23 initiative, reducing our carbon footprint,  
24 reducing our dependence on foreign oil, reducing

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

215

1 the CO2 emissions. The list goes on and on and on  
2 and on. That is where we need to go.  
3 Integration. Not segregation.

4 Point 4 -- oh. And the last -- it has.

5 (Brief interruption.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Please. Go ahead.

7 MR. AMUNDSON: Point 3, "a variety of  
8 housing types and prices."

9 Again, we can argue variety. I would say  
10 variety looks like this. We have a very narrow  
11 band that looks like this.

12 The affordable housing at the moment is  
13 being stripped from this. We can certainly add  
14 variety to the housing prices. And instead of  
15 adding that kind of variety, they are proposing to  
16 have relief from that to restrict the variety of  
17 housing prices that are in their subdivision.

18 Point 4, "To preserve native vegetation,  
19 topographic, and geologic features and  
20 environmentally sensitive areas."

21 I have heard nothing in terms of that kind  
22 of testimony. The only testimony I have heard is  
23 that rather than preserving topographic and  
24 geologic features they are going to level the site



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

216

1 as much as they possibly can and have asked for  
2 remediation for the costs associated with that.  
3 9,000 cubic yards' worth if I remember right.

4 Point 5, "To promote the economical  
5 development and efficient use of land, utilities,  
6 and street improvements, drainage facilities,  
7 structures, and other facilities."

8 I am not exactly sure what to do with this  
9 one. Economical we can argue about. I know we  
10 can't talk about the TIF. But there it is, and  
11 one can argue about whether the necessity for the  
12 TIF indicates whether this is an economical  
13 development or not.

14 Beyond that, again, it is an efficient use  
15 of land because it crams as much stuff in there as  
16 it possibly can. But that doesn't necessarily  
17 make it a good development. More is not  
18 necessarily better.

19 And the industrial folks would beg, I am  
20 sure, to say, "Give me a buffer," you know. We  
21 need a little less efficiency than there is right  
22 now.

23 Point 6, "To encourage redevelopment of  
24 sites containing obsolete or inappropriate

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

217

1 buildings or uses."

2 I don't know if the building was obsolete.  
3 It happened to be vacant. It happened to need a  
4 new tenant. It was not an inappropriate building  
5 use because our area is a mixed-use environment.  
6 There is light industrial across the street.  
7 There is light industrial to the west. There is  
8 light industrial to the south. So it was not an  
9 inappropriate building or use.

10 And obsolete? Beauty is in the eye of the  
11 beholder. I look at that building or what used to  
12 be the building. I see the potential for a small  
13 start-up in there. Because old buildings, yes,  
14 they are delapidated. But they are cheap.

15 When I helped to found the Habitat for  
16 Humanity Restore up in Elgin, we needed to get the  
17 business launched with a big volume of space --  
18 20,000 square feet -- on a very, very little  
19 budget.

20 We didn't even look at the new buildings.  
21 We couldn't afford them. They wanted \$16 or \$20 a  
22 foot. We looked at the old buildings in Elgin  
23 coming in at \$3 or \$4 a foot. That is where small  
24 upstarts get their founding is when they have

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

218

1 access to cheap real estate which is in the market  
2 and in the demand. This comes from buildings that  
3 are, quite frankly, probably toward the end of  
4 their life cycles. And there is not an option for  
5 that any more because the building is now rubble.

6 Point 7, "To encourage a collaborative  
7 process among developers, neighboring property  
8 owners and residents, and governmental bodies in  
9 the community."

10 I think everybody from the neighborhood  
11 here would argue there has been no collaborative  
12 process amongst the neighboring property owners  
13 and residents.

14 We had to find out about this by accident  
15 almost. There may have been collaboration among  
16 the government bodies. The community as a whole,  
17 I don't think so.

18 And developers, if we count the possibility  
19 of the non-profit developers to assume the  
20 production of the affordable housing criteria,  
21 there has been no contact with them either that I  
22 am aware of. And I have asked about it in the  
23 past and been told that option is dead. It  
24 doesn't work. So that has been shut down to the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

219

1 best of my knowledge. I wish that was not the  
2 case.

3 So the next page the factors listed in  
4 Section 17.04.400.B shall be used to justify  
5 relief from requirements of the zoning district.

6 No. 1, "The PUD will provide community  
7 amenities beyond those required by the ordinance,  
8 such as recreational facilities, public plazas  
9 gardens" -- I think this is a typo -- "public  
10 areas, pedestrian and transit facilities."

11 I have seen evidence of, I think, two or  
12 three pedestrian paths. And they deeded a small  
13 neck of the land to get to Belgian Town Park.  
14 Somebody correct me if I am wrong. But that is  
15 what I remember from the plan.

16 That does not seem to be a terribly big  
17 concession to me for a \$42 million development. I  
18 don't know. You might be able to figure out how  
19 many dollars we are talking about to provide these  
20 kind of amenities. But it is not that much.

21 "The PUD will preserve open space, natural  
22 beauty, and critical environmental areas in excess  
23 of what is required by ordinance or other  
24 regulations."

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

220

1           The only open space I see is the leftover  
2           land around the detention pond where they couldn't  
3           physically pack another house. I don't see much  
4           evidence of purposeful open boulevards. Clipping  
5           corners back at the intersection so you can see.  
6           There is no buffer zones. There is no transition  
7           zones between the residential and industrial that  
8           bound it. There is boundary territory around  
9           detention ponds, but that is the best I can define  
10          what has been provided for us.

11                 Three, "The PUD will provide superior  
12                 landscaping, buffering, or screening."

13                 I am not a landscape architect. I don't  
14                 know how to comment on that. I don't know that it  
15                 is superior. I don't know that it is inferior.  
16                 It is in there providing landscaping. Whether it  
17                 is superior or not, that could be a point for  
18                 discussion.

19                 4, "The buildings within the PUD will offer  
20                 high quality architectural design."

21                 The buildings represent to me, personally,  
22                 the worst of what is being done to suburbia which  
23                 is exactly why we all live in the neighborhood  
24                 where we do. We chose to live there to get away

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

221

1 from this kind of stuff. And now, this stuff is  
2 following us into our neighborhood.

3 The architect described his buildings as  
4 inserting design elements "to relieve the  
5 monotony." I don't know. If that was -- if I was  
6 sitting in a design class at a school and a  
7 student said to me, "I inserted the elements to  
8 relieve the monotony," I -- the first question I  
9 have after stopping him in his tracks is, "Why did  
10 you design a monotonous building then?"

11 This is what tract homes are. That is what  
12 we have all gotten used to as if is good enough.  
13 But that is not our neighborhood. We moved to our  
14 neighborhood to get away from that.

15 And, you know, taking the townhomes, they  
16 are just these -- you know, bam, bam, bam -- a  
17 wall of garages and four front doors with no  
18 porches. The row houses I actually like better  
19 because the garages are backloaded so they offer  
20 some friendliness to the pedestrian on the street.

21 And the houses, looking at them, there were  
22 eight that were shown. Three with porches.  
23 Basically, to my eye and without plans and  
24 everything else you need to know about it, it

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

222

1 looks like the same house dressed up eight  
2 different ways, which doesn't necessarily  
3 constitute a variety or a sympathetic meeting up  
4 with the neighborhood that is around it.

5 Because, again, our neighborhood will have  
6 literally originally a 600-square foot limestone  
7 hut next to a really nice early 20th Century  
8 four-square brick, maybe 1700 or 1800 square feet.  
9 We have a huge variety in our neighborhood. I  
10 don't see that in what they are offering.

11 I see mass-produced townhomes having been  
12 described as having monotony-relieving devices and  
13 houses that look like just left-handed and  
14 right-handed versions of the same thing dressed up  
15 eight different ways.

16 Five, "The PUD provides for  
17 energy-efficient building and site design."

18 I heard nothing in the testimony about  
19 that. I see no evidence in looking at the  
20 elevations of these houses that are oriented to  
21 take advantage of solar energy or make the use of  
22 shade at appropriate times of the year or they are  
23 pitched in such a way to prevent cold north winds  
24 from penetrating in the winter or screening set up

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

223

1 such to help them be more energy efficient, or  
2 that they have solar energy incorporated into any  
3 of them, or that they have wind turbines, or the  
4 street lighting is LED or -- you know, the list  
5 goes on and on.

6 And on the aesthetic design, where is the  
7 energy efficiency on that? I have seen the same  
8 mistakes we have made as a society being repeated  
9 again and again and again.

10 6, "The PUD provides for the use of  
11 innovative stormwater management techniques."

12 I see a detention pond. We could argue  
13 whether that is creative or not. I don't know.  
14 What about grasses? What about hard surfaces that  
15 we would have to ass for the exception of zoning  
16 laws to allow driveways made from appropriate  
17 materiels instead of the materials which create  
18 runoffs and forces us to have detention ponds? We  
19 are living in our own engineered nightmare.

20 And I haven't seen -- but again, I am not a  
21 landscape person. I am not a site engineer. I  
22 don't know what constitutes innovative. But  
23 looking at it, I don't see that.

24 7, "The PUD provides accessible dwelling



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

224

1 units in numbers or with features beyond what is  
2 required by the Americans with Disabilities Act or  
3 other applicable codes.

4 The Applicant themselves state that  
5 they will meet ADA. They don't say they will  
6 exceed it.

7 8, "The PUD provides affordable dwelling  
8 units in conformance with, or in excess of, the  
9 City policies and ordinances."

10 They are asking for complete relief from  
11 this point.

12 9, "The PUD preserves historic buildings,  
13 sites, or neighborhoods."

14 And I would argue strenuously this PUD does  
15 violence to our historic neighborhood --  
16 irreparable violence. Violence that may drive out  
17 some of our employers or some of the other  
18 residents that work there. Violence that forces  
19 us into a car culture as we covert what is a very  
20 happily-coming-along mixed-use community into a  
21 more strictly residential community where we all  
22 have to drive to get to our jobs. I don't think  
23 that is good.

24 The next goes through all the things they

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

225

1 want relief from. And that extends for more than  
2 a full page.

3 And under Item 4, "The proposed PUD will  
4 eliminate blighted conditions." This is their  
5 response. The question being, "The proposed PUD  
6 will be beneficial to the physical development,  
7 diversity, tax base, and economic well-being of  
8 the City."

9 Their response is, "The proposed PUD will  
10 eliminate the blighted condition."

11 And I would love to have a great discussion  
12 on what defines "blight." "Blight" to me is an  
13 intractable problem that come boom or bust or boom  
14 or bust does not go away under any conditions,  
15 under any economic conditions whatsoever.

16 If you drive through small towns in  
17 southern Illinois and you go to Main Street or  
18 what is left of Main Street and you see all the  
19 second- and third-floor windows boarded up,  
20 boarded up since probably 1967, that is blighted.  
21 That is a condition that no one has been willing  
22 to invest in for decades.

23 "Blight" has been used as political  
24 football. We did some research on a county in

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

226

1 California that declared the entire county  
2 blighted just so they could get Federal stimulus  
3 dollars. It is a term that is thrown around to my  
4 mind a little bit too easy to say, "Oh. It is  
5 blighted."

6 Well, what does it mean to be blighted?  
7 Because not too many years ago this was a  
8 functioning, employable, useable building. It  
9 needed a new tenant. So it got knocked down.

10 It will address the environmental  
11 challenges. That is fine.

12 "Covert the subject property into an  
13 attractive residential community." That is just a  
14 personal aesthetic standpoint. I don't think it  
15 is attractive. I think it does violence to our  
16 neighborhood.

17 "Which provides diversified and affordable  
18 housing for residents of the community." They are  
19 asking for relief from the affordability clause.

20 "Places the property on sound footing for  
21 improvement of the City's tax base." After the  
22 TIF, the improvement of the City's tax base will  
23 happen in 23 year's time.

24 So again, I will say what I said last

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

227

1 time -- and forgive me for repeating myself a  
2 little bit here -- I am not against development.  
3 I don't think anybody in our neighborhood is  
4 against development.

5 What we are for is good development that  
6 integrates with our neighborhood and respects who  
7 is there already.

8 To the point of the industrial folks, they  
9 need a little relief. The current plan doesn't  
10 give them any. I would be nervous if I owned an  
11 industrial building that was going to back up to  
12 residential units 10 feet off my property line. I  
13 would be very nervous. The gentleman who spoke  
14 earlier has a good right to be nervous.

15 I think the plan needs to respect the  
16 diversity of our neighborhood. This residential  
17 plan does not respect that diversity. Within  
18 500 feet of my house, I have a church, school,  
19 retail, office, light industrial, single-family  
20 homes that have been converted to rentals,  
21 single-family homes that are owner occupied,  
22 multi-family. There used to be a liquor store and  
23 a barber. Oh. And a bank. In other words, we  
24 have everything. And I think any smart

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

228

1 development of this plat of land needs to  
2 incorporate and accept that.

3 And the everything that we are is what  
4 makes our neighborhood work. It is why -- and I  
5 have been amazed knocking on doors these past few  
6 weeks how many residents who have been in our  
7 neighborhood -- no further than two or three  
8 blocks from where they live now -- for 65 years.  
9 People come. They settle down. They stay because  
10 what is there works.

11 And part of what works is the messiness of  
12 it all. But we all get along. I have 18-wheeler  
13 trucks going down the street to service the  
14 industrial. That is okay. I have people parking  
15 on my street to go to St. Pat's. That is okay.

16 You know, we are -- there is give and take  
17 on that. We feel a little pushed right now  
18 because we have all the bus traffic and other  
19 issues that have come up. Some of the traffic  
20 issues I think are making a lot of us nervous.  
21 When we see a whole massive influx of people who  
22 are going to be on the exact same schedule --  
23 kids, work, kids, work -- that will only add to  
24 that.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

229

1                   Now, if as part of the development we  
2                   had -- and Jane Jacobs talks about this -- mixed  
3                   uses, multi-uses happening in any one district --  
4                   we could have industrial happening on one site and  
5                   residential happening on another site and maybe  
6                   office or something happening on another site -- I  
7                   mean, you need the movement of people at different  
8                   times of day, which is what we presently have, to  
9                   make the neighborhood work and function and be  
10                  healthy and be walkable and be sociable.

11                  And you know, this is a huge opportunity  
12                  for the City. And you know, I wouldn't be  
13                  spending my time if I didn't care. I care about  
14                  the long-term vision. I want the industrial  
15                  partners in our neighborhood to stay there. I  
16                  don't want to get rid of them. They employ  
17                  people. They give us tax base. They need to  
18                  stay. They need to be made to feel welcome, not  
19                  threatened.

20                  And this is an opportunity that there will  
21                  be none other like it for -- I don't know if there  
22                  is another chance in this City's history to have  
23                  this much land to keep as a mixed-use historic  
24                  neighborhood. And I think we can do better than

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

230

1 what has been proposed. That is the bottom line  
2 for me.

3 I am not going to say don't develop it. It  
4 needs to be developed. Something needs to happen.  
5 But I think we can do better.

6 Thank you for your time.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

8 Ma'am, do you have something quick because  
9 I was going to take a quick break?

10 MS. VANDERHEYDEN: Well, it will be  
11 quick.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

13 MS. VANDERHEYDEN: It will be quick  
14 because I can't stand very long.

15 Can you hear me? Okay.

16 I am the old lady in the neighborhood, and  
17 I sit outside.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on one second.

19 If you could, just state your name and  
20 spell your last name.

21 MS. VANDERHEYDEN: Oh. Lorraine  
22 Vanderheyden, V-a-n-d-e-r-h-e-y-d-e-n. I live at  
23 622 Cedar Street. And I have been there for 52  
24 years. My neighbor has been there 52 years. My

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

231

1 across-the-street neighbor has been there over 60  
2 years. And all my neighbors have been there  
3 forever. And I like my neighborhood.

4 But I have three things to say. One, I see  
5 the traffic. You have already heard it. And it  
6 is real. Okay.

7 Second, I have a -- my children played in  
8 the muck. And they played in the muck, and I  
9 didn't realize what the muck was. And the  
10 neighborhood children played there. And I know of  
11 three boys seriously ill that died before they  
12 were in their 40s. And I have a son that is not  
13 in good health. And so I really feel strongly  
14 about cleaning it up because -- whether that has  
15 anything to do with their illnesses. But it does  
16 seem strange to me that those boys were the ones  
17 that practically lived there, riding their bikes,  
18 playing in the muck.

19 And my husband has been -- was raised on  
20 7th Street. And he and his friend today were  
21 talking about the oil that ran down through their  
22 property 60 years ago. And I do -- I just want to  
23 make sure it is cleaned up. And that is all.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

232

1                   At this time, we are going to take a break.  
2                   We will reconvene at 9:00 o'clock.

3                                   (Whereupon, a recess was had at  
4                                   8:54 P.M. after which the  
5                                   proceedings were resumed at  
6                                   9:09 P.M. as follows:)

7                                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.  
8                   St. Charles Plan Commission come to order.

9                                   We are currently on Item No. 4 on the  
10                   agenda, Lexington Club PUD.

11                                  At this point in time, we are going to --  
12                   if there are any additional questions, we will  
13                   take them. But following that, we will take  
14                   additional questions from members of the Plan  
15                   Commission and then move on to the rebuttal or  
16                   final statement from the Applicant. And finally,  
17                   we will review the findings of fact from our  
18                   staff.

19                                  So let's go ahead, then, if any member of  
20                   the Plan Commission has anything else.

21                                  Brian, go ahead.

22                                  MR. DOYLE: I have a couple of  
23                   questions.

24                                  Do we have anyone from the -- I have a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

233

1 couple questions.

2 Do we have anyone from the City's economic  
3 department here who could answer a question about  
4 TIF financing?

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Economic department.

6 MR. DOYLE: I know it isn't -- trust me  
7 I know it is not our purview but --

8 MS. TUNGARE: It would Michael Mertes  
9 and legal counsel that can probably respond.

10 MR. DOYLE: I have a simple question.

11 In theory, can TIF financing cover all of  
12 the site remediation costs involved with this  
13 project?

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on a second.  
15 Were you sworn in at the beginning?

16 MR. MERTES: I was not. Sorry.

17 (The witness was thereupon duly  
18 sworn.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you could just  
20 state your name and spell your last name.

21 MR. MERTES: Michael Mertes,  
22 M-e-r-t-e-s, 2 E Main Street, St. Charles. I am  
23 the City Economic Development Coordinator.

24 To give you the answer as best as I

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

234

1 possibly can, first of all, unfortunately the  
2 Economic Development Director could not be here  
3 tonight because of a last-minute thing that  
4 happened.

5 He has been the one who has been dealing  
6 with the TIF issue right now in terms of talking  
7 with the consultant.

8 In terms of whether or not TIF can  
9 completely cover the remediation, I can't say it  
10 can cover 100 percent of it with utter certainty.  
11 I know it can cover a large portion of it.

12 The specifics, I just unfortunately -- I  
13 apologize. I haven't dealt with the TIF before.  
14 I don't have any personal experience. I can't  
15 tell you for sure.

16 MS. TUNGARE: If I can add to that --  
17 and I am sure legal counsel can probably say a few  
18 words as well.

19 Environmental remediation is one of the  
20 eligible activities as is laid out in the  
21 statutory requirements.

22 Now, as Mr. Mertes indicated, whether  
23 100 percent of those costs will be eligible  
24 through TIF or not, that is still a work in

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

235

1 progress. And there will need to be discussion  
2 between the City and the Applicant on that.

3 MR. GOOD: That is about the best answer  
4 that can be given at this point.

5 MR. DOYLE: Let me clarify why I am  
6 asking this question.

7 What I am trying to determine is we have  
8 heard testimony about the importance of developing  
9 this parcel. The Housing Commission in its  
10 recommendation said that developing the land is a  
11 benefit to the public. And we know that there are  
12 some site conditions that need to be -- that are  
13 considered there.

14 What I am trying to determine is if the  
15 site condition is a -- is a basis for relief under  
16 the PUD application or if the TIF process is a  
17 complete remedy for -- for the site condition.

18 And therefore, if both -- if both issues --  
19 both the TIF, which of course we can't analyze  
20 really -- we can't really consider as part of the  
21 application -- but if the site condition and the  
22 TIF can be wrapped up together and sort of, you  
23 know, ejected from this whole sort -- whole sort  
24 of issue. So you have answered the question. I

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

236

1 just wanted to clarify that for other people in  
2 the room as to why I am asking the question.

3 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, could I add  
4 something?

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

6 MR. GOOD: I will be brief. I think  
7 you -- one thing that is fair to state --  
8 certainly, the developer can speak for itself --  
9 it is probably fair to state that those sites that  
10 require remediation are spread out over the entire  
11 site. It would be very difficult to develop the  
12 site unless all the sites are remediated.

13 Is that a fair statement? All the sites  
14 have to be remediated in order to permit you to  
15 develop the site?

16 MR. STILLWELL: Correct.

17 MR. GOOD: In order for the development  
18 to occur, those sites will be remediated  
19 regardless of how they are financed.

20 So I think you have to assume the site  
21 would only be developed if, in fact, that  
22 remediation occurs. In my opinion, yes, you can  
23 consider that a benefit to be taken into  
24 consideration as part of the PUD process.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

237

1 I certainly will not attempt to speak for  
2 the residents. Leaving aside the development  
3 aspect and their concerns about that, personally,  
4 I would want that site cleaned up if I lived close  
5 to it.

6 And the young lady who testified about  
7 children playing in the muck and things, I  
8 certainly would have a great fear of living  
9 adjacent to that site because of that or having  
10 children playing on that site.

11 So cleaning that site up would be a benefit  
12 to the public at large.

13 MR. DOYLE: Yes. No doubt.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

15 Any other questions?

16 Yes, sir.

17 MR. WARDEN: Jason Warden, W-a-r-d-e-n,  
18 517 James Street.

19 Just talking in regards to what -- you  
20 know, cleaning that site up, we live by there.  
21 Sure. We would love to see it cleaned up. And I  
22 guess the question I have is when you guys  
23 purchased the property, you knew it had the  
24 environmental issues; correct?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

238

1 MR. STILLWELL: Nobody knows the full  
2 extent of the environmental issues.

3 MR. WARDEN: But you knew it had the  
4 environmental issue.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on.

6 If you could just come up and speak in the  
7 microphone.

8 MR. STILLWELL: I was not present at the  
9 time that the Applicant purchased the property.  
10 So I cannot speak with firsthand knowledge of what  
11 he did or did not know.

12 It is my assumption that he knew that there  
13 were conditions at the site that would require  
14 some form of remediation because of its industrial  
15 history.

16 I don't know what the factual information  
17 was that was provided by the seller of the site at  
18 the time. It is my understanding it was an  
19 auction.

20 So I don't know enough about the details to  
21 begin to delve into the mindset of the Applicant,  
22 unfortunately.

23 But for the purposes of discussion, if it  
24 pleases this individual, we can assume there was

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

239

1 some knowledge that there was a problem there.

2 I will tell you this right now: That  
3 Mr. Huff -- and he can speak for himself -- has  
4 been working on this issue for four years. And as  
5 of this point, we still don't know until we go  
6 through there and do the actual development  
7 component of this project -- should it be  
8 approved -- what the exact -- the exact  
9 composition of the environmental challenges are on  
10 this site.

11 So this is an unknown quantity. We have  
12 certain understandings based upon what has been  
13 progressed to date. But there is more to  
14 determine as we get into more extensive  
15 examination and development.

16 MR. WARDEN: So how come since we have  
17 known that it has environmental issues and you  
18 have -- or your client has owned the property for  
19 four years -- how come nothing has been done to it  
20 yet? How come it hasn't been abated?

21 You know, if anyone else has a property  
22 that is like that, you need to abate it to take  
23 care of your property. How come it has taken four  
24 years and nothing has still happened to the site?



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

240

1 MR. STILLWELL: Well, in fact, some  
2 things have happened to the site. I mean, perhaps  
3 it would be more appropriate if I just get into my  
4 summary at some point.

5 But there were questions raised I think by  
6 Mr. Amundson about, "Is this a blighted area?  
7 Maybe this is a historically significant site that  
8 offers low-cost, non-residential opportunities."

9 Through the process of this very arduous  
10 review and negotiation and redesign that the  
11 Applicant has been involved in for four-and-a-half  
12 years, the City identified conditions at that  
13 location of these potentially historical sites  
14 that require demolition because of safety  
15 concerns. And in fact, the Applicant proceeded to  
16 go forward with certain levels and components of  
17 demolition even though this process obviously has  
18 not come to fruition and we didn't know what the  
19 ultimate results would be.

20 So there have been activities. But we  
21 can't get into the remediation program until we  
22 actually have a plan of development that we can  
23 work with and then go through the process with the  
24 State authorities and the representatives of the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

241

1 community to make sure that it is carried out  
2 appropriately to conform with the plan and the  
3 land use that has been approved for the property.

4 So this Applicant is doing everything in  
5 conformance with appropriate procedures. All the  
6 standards have been met with the City of  
7 St. Charles.

8 Why has it been done that way? That is  
9 simply the way these processes work. And it is  
10 the regulators that establish those processes, not  
11 us. Just as they establish the standards of  
12 review with respect to traffic considerations and  
13 rely upon certain established criteria through the  
14 Institute of Traffic Engineers manuals to be able  
15 to project existing conditions.

16 So we have to work within those parameters.  
17 And I will get into more detail on that later.

18 MR. WARDEN: Okay. I guess whether it  
19 is residential, industrial, manufacturing, it is a  
20 bad site that this gentleman owns; and it should  
21 be addressed. I mean, he doesn't need approval on  
22 that layout of townhomes and single-family homes  
23 in order to take care of his responsibility of  
24 taking care of his property. That could be going

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

242

1 on right now. It doesn't have to be once that is  
2 approved and he has got the money to do it. He  
3 can do that now. It is his property, and he  
4 should do that. And maybe the former owner should  
5 have. But he should take care of that property  
6 with or without the approval of that subdivision.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

9 Any other questions?

10 All right. Mr. Stillwell.

11 MR. STILLWELL: When the Applicant came  
12 to the City to begin this process several years  
13 ago, it had to look to the guidelines that were  
14 provided by the community. A landowner always has  
15 the responsibility to look to what it is the  
16 community through its land use ordinances and  
17 guidelines are seeking to accomplish for a  
18 particular location.

19 In 2006 through 2008, the City of  
20 St. Charles undertook a review of its  
21 Comprehensive Plan with respect to this particular  
22 area.

23 And it is my understanding -- and I have a  
24 copy of the plan that was adopted -- and the plan

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

243

1 was adopted in 2008. It attempted to establish  
2 some guidelines, some objectives, and goals that  
3 the City would like to see accomplished at this  
4 location.

5 Now, I am going to assume -- I was not a  
6 participant in that process. But I am going to  
7 assume that all of the normal statutory procedures  
8 were followed. The City has a history of being  
9 very open with its residents in providing them an  
10 opportunity to provide input. I am going to  
11 assume that there was extensive opportunity for  
12 the community at large, as well as the  
13 neighborhood specifically, to engage in that  
14 discussion for the two-year process that ensued.  
15 That ultimately lead to the current road map that  
16 has been established by the Comprehensive Plan.

17 So in good faith, the Applicant came to the  
18 table and looked at those standards and attempted  
19 to draw up and present for consideration a plan  
20 that addressed the objectives.

21 You will recall that we came before you in  
22 2008 with that initial plan. It had 175 units.  
23 It was more of a neo-traditional residential  
24 design with some single-family in it. It entailed

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

244

1 a great deal of improvement services because of  
2 the motor courtyards.

3 And we got a fair amount of negative  
4 reaction, not just from planning commissioners and  
5 ultimately also planning and development members  
6 of council but from the neighbors because they  
7 felt the density was too great and the benefits  
8 provided didn't offset the detriments.

9 And so we went back and started working on  
10 a revised plan and came back with a revised plan.  
11 We then continued to work with the staff, park  
12 district, with the school district and finally  
13 came to the plan that you see in front of you.

14 But when the Applicant looked at the  
15 Comprehensive Plan, there were a few generalized  
16 goals that the City had identified. And we have  
17 tried to incorporate some of those goals. And I  
18 think that they also then dovetailed with the  
19 types of standards and objectives that are  
20 enunciated in the PUD.

21 One of the things I want to point out --  
22 and this is my experience based upon my years of  
23 involvement in this kind of activity and my  
24 dealing with the legal aspects of it -- I never

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

245

1 try to just make arguments on technically legal  
2 grounds, but it is an important point of reference  
3 as far as understanding the process of what we are  
4 trying to accomplish -- the courts, Illinois  
5 Supreme Court, has made clear over the years in  
6 numerous cases that when it comes to the standards  
7 that you have incorporated into your ordinance --  
8 and they are customary and routine in communities  
9 throughout this state -- that those are not  
10 standards that every item must be complied with.

11 First of all, oftentimes there are  
12 generalized statements. They don't provide clear,  
13 objective criteria, as opposed to more sometimes  
14 subjective goals.

15 But the Court makes it clear that the  
16 purpose of these standards is to establish some  
17 benchmarks as to what are some of the things we  
18 would like to have considered. And they give you  
19 the opportunity and the ability when the big  
20 picture is looked at to begin to weigh the  
21 benefits and the detriments.

22 I mean, it is clear that any time something  
23 is done whether it is private development or  
24 whether it is public development -- and the public

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

246

1 does do a lot of development, too -- that there  
2 are good things about it and there are some things  
3 that are not as good. But sometimes you have to  
4 balance those competing goals. That is what we  
5 have really tried to do in this rather difficult  
6 site that we are dealing with.

7 Under the Comprehensive Plan, the City  
8 identified the interconnection of the existing  
9 street network as a goal to strive for. It also  
10 encouraged similar but diverse types of housing  
11 styles.

12 It also recommended that there be some  
13 forms of buffer or transition between the various  
14 types of adjacent uses and to look towards placing  
15 the more dense locations or the more dense  
16 components away from the lower-density existing  
17 residential and more towards industrial or  
18 non-residential.

19 These are the kind of things that we have  
20 attempted to do. We have attempted to accommodate  
21 those types of goals. I won't go through every  
22 one of the goals. You know them better than I do.

23 We also attempted wherever possible to  
24 incorporate the standards of the Special Use from

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

247

1 the PUD.

2 What I would like to do, if I can, which is  
3 going to be tough --

4 Russ, how do I get the Power Point up here?  
5 I would probably be better suited operating a 747  
6 than operating this computer.

7 One of the goals, as I indicated, for the  
8 Comprehensive Plan was the integration of existing  
9 street networks. So in each instance that is what  
10 has been attempted to be done relative to the  
11 interconnection of 9th and 7th and 6th and Mark  
12 Street, trying to provide for the smooth  
13 integration of traffic movement, pedestrian  
14 movement, and to blend this in as part of the  
15 overall community.

16 Clearly, there are limitations when you get  
17 to the westerly half of the property because of  
18 the elements of the creek and adjacent industrial.

19 One of the objectives the City identified  
20 was for longer term-planning for the  
21 interconnection for 12th Street with the street  
22 network that is being developed within this plan  
23 here.

24 And so as a result of that, we have



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

248

1 provided for a dedication area that will permit  
2 the creation of a public street right-of-way in  
3 the future should there be a circumstance in the  
4 future where there might be redevelopment of the  
5 industrial site to the west.

6 That is something that was requested by the  
7 City, and we have integrated that for that  
8 purpose.

9 One of the things that has been identified  
10 in the standards is to try to find ways to provide  
11 open space to protect some of the natural areas,  
12 native vegetation, provide a pedestrian-friendly  
13 environment, the things Mr. Amundson went through  
14 point by point.

15 Let's take a look at the plan up on the  
16 screen which has the site plan over layed on the  
17 aerial photograph and gives juxtaposition for  
18 existing uses.

19 And some of things that we attempted to  
20 incorporate in this plan to accommodate some of  
21 the PUD objectives are pedestrian interconnections  
22 in the northwest corner of the site and in the  
23 center of the site to what will be in the future a  
24 bike path and trail that the park district has

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

249

1           planned to take over when the railroad spur is  
2           vacated.

3                       And we have also provided for pedestrian  
4           interconnection from the internal Ryan Street in  
5           this subdivision to the south to the park that the  
6           park district is working on.

7                       As part of the discussions we had with  
8           staff and actually as a part of the testimony that  
9           was provided and may very well have been in front  
10          of this body or else the planning and development  
11          committee, the owner of Holm Industry up here  
12          through his legal counsel said, "We are concerned  
13          because we relied upon being able to obtain fire  
14          access on your property because of past conduct  
15          and the way the adjacent owners cooperated."

16                      And so in working with the fire department  
17          and staff, there was a driveway designed that  
18          would allow for that emergency access that would  
19          help to service the needs of the Holm Industry  
20          site, trying to be respectful of the adjacent  
21          conditions.

22                      You can see that based upon the allocation  
23          of densities as it conforms with the objectives of  
24          the Plan, we have located the lower density,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

250

1 single-family on the east side. We have focused  
2 the bulk of the traditional townhomes on the  
3 westerly part of the property. And then up in the  
4 northeast corner are the row homes.

5 And all of this is provided through a  
6 respect for and a protection of the natural  
7 conditions that exist along the southern boundary  
8 of the site most immediately adjacent to the  
9 existing residential properties.

10 As testified to by Terry Smith, the State  
11 Street Creek has been protected as a natural  
12 corridor with respect to the native vegetation.  
13 The retention ponds have been located in the lower  
14 areas but with a distance from the creek so as to  
15 protect those natural conditions.

16 But so now we have the creek, the native  
17 vegetation, the natural conditions there, along  
18 with the open space for the detention facilities  
19 that provide buffers and setbacks and protections  
20 to adjacent property owners.

21 In addition, we have looked at how we can  
22 best accommodate things such as addressing  
23 creative storm water approaches. We have  
24 identified the three detention facilities. As

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

251

1           stated, those detention facilities are not the  
2           older style, wet-bottom facilities. These are  
3           native grasses. They have natural vegetation,  
4           emergent vegetation. That is really what is the  
5           driving goal these days of effective storm water  
6           management design.

7                       The reason for that is it helps to  
8           implement what is referred to these days as "best  
9           management practices." It helps facilitate the  
10          cleaning of the water. The natural vegetation  
11          provides a filtration effect so that as the water  
12          is collected in those areas it is actually  
13          filtered and cleaned before it is discharged.

14                      So these are the kinds of things that as a  
15          planned unit development we are attempting to  
16          incorporate into this overall plan that helps to  
17          address the kind of goals that are enunciated in  
18          sections established in the PUD standards.

19                      If you would like, I will go through each  
20          of these in particular. But quite frankly, I  
21          believe that the testimony that has been given by  
22          all of the Applicant's witnesses is testament to  
23          the efforts that have been made by this Applicant  
24          to try to be sensitive to all of the standards

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

252

1           that the City has set forth, within reason.

2                         And we will be the first to admit that not  
3 every objective can be accomplished. And it is  
4 particularly difficult in dealing with the site  
5 that has some of the constraints and impediments  
6 that this site has.

7                         But on balance, I believe we have done an  
8 excellent job of addressing the types of  
9 standards, these kinds of objectives, and allowing  
10 the site to be potentially cleaned up,  
11 redeveloped, and put back into a productive  
12 neighborhood environment through the  
13 implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

14                         Now, again, I turn to you as the Plan  
15 Commission. You tell me what you would like me to  
16 do with respect to the standard. If you want me  
17 to go through MAP amendment standards, I will be  
18 happy to do that. I can go through point by point  
19 on every PUD standard as well as every Special Use  
20 standard. I will be happy to do that as well.

21                         But I don't want to belabor this  
22 presentation and run it unnecessarily long unless  
23 this is something that you would like me to do  
24 based upon the information you received so far.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

253

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think that what we  
2 will do -- and I have asked staff to provide a  
3 short summary of that. So we don't -- we don't  
4 need to go through it in detail. We are familiar  
5 with it.

6                   And just for the public's information, all  
7 of these standards are straight out of the zoning  
8 ordinance and contained on the applications. But  
9 those are the things that we consider in coming up  
10 with what type of recommendation we are going to  
11 make.

12                   So what we will do if -- as soon as you are  
13 done, I will see if there are any questions of you  
14 regarding what you have discussed so far. But  
15 then I will ask our staff to give a summary of  
16 that. And we will have a short discussion on  
17 those standards to make sure -- you know,  
18 obviously, we want to make sure that we have all  
19 the information that we need if we feel that  
20 closing the public hearing is appropriate tonight.

21                   MR. STILLWELL: Very well.

22                   One other thing I wanted to comment on in  
23 closing, Mr. Doyle had raised the question about  
24 the TIF. And it is not so much TIF as what the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

254

1 TIF represents, which is an attempt to address a  
2 blighted condition.

3 And I will state for the record this  
4 qualifies as a blighted condition. And obviously,  
5 going forward, we have eligibility requirements  
6 that have to be met and that type of thing.

7 But really the issue to look at is, if it  
8 is blighted, how does that interact with the PUD  
9 standards? I think that the blighted condition  
10 does, in fact, very much integrate with the PUD  
11 standards because it sets a primary goal that is  
12 enunciated by the City Council in its  
13 Comprehensive Plan to eliminate that condition and  
14 to find a viable plan that will allow that to  
15 happen within the constraints of economic reality.

16 And everything that gets done in life,  
17 whether it is a public project or a private  
18 project, has to work within budgetary constraints.

19 Part of the problem that we have as a  
20 nation and as a state is the failure to adhere to  
21 those budgetary constraints.

22 So we come to you asking you for your due  
23 consideration and hopefully recommendation of  
24 approval based upon the arduous efforts we have

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

255

1           made to try to blend those budgetary constraints  
2           with all of the goals and visions that have been  
3           enunciated by the City in your guidelines and your  
4           documents, your Comprehensive Plan, and your  
5           Zoning Ordinance.

6                     Thank you.

7                             CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank  
8           you.

9                     Russ, would you like to provide us with a  
10          kind of a summary of the findings of fact?

11                    MR. COLBY: Sure. I will summarize them  
12          for you.

13                    And there is three different applications  
14          that are before the Plan Commission for  
15          consideration. The first is the MAP amendment,  
16          zoning MAP amendment. Second is the special use  
17          for PUD application. And third is the application  
18          of approval of the PUD preliminary plan.

19                    There are findings of fact that are  
20          associated with two of these applications, the  
21          first one being the MAP amendment. This is the  
22          rezoning. It changes the zoning of the property  
23          from a manufacturing district to the two  
24          residential districts.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

256

1                   The list of the findings that are to be  
2                   considered generally include the following topics:  
3                   The existing uses and zoning of the nearby  
4                   property, the extent to which property values are  
5                   diminished by those zoning restrictions, the  
6                   suitability of the property for the purpose for  
7                   which it is presently zoned, the length of time  
8                   that the property has been vacant, evidence or  
9                   lack of evidence of the community's need for the  
10                  use permitted by the current zoning, the  
11                  consistency of the proposed zoning change with the  
12                  City Comprehensive Plan, whether the zoning  
13                  corrects an error or an omission on the zoning  
14                  map, the extent to which the proposed zoning  
15                  change creates non-conformity, and the trend of  
16                  the development in the general area in question.  
17                  All of those are part of the MAP amendment  
18                  application.

19                  And the zoning ordinance does not require  
20                  that all of these findings be in the affirmative,  
21                  but that the Plan Commission will make a  
22                  recommendation based on the preponderance of the  
23                  evidence that is presented. That is the MAP  
24                  amendment application.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

257

1           The special use for a PUD application for a  
2           planned unit development, the zoning ordinance  
3           requires that the Plan Commission make a finding  
4           as to whether or not the PUD overall is in the  
5           public interest. And there is specific criteria  
6           that are used to assess whether or not the PUD is  
7           in the public interest.

8           Just to run through those quickly: One,  
9           that the proposed PUD advances one or more of the  
10          purposes of the planned unit development  
11          procedure.

12          Two, the PUD preliminary plans conform to  
13          the requirements of the underlying zoning district  
14          except where the requirements would either inhibit  
15          the creative design or the requirement would be  
16          impractical. And the proposed PUD would provide  
17          benefits that would outweigh the variances that  
18          are requested.

19          Third, that the proposed PUD conforms to  
20          the standards applicable for special uses.

21          Fourth, that the PUD be beneficial to the  
22          physical development, diversity, tax base, and  
23          economic well-being of the City.

24          And then fifth, that the PUD conforms to

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

258

1 the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan.

2 So those are all the criteria that are  
3 considered in making the decision whether or not  
4 the project is in the public interest.

5 And then the third application is the  
6 application for PUD preliminary plan. And these  
7 are considered as supporting information for the  
8 special use for PUD application. So that would be  
9 recommendations just based on the plans that are  
10 provided in support of the PUD.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right, Russ.

12 MR. COLBY: That is the summary that I  
13 have.

14 MS. TUNGARE: I have one comment to the  
15 summary that has been provided.

16 The findings of fact that Mr. Stillwell was  
17 referring to were responses to these questions or  
18 these criteria that Russ just summarized.

19 The Applicant has provided their responses  
20 that Mr. Stillwell offered to the Commission.  
21 Those are included in your packets and made  
22 available publicly as well.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank  
24 you, Rita.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

259

1                   Anything further from the members of the  
2 Plan Commission?

3                   MR. DOYLE: I have one question for the  
4 Applicant.

5                   You mentioned economic reality and  
6 constraints and the trade-offs that you need to  
7 consider as you develop this plan.

8                   One that I would like to try to understand  
9 just a little bit more is the switch from the  
10 neo-traditional design to the more suburban  
11 townhomes with the front-loading garages.

12                   What obstacles led you to make the  
13 change -- that change? And conversely, what would  
14 be required -- if it is even possible to sort of  
15 describe it concisely -- what kind of changes  
16 would be required to allow this plan to remove the  
17 front-loading garages? You know, is there a  
18 way -- what is the trade-off?

19                   MR. STILLWELL: If you remember the  
20 original plan, which is actually in here, that was  
21 the plan you saw back in 2008. The townhomes that  
22 you see there both up in the northeast corner as  
23 well as all of this in here are neo-traditional  
24 design with motor courts. So all of this layout

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

260

1 incorporated that rear-load garage design. That  
2 was actually what was able to provide the density  
3 of 175 units on the site.

4 The -- there were a number of issues that  
5 had to be taken into account as the developer  
6 talked with the community, found out what the  
7 feedback was and where the problems lie including  
8 an important one which was density.

9 One of the things that has evolved and  
10 continued to evolve as a result of the shift in  
11 the market that we are dealing with is that the  
12 neo-traditional design which is a vertical design  
13 which goes over the garages and involves greater  
14 stairways and smaller spaces that are vertical  
15 have fallen out of favor. They are not the type  
16 of product that people are looking for.

17 And so that was a component of it. We  
18 definitely want to present to you a proposed  
19 development that, in fact, has market viability  
20 and can perform as projected. And the intensity  
21 of the neo-traditional style posed a problem from  
22 that perspective.

23 It also posed a problem from the  
24 improvement perspective. There is a tremendously

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

261

1 greater amount of improvement surface on that plan  
2 in order to have the motor courts.

3 If you look at that plan and you  
4 juxtaposition to the plan I had up a little bit  
5 ago, you will see much, much less green space  
6 within the townhome area.

7 On a challenging site such as this, that  
8 only exacerbated the problem, not just from an  
9 economic position which were severe but also from  
10 the standpoint of the site conditions that we are  
11 dealing with and that are a part of the economic  
12 package that is being discussed between the  
13 Applicant and the City.

14 And so all of -- both of those factors came  
15 together. So then, once we had to start looking  
16 at reducing density, we needed to start looking at  
17 alternative product types that would lend itself  
18 to that lower density and provide market  
19 feasibility that would support sufficient revenue  
20 streams. Everybody understands that. It is the  
21 way we run our households and our businesses and a  
22 development.

23 And so ultimately, you have to find a  
24 vehicle by which you can design this and build it

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

262

1 out in a fashion that is not just marketable but  
2 feasible.

3 So overall, those are the conditions that  
4 lead to the switch from the neo-traditional design  
5 which initially the Applicant was happy to try to  
6 move forward with and try to make it work.

7 But there was definite resistance from the  
8 community that forced us to reassess what would be  
9 an appropriate product mix that would address some  
10 of the other criteria of the community and still  
11 meet the standards.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything further?

13 All right. All right.

14 If the Planning Commission feels they have  
15 received sufficient evidence to make a  
16 recommendation --

17 Yes, Brian.

18 MR. DOYLE: One question we have for  
19 staff.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

21 MR. DOYLE: Would you please clarify the  
22 status of the land/cash formulas for the school  
23 district? Do the -- have those formulas been  
24 satisfied?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

263

1                   MR. COLBY: The Applicant has submitted  
2                   the land/cash worksheet that is a part of the  
3                   City's application. And they are showing  
4                   population student generation numbers based on the  
5                   City's formulas. And that worksheet shows that  
6                   they are proposing that the requirement of their  
7                   subdivision for the land/cash donation be an  
8                   all-cash donation based on those formulas.

9                   So they are complying with the City's  
10                  ordinance for the land/cash requirement. And the  
11                  school district has received a copy of that. And  
12                  they have not requested that there be any type of  
13                  land donation in connection with this development  
14                  which would be the only question we would be  
15                  asking them in terms of land/cash requirements.

16                  MR. DOYLE: Thank you.

17                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: One other thing.  
18                  Prior to our next meeting, would you be able to  
19                  provide the -- do you have the transcript  
20                  available from when this was before us previously  
21                  back when the site plan was --

22                  MR. COLBY: From the concept plan  
23                  application?

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

264

1 MR. COLBY: Yes. We have minutes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Would you be able to  
3 provide those?

4 MR. COLBY: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.  
6 Anything further?

7 As I was saying, if the Plan Commission  
8 feels that they have enough information and have  
9 received enough evidence to make a decision  
10 whether to recommend denial or approval of this  
11 application or these three applications to the  
12 City Council, a motion to close the public hearing  
13 would be in order?

14 MS. AMATANGELO: So moved.

15 MR. SCHUETZ: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It has been moved and  
17 seconded.

18 Any discussion on the motion?

19 Okay. Roll call.

20 Doyle.

21 MR. DOYLE: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

23 MR. PRETZ: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Henningson?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

265

1 MR. HENNINGSON: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

3 MR. SCHUETZ: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Amatangelo.

5 MS. AMATANGELO: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace. Yes.

7 All right. The public hearing is now  
8 closed. And that concludes Item No. 4 on your  
9 agendas.

10 And staff, just for public information, I  
11 am assuming that this will be before us on our  
12 October 18th meeting.

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. That's correct.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

15 Item 5 on the agenda, meeting  
16 announcements.

17 If anyone is not going to be here for the  
18 next three meetings --

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 6, additional  
21 business from Plan Commission members.

22 All right. Staff? Citizens?

23 All right. Item 7 is adjournment.

24 Is there a motion?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

266

1 MR. SCHUETZ: I move we adjourn this  
2 meeting.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. I move to  
4 second it.

5 All in favor?

6 (The ayes were thereupon  
7 heard.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The St. Charles Plan  
11 Commission is adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

12 (Which were all the proceedings  
13 had in the above-entitled  
14 matter at the hour of  
15 9:50 P.M.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/4/11  
PUBLIC HEARING

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 ) SS.  
2 COUNTY OF K A N E )

3 I, Geri L. Warsop-Denson, Certified  
4 Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003233, CSR, RPR, do  
5 hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the  
6 proceedings had in the above-entitled matter and  
7 that the foregoing is a true, correct, and  
8 complete transcript of my shorthand notes so taken  
9 as aforesaid.

10 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my  
11 hand on this 11th day of October, 2011.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24



*Geri L. Denson*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
Registered Professional Reporter