

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2012**

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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Matthew O'Rourke, Planner
 Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
 Rita Tungare, Community Development Director
 Chris Tiedt, Development Engineering Division Manager
 Sonntag Court Reporter

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chairman Wallace.

2. Roll Call

Vice Chairman Kessler called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Presentation of Minutes

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the May 22, 2012 meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. Corporate Reserve of St. Charles PUD – Residential Development (Corporate Reserve Development, LLC)

Application for Amendment to Special Use Ordinance 2008-Z-18 to permit residential use
Application for Map Amendment from the OR Office Research District to the RM-3
General Residential District

Supporting Documents:

- PUD Preliminary Plans dated 5/14/12
- Landscape Plans dated 5/16/12
- Preliminary Engineering Plans dated 5/16/12

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

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, June 5, 2012

Page 2

Mr. Kessler made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

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

Nays: None

Absent: Motion Carried.

5. General Amendments (City of St. Charles).

Chapter 17.28 “Signs” related to provisions for Temporary Signs during construction projects

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

Mr. Kessler made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

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

Nays: Wallace

Absent: None

Motion Carried.

MEETING

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

6. General Amendments (City of St. Charles)

Chapter 17.22 “General Provisions” and Chapter 17.30 “Definitions” related to provisions for Donation Boxes.

Mr. Kessler made a motion to recommend approval of the General Amendment. Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

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

Nays: Amatangelo, Pretz

Absent: None

Motion Carried.

7. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)

Chapter 17.28 “Signs” related to provisions for Temporary Signs during construction projects.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, June 5, 2012

Page 3

Mr. Kessler made a motion to recommend approval of the General Amendment. Mr. Doyle seconded the motion.

Voice Vote:

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

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion Carried.

8. Meeting Announcements.

Tuesday, June 19, 2012 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers

Tuesday, July 3, 2012 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers - Cancelled

Tuesday, July 17, 2012 at 7:00pm in Council Chambers

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

10. Adjournment at 9:38 p.m.

1 **PRESENT:**

2 MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;
3 MR. TIMOTHY KESSLER, Vice Chairman;
4 MS. SUE AMATANGELO, Member;
5 MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;
6 MR. CURT HENNINGSON, Member;
7 THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and
8 MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.

9

ALSO PRESENT:

10

 MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager;

11

 MR. MATTHEW O'ROURKE, Planner;

12

 MS. RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community
13 Development; and

13

14 MR. CHRISTOPHER TIEDT, Development Engineering
 Division Manager.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

3 Tim?

4 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

5 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Here.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

8 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

12 MEMBER KESSLER: Henningson.

13 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Here.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

16 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, here.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 3
18 on your agenda, presentation of the minutes of
19 May 22nd, 2012, meeting.

20 Is there a motion to approve?

21 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved
24 and seconded. All in favor?

1 (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion passes
5 unanimately.

6 Item No. 3 on your agenda is Public
7 Hearing, Corporate Reserve of St. Charles; I'm
8 sorry -- I said Item 3. It's Item 4.

9 We have an application for amendment to
10 Special Use Ordinance 2008-Z-18 to permit
11 residential use, application for MAP amendment
12 from the OR Office Research District to the RM-3
13 General Residential District with supporting
14 documents PUD dated 5/14/12, landscape plans
15 dated 5/16/12, and preliminary engineering plans
16 dated 5/16/12.

17 Do we have additional exhibits, Matt?

18 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. There was a list
19 of exhibits included in the packet.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry. Give me
21 just a second.

22 While I'm looking for that, for those of
23 you who have never been here before, welcome.

24 Thank you for coming.

1 This is the St. Charles Plan Commission.
2 We are commissioned by the City of St. Charles
3 City Council to conduct public hearings for
4 applications that come before the City.

5 In this case we have two applications. One
6 is for the amendment to an ordinance, and the
7 other one is an amendment to the City's zoning map.

8 So what we do is we hear from the
9 Applicant. They present information regarding
10 their application, including evidence which the
11 Plan Commission will take, and we'll also hear
12 rebutting evidence from anyone who wishes to
13 give it.

14 From a procedural standpoint, we will hear
15 from the Applicant first, and then after the
16 Applicant is finished, members of the Plan
17 Commission will ask questions of the Applicant.
18 After the Plan Commission has had a chance to do
19 that, then any member of the audience who wishes
20 to may ask questions of the Applicant.

21 We will divide the meeting into question
22 time and comment time. So if you have comments,
23 wait until everybody has asked questions about
24 what the Applicant has already presented.

1 Following that, anyone who wishes to offer
2 comments or offer any type of testimony, either
3 for or against the application, may do so.

4 At the end, the Applicant will have the
5 opportunity to offer rebuttal to any evidence
6 offered by anyone else.

7 Any questions regarding our procedures?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then the
10 way -- first of all, let me point out that we
11 have a Court Reporter present here. State law
12 requires that the public hearing be taken down by
13 a Court Reporter.

14 And so anyone who wishes to speak, first of
15 all, you can -- only one person can speak at a
16 time because the Court Reporter can't take down
17 more than one person, and you have to be
18 recognized by the Chair in order to speak. When
19 anyone asks to speak, I ask that they approach
20 the lectern, state their name, spell their last
21 name for the record, and also their address.

22 So at this time anyone who wishes to offer
23 testimony or answer questions, I'll swear you in.

24 (Whereupon, the witnesses were

1 Exhibit G is a draft traffic study, Hampton
2 Lenzini & Renwick, dated 5/11/12;

3 Exhibit H is draft sanitary sewer study,
4 Wills, Burke, Kelsey & Associates, dated
5 4/24/2012;

6 Exhibit I is a memorandum to draft sanitary
7 sewer study, Wills, Burke, Kelsey & Associates,
8 dated 5/7/2012;

9 Exhibit J is a memorandum to draft sanitary
10 sewer study, Wills, Burke, Kelsey & Associates,
11 dated 5/21/2012;

12 And Exhibit K is concept plan site plan,
13 BSB Design, Inc., received 11/14/2012.

14 Are we sure?

15 MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah. That was the
16 concept plan.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 2011? Exhibit K
18 was received 11/14/2011.

19 After we go through the procedure that I
20 talked about earlier, the Plan Commission will
21 not take action on this application tonight. The
22 purpose of the Plan Commission holding this
23 public hearing is to receive all information that
24 the Plan Commission believes it needs in order to

1 make a recommendation to the City Council.

2 The Plan Commission does not make a
3 decision. We only make a recommendation on what
4 the City Council should do, and we do that within
5 the confines of what is laid out in our
6 ordinances.

7 The Plan Commission considers findings of
8 fact which are laid out in the ordinances, and
9 we'll go through those later on when we have
10 discussion, but for each of the applications, the
11 Plan Commission does a fact finding job where we
12 say, "Did the Applicant fulfill certain factors
13 that are laid out in the ordinance?" If they
14 did, then we recommend approval. If they did
15 not, then we'll recommend denial to the City
16 Council.

17 So at a meeting in the future, depending on
18 whether we need to continue the public hearing
19 for more information or not, this Commission will
20 make a recommendation to the City Council.

21 Any questions at this point?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Matt,
24 do you have anything for us?

1 MR. O'ROURKE: No. They'll make
2 their presentation at this time.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is the Applicant
4 ready?

5 Okay, go ahead.

6 MR. ROBERTSON: Good evening. My
7 name is Paul Robertson, R-o-b-e-r-t-s-o-n,
8 1930 North Thoreau Drive, Schaumburg, Illinois.

9 Thank you for having us here tonight.
10 We're here to talk about the Corporate Reserve of
11 St. Charles.

12 With me tonight I have Hank Stillwell from
13 Rathje & Woodward, our attorney. I have our
14 architects and planners Terry Smith and
15 Jeff Mulcrone. We have our civil engineer,
16 Kevin Matray from Mackie Consultants, and our
17 landscape architects, Michelle Retson and
18 George Kinsella from Kinsella Landscape.

19 So we have everyone here to answer
20 questions. Hopefully we can satisfy all your
21 questions from the design team.

22 A little bit of background. The subject
23 property is on Main Street west of Randall Road.
24 It's 50.4 acres zoned in 2008 for a mix of office

1 and commercial.

2 The area you see in green is currently
3 zoned OR, office research, and is entitled for
4 576,000 square feet of office. The area shown in
5 red, which is not part of our amendment, is zoned
6 BP and allows for retail office and mixed use.

7 What we entitled back in 2008 was Lot 6 and
8 Lot 5. Lot 6 is currently improved with
9 two 15,000-square-foot single-story office
10 buildings, which I'm pleased to report are
11 100 percent occupied now, and Lot 5 is entitled
12 for a three-story 45,000-square-foot office
13 building. That is still to be developed.

14 Lot 8 is the subject of our discussion
15 tonight and was to be a future phase of this
16 development. What we envisioned was two
17 200,000-square-foot five-story office buildings
18 60 feet in height. We have 500,000 square feet
19 of total office space entitled in addition to
20 what's already there. That would -- this
21 originally included structured parking, some
22 three-level structured parking, some two-level
23 structured parking, and fairly intensive use of
24 the site.

1 This is generally the current condition of
2 the site. We have the two office buildings on
3 Lot 6. Again, it took us a little bit longer to
4 lease those than we had originally anticipated,
5 but they are fully occupied now.

6 No secret that job growth has been slowed.
7 That creates reduced demand for office space and
8 extended the time for the office side of this
9 project.

10 We looked at a lot of different uses and
11 tried to find a way to get this productive and
12 back online quicker, so we studied the housing
13 market. There's been fundamental changes in the
14 housing market away from owner-occupied and
15 towards rental housing.

16 What we're talking about is a 20-acre site
17 on Lot 8. We commissioned an independent market
18 study that confirmed the opportunity for
19 residential housing -- for rental housing here,
20 and then we studied the estimated tax revenue
21 from the -- from the undeveloped site. This does
22 not include the two existing office buildings.
23 And we estimate that with the rental of multi-
24 family we would generate in the next 10 years

1 something on the order of \$10.8 million of real
2 estate tax revenue. Without the multi-family we
3 estimate that to be \$2.8 million, and it's really
4 driven by the lack of demand for office and the
5 slow nature of office development in general.

6 Back in November we were before you with
7 our concept plan, and I'm going to turn it over
8 to Terry Smith from BSB Design, who is going to
9 walk you through the concept plan that we
10 discussed with you in November and show you the
11 changes to the plan that we are now seeking your
12 recommendation on.

13 MR. SMITH: Good evening. Again, my
14 name is Terry Smith, S-m-i-t-h, with BSB
15 Architect Design Architects and Planners. We are
16 at 3436 North Kennicott, Arlington Heights,
17 Illinois.

18 As Paul mentioned, just turning back the
19 clock to last November, we came before you and
20 submitted this plan, originally a rental multi-
21 family plan with 407 total rental units.

22 The plan had somewhat of a -- what we call
23 a Main Street entry. The plan was comprised of a
24 combination of three-story buildings on the

1 fringe, four-story standalone buildings in the
2 middle, and these two buildings at the entry were
3 three-story mixed-use buildings with
4 office/commercial space at the ground floor.

5 All the buildings -- the three-story
6 buildings had attached tucked under drive-in
7 garages, with the four-story buildings actually
8 have parking garages subgrade. Total
9 office/commercial space proposed in the two
10 mixed-use buildings totaled about 3500 square feet.

11 Now, after we presented this plan, there
12 were obviously a number of concerns that were
13 expressed. First of all, the density. Many
14 thought that there's too much density on this
15 site. Many here were also concerned about the
16 height of the four-story stand-alone buildings in
17 the middle.

18 There's also some comments related to the
19 open space, and while we had a lot of open space
20 and a lot of green on the site plan, many felt
21 that there really wasn't any -- any sort of
22 connectivity or continuity purpose to this
23 open space.

24 I think -- as we worked through this and

1 into the process were somewhat self-aware and
2 concerned about, you know, the viability of
3 actual -- being so distant, so far off of
4 Main Street and how viable any kind of office or
5 commercial, even a small amount of it, in the
6 ground floor of these two buildings. There was
7 obviously the -- in addition, the general concern
8 with traffic and also parking. Not so much that
9 there was not enough of it but that there was
10 kind of this mass and sea of parking lots, and
11 there was a question that, you know, could we do
12 a better job of maybe breaking up these parking
13 lot areas.

14 So having -- having taken all of that into
15 consideration, what we did was we worked very
16 hard, both internally with our group -- and, of
17 course, we appreciate the assistance that Matt
18 and Rita and Russell and staff has given us and
19 the direction and suggesting ways of making this
20 site plan better, which we think we've done.

21 First of all, I would say that our site
22 plan structurally is actually very similar to
23 what was previously submitted. We have a main
24 entry off -- just north of Main Street across

1 Woodward Drive. That will be the entry into our
2 community.

3 We still have this -- even though we've
4 taken out the retail/office component in these
5 mixed-use buildings, we still have sort of this --
6 kind of this streetscape entry coming into the
7 community with angled parking, sidewalks and
8 trees and flush grades and a terminus onto our
9 club building.

10 Now, whereas, before we had sort of a
11 complete circular entry, I think there was maybe
12 a little confusion as far as relative to
13 circulation, so what we did is we kind of
14 simplified that drop-off in front of the club and
15 just made it a half circle.

16 Now, on either side of this entry we have a
17 couple of loop streets that serve a small cluster
18 of buildings on the east side and a larger
19 cluster of buildings on the west side. So
20 there's a straightforward circulation system that
21 we've provided, and we've also incorporated a
22 permanent access point onto Woodward Drive.

23 All told what we have is three potential
24 access points, one off of Woodward Drive --

1 two off of Woodward Drive, and another access
2 point of Cardinal Drive.

3 So the result of this site plan is that we
4 end up with just three-story buildings. We've
5 reduced our density from actually 407 units to
6 331 units. We've taken out the standalone
7 four-story buildings. So we're now at three
8 stories on the buildings.

9 If you take a look at the plan, you kind of
10 see that there's just a better linkage of all the
11 open space that we have. We've kind of created --
12 for example, on the west side we created this
13 east-west open space spine that connects the
14 trail along the west side; we've created this
15 little trail park at the west end, and there's
16 sort of a special paved area connecting the trail
17 park on the west end to a main park on the
18 east end.

19 So we've kind of created a nice continuous
20 open space connection in this area. We've
21 created an over -- an outlook area that provides
22 some parking and off-site views to this tree line
23 along the old railroad right-of-way. And
24 additionally, I think we've done, I think a

1 better job of kind of breaking up sort of the
2 large expansive parking lot areas that we had
3 before.

4 Our buildings on the site, really there's --
5 there's really three building types. Type 1 and
6 Type 2, they're 21-unit buildings. All the
7 buildings have eight attached garages. Then
8 there's a Type 3 building type that's actually a
9 walk-out condition that exists in one, two, three
10 spots. Those buildings will have 25 units
11 because there's a four-unit walkout portion of
12 the building, and there's actually kind of a
13 variation of the different building sites where
14 we have actually a half walkout in the
15 two buildings that kind of flank the club area.

16 So we have, again, those -- all of the
17 buildings now on the site will be predominantly
18 three stories.

19 Another thing that we've done as part of
20 this is put a concerted effort of designing our
21 club area. Whereas, before I think it was
22 somewhat more of just a placeholder, we've since
23 gone back in our current scenario and really
24 thought carefully about the club area, both the

1 interior spaces of the club and the exterior
2 amenities surrounding the club building.
3 Jeff Mulcrone will talk not only about the club
4 architecture, but the residential architecture,
5 as well.

6 We've talked a little bit about the pocket
7 parks and trails that are on the plan, the
8 overlook, this east-west spine park that's now in
9 the plan, and having connectivity to the bike
10 trails that exist surrounding the property.
11 There's a lot of opportunities for walking,
12 biking, connectivity to trails, and we think
13 that's just a terrific amenity for this
14 community.

15 Some of the hardscape elements that we are
16 proposing on site, we have some entrance
17 monumentation that will occur on Woodward Drive.
18 We have a standalone project entrance sign in the
19 median as you come into the community off of
20 Woodward Drive flanked on either side by stone
21 columns that will have backlit tops, and that
22 will be followed with some ornamental fencing and
23 smaller columns, and that treatment will occur on
24 both sides of the project entry.

1 Garbage, there are numerous locations for
2 garbage dumpsters on site. These dumpsters will
3 be surrounded by, we think very elegantly
4 designed dumpster enclosures that will reflect
5 the same building materials used in the -- in the
6 architecture on the rental buildings.

7 Lighting, as you'll see when Jeff presents
8 the architecture, our building design is
9 predominantly contemporary, so we've elected to
10 choose a light fixture on site that sort of has
11 that same contemporary look. That lighting plan
12 was also provided in the submittal package that
13 you received.

14 Looking at an additional sign, actually, a
15 monument sign 8 foot tall located at the corner
16 of Corporate Reserve Boulevard and Main Street.
17 This will be at the northwest corner.

18 A couple of other things. Mailbox kiosk --
19 mail delivery will be handled by two separate
20 standalone mail kiosks that will flank both sides
21 of the club so residents will get their mail.
22 The Postmaster or postal employee will deliver
23 mail to these individual boxes. Each resident
24 will have their own mailbox and will get their

1 mail in that fashion. We have these next to the
2 club because in any event there's a larger parcel
3 or package, the delivery person can take the
4 parcel into the club building where the resident
5 will pick it up there.

6 Other things to point out, our parking
7 ratio is consistent with the ordinance. I think
8 our overall ratio is about 1.6. We do have --
9 there are eight garage spaces per building. I
10 think I had mentioned that before.

11 What I'd like to now do is introduce Jeff
12 Mulcrone from BSB Design. He'll walk you through
13 the building architecture.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. MULCRONE: Thank you. My name is
16 Jeff Mulcrone, M-u-l-c-r-o-n-e, with BSB Design,
17 3436 North Kennicott, Arlington Heights, Illinois.

18 I'm just going to walk you through the
19 typical building that reflect the buildings on
20 the site.

21 We'll have 15 total of these buildings.
22 There's 331 total units. The units range in size
23 from 650-square-foot one-bedroom one-bath to a
24 1200-square-foot two-bedroom two-bath unit. All

1 of the units have a fresh, open floor plan feel.
2 They're well appointed with living, kitchen, and
3 bath spaces. Each unit also features -- it's
4 going to have a cutting edge interior design
5 scheme that's modeled after a lot of the leading
6 markets, multi-family projects that you find
7 across the country. All of the residents will
8 also enjoy extra large outdoor living spaces. As
9 you can see on the plan, a lot of the units have
10 oversized exterior balconies for their own
11 personal outdoor space.

12 As Terry mentioned, of the 15 buildings on
13 the site, 5 have various walkout basement
14 conditions. Each building does feature
15 eight private garages. We also have space for
16 private handicap garage access to the building,
17 and the garages are set up as semiprivate or
18 private, depending on what the residents choose
19 to use. They're open to all the residents. Some
20 residents will park outside and some will choose
21 to have an individual garage space.

22 On each end of the common corridor space is
23 a weatherproof and secured vestibule that comes
24 out into a staired tower. We have the common

1 corridor area connected to the garages and then
2 the private entrances to each of the units.

3 Another unique feature of the building is
4 that we'll also have private storage spaces for
5 each of the residents in the building for
6 individual resident's use.

7 This is a second-floor plan similar to the
8 first and just showing that we'll also have
9 storage on each level. So, for instance, this
10 half of the building is four units. We've got
11 four private storage areas for those units.

12 One other thing to point out is that,
13 unlike a lot of multi-family dwellings, these
14 buildings have -- half of every building has
15 corner units, which is pretty unheard of in the
16 Chicagoland market for multi-family residential.
17 So a lot of the residents will have great views
18 and daylight from two sources rather than
19 from one.

20 And this is just the typical third-floor
21 plan, very similar.

22 This plan is showing a typical walkout
23 condition that I believe is on three of the
24 buildings where on the back side of the building

1 there will be four additional units, and these
2 are interconnected to the common corridors. So
3 these units can also have direct access to the
4 outside, as well as the stairs that have access
5 to those indoor garage spaces.

6 As I mentioned before, the elevation is a
7 contemporary feel but with classic architectural
8 elements. You'll notice we have forward-facing
9 gables. But we've taken a more contemporary
10 approach with it with a different blend of
11 materials and colors. We think it's exciting.

12 There's stone veneer in some areas, hardy
13 board shingles, metal roofs, metal balconies. So
14 it's a nice play in materials and well balanced.
15 And we actually do have some preliminary material
16 samples we brought with us if you'd like to view
17 those at some point.

18 These are the other three sides of the
19 typical multi-family building just showing the
20 varying colors, the balance and the play, and the
21 varying roof lines. There's a lot of
22 fenestration and a lot of glass to the units, so
23 there's a lot of interconnection with nature,
24 especially since a lot of these buildings back up

1 to the woods.

2 The clubhouse. Well, the clubhouse is
3 actually -- it's a very simple plan, but it's a
4 unique design for this. We have been analyzing a
5 lot of trends in Minneapolis, Denver, Phoenix,
6 Dallas, and those trends slowly migrate across
7 the country. We do have a few offices across the
8 country, and when we see these trends, we try to
9 bring them to the Midwest.

10 This is an open floor plan, a lot of light,
11 a lot of stone, a lot of glass; it's a very
12 inviting feel for your future residents, becomes
13 a focal point for the community, a destination, a
14 social hub. We've got this boardwalk that's in
15 line with the entrance boulevard to the
16 community. So as you drive into the community,
17 you'll see this great clubhouse at the edge of it
18 where all the residents can gather. We've got a
19 center with a club room, and on this side there's
20 a 24-hour social room and a fitness wing, and
21 both of these rooms look out over the pool and
22 all the amendments that the developer has planned
23 for the residents.

24 So with the clubhouse we incorporated some

1 of the same materials we're using on the
2 apartments and just expressed them in a cleaner,
3 more modern way because this is a more
4 commercial-type building. It relates well to the
5 office buildings that are currently on the site,
6 and it reflects the progressive nature of the
7 social center for the community.

8 And these are just some alternating
9 perspectives of the club.

10 MS. RETSON: Hi, I'm Michelle Retson,
11 R-e-t-s-o-n, with Kinsella Landscape, 13821 South
12 Harrison in Blue Island, Illinois.

13 One of the variances that we are trying to
14 get is the foundation plantings -- I'm sorry;
15 foundation trees. Unfortunately, with the way --
16 I don't know if it's unfortunate, but the way the
17 driveways are laid out on each building, I'm
18 unable to put trees. I was working in the site
19 triangles trying to fit them in, but it's just
20 not going to work on that side.

21 So this is the typical foundation
22 plantings. As you can see, there are plantings
23 on almost every portion of the building. They're
24 packed in there. We've used very similar shrubs

1 to the existing site which we know work as far as
2 maintenance for it over the years. I've done the
3 inventory of the plants, so I know what works
4 there, and that's what I tried to focus on all
5 the foundation plantings.

6 As for the trees, we've tried to make them
7 up in other areas. I know the required
8 foundation was 381 trees total for all the
9 buildings. We ended up providing 242. However,
10 the clubhouse has 39, with only 19 required, and
11 then throughout the site we had provided
12 40 percent, which was only required 10 percent.
13 so as you can see, we have made up for them
14 elsewhere.

15 This is the overall site. Specifically,
16 the green space area is the part, and I'll have
17 those enlarged in the next couple slides. But
18 here's this area that Terry was talking about
19 before. Specifically, the central park here, we
20 have a lot of trees here. Over here, the central
21 courtyards in between some of the buildings, and
22 then this other park area down here.

23 This is a park on the corner, and this is
24 that central park area. That area is very

1 heavily landscaped at a portion of it, which is
2 the focal point down that central park that he
3 was talking about.

4 The plant pallet just real quick, like I
5 said, it was very similar to the existing office
6 buildings. I wanted to have some continuity but
7 different colors so you have a sense of place --
8 a sense that you are in a different place but
9 still know that it's part of the same development.

10 And then this is the existing. That's
11 Lot 6. I'm sure you guys have been there, but it
12 has kind of a prairie-ish feel to it but kind of
13 fits with the modern architecture.

14 MR. ROBERTSON: I just want to --
15 excuse me. I just want to touch on the traffic
16 study really quickly and we'll wrap this up.

17 When we did the entitlement back in
18 2008, the City commissioned HLR to do an impact
19 study for the development. And the conclusion of
20 that report was that in the morning there would
21 be 765 movements around the site, and in the
22 evening there would be 870. HLR updated that
23 study to reflect the 330-unit apartment
24 development, and the morning traffic impact

1 dropped to 354, and the evening was 587.

2 So there's been a dramatic decrease in the
3 impact on the roadways based on this plan versus
4 what is entitled for the site right now.

5 That concludes our comments and our
6 presentation. So we're available to answer
7 whatever questions you have.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.
9 Thank you.

10 We'll start with the Plan Commission.
11 Questions from the Plan Commissioners?

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I had a question on
13 the traffic statement that you just made.

14 I just wanted clarification. On the
15 354, is that a total, or is that a reduction in
16 the a.m.?

17 MR. ROBERTSON: This study was based
18 on the development being fully developed. So the
19 765 in the morning and the 354 is as if the
20 property is completely developed. That's not an
21 incremental difference. That's the total traffic
22 generation. 354 is the total revised traffic
23 generation in the morning.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: For Lot 8?

1 MR. ROBERTSON: For the whole
2 development, all 50 acres.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And it dropped
4 dramatically because of the redesign?

5 MR. ROBERTSON: I believe that the
6 nature of the use that residential doesn't create
7 the same --

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

9 MR. ROBERTSON: -- level of traffic
10 impact, which kind of makes sense because you'd
11 see the morning -- Chris, do you want to talk
12 to them?

13 MR. TIEDT: Maybe I can help. The
14 drop is basically because the original office use
15 that was proposed on Lot 8 was removed, and it
16 was replaced with 331 residential units.

17 Now, the traffic generated -- during the
18 traffic study they used the IPE trip generation
19 manual, which is based off of square footage and
20 the type of use. I'm sure you've heard that
21 before.

22 So, basically, based on the trip generation
23 manual, it shows a decrease in those overall peak
24 hour site trips.

1 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I wanted to ask a
3 question regarding an exhibit we have. This is
4 Exhibit F, e-mail from Paul Robertson, Housing
5 and Trust Fund Contribution, dated 6/1/12. Would
6 you mind just going over that with us?

7 MR. ROBERTSON: When we were before
8 you in November the -- and, further, when we were
9 with Planning and Development, the issue of
10 inclusionary housing came up, and some of the
11 feedback that we got from our neighbors and from
12 some of the City Council members was that -- that
13 St. Charles currently has an adequate inventory
14 of income restricted housing or income affordable
15 housing and that the neighbors and this alderman
16 did not wish us to participate in the inclusionary
17 housing ordinance.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And maybe
19 part 2 of the question is something staff could
20 answer. What would the -- and I know it was in
21 the staff report, so I'll direct to it Matt.

22 What would the requirements be under the
23 inclusionary housing ordinance for this project?

24 MR. O'ROURKE: Basically, for a

1 development this size, what the ordinance would
2 say is 15 percent of the units should be
3 considered inclusionary, which means they have to
4 be affordable to households at a certain level.

5 So it basically breaks down to 50 units, or
6 the ordinance does have some provisions in there
7 that they could ask for a waiver to do 50 percent
8 fee in lieu -- 50 percent of required units; let
9 me clarify that -- and then 50 percent of them
10 still on-site. Our current ordinance says it's
11 104,500 per unit, which equates to about
12 \$2.6 million.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And the proposal
14 that was brought up is to not construct any of
15 the affordable units and to pay \$50,000 instead
16 of the 2.6 million into the trust fund?

17 MR. O'ROURKE: That's their request.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

19 Thank you.

20 Yes?

21 MEMBER AMATANGELO: One quick
22 question, and this is for Michelle Retson. Are
23 you still here?

24 MS. RETSON: Yes.

1 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Hi, Michelle.

2 You'd stated that 381 trees were the
3 requirement, but you did not -- or I may have
4 missed it -- combined with the clubhouse, how
5 many trees then are there?

6 MS. RETSON: Let's see. 242 for the
7 foundation and then 39 for the clubhouse.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry; can you
9 say that again?

10 MS. RETSON: There are 242 provided
11 for the foundation trees and then 39 provided for
12 the clubhouse.

13 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So we're still
14 short 100 trees; correct?

15 MS. RETSON: Yes. But they're made
16 up elsewhere on the site. I know on the first
17 page of the landscape plan --

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We have for
19 landscape -- this is too small for me to read.

20 MS. RETSON: There are 459 trees
21 provided total on site; I'm sorry.

22 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Very good.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian?

1 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a couple of
2 questions here. First of all -- I'm just going
3 to go down the order that I wrote them.

4 There are a number of retention ponds on
5 the north side of the parcel. Are those
6 naturalized retention ponds like we have in other
7 properties in the city right now?

8 MS. RETSON: They are almost exactly
9 the same as the existing property with the seeded
10 areas with a prairie-like feel to them, and then
11 there are little berms with -- I forget what the
12 exact growth is but -- they're Rosa caroliniana,
13 which will grow and actually help the erosion.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So they are
15 natural?

16 MS. RETSON: Yes, they are natural.

17 MEMBER DOYLE: You mentioned bike
18 paths, connectivity to bike paths, sidewalks.
19 I'm curious. Could you comment about the
20 walkability throughout the site, particularly
21 walkability from the buildings to the clubhouse.

22 MR. SMITH: Here we go. It's hard to
23 really tell on this graphic, but the way that this
24 community was designed is that in front of every

1 building along the street there's a 5 1/2 foot
2 parkway separating the driveway from a sidewalk.
3 So along all the drives there is -- there are
4 sidewalks that tie all the pedestrian traffic
5 together, and those walks occur in front of the
6 buildings.

7 Additionally, those walks also connect to
8 the trails at various locations, as well. I
9 think there's a connection here, a trail that
10 runs along Woodward Drive, a trail that runs
11 along the west side of the property. We have
12 sidewalks that connect there and there.

13 There's also provisions for a sidewalk
14 connection crossing Woodward Drive. I believe
15 now this sidewalk is in just to a certain point,
16 and I think it stops pending the completion of
17 this Main Street intersection. So in the future
18 there will also be connectivity, pedestrian
19 connectivity to Main Street.

20 So there's really a significant amount of
21 sidewalks in the community.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Next question,
23 am I correct that you have more on-street -- you
24 have more parking overall throughout the site

1 than was required by the ordinance?

2 MR. SMITH: Yeah. But it's 1.6 and
3 that's kind of -- that's really I think -- in the
4 best practices for rental communities 1.6, 1.7 is
5 sort of the kind of minimum threshold.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: 1.6? That is 1.6
7 spaces to --

8 MR. SMITH: Per unit.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: -- per unit?

10 MR. SMITH: 1.6 spaces per unit. So
11 even though -- I think for one-bedroom units
12 you're only required 1.2 spaces per unit. We
13 don't want to -- we don't want to necessarily
14 plan a sea of asphalt parking, but at the same
15 time, we don't want to short ourselves parking,
16 as well.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: Is it less garages?

18 MR. SMITH: It's including garages,
19 including garages.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: In your experience, is
21 there any room to reduce that number down and not
22 violate best practice?

23 MR. SMITH: Well, I think certainly
24 you could look at certain areas and say -- for

1 example, the northwest corner of the site maybe
2 what we could do is consider, you know, land
3 banking these spaces. So that is to plan for
4 future use but maybe not build them until it's
5 demonstrated that they're needed, and we may be
6 able to land bank some spaces over on this side,
7 as well. So there could potentially be that
8 opportunity.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Related to this -- I
10 see that you have, as you call it, "pocket parks."

11 MR. SMITH: Sure.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: Are there -- have you
13 considered a playground or any kind of facilities
14 for children?

15 MR. SMITH: We've not considered that.
16 I think the demographics of these renters --
17 these are smaller units. You're probably looking
18 at single people or younger professionals. I
19 think we're probably not going to see a lot of
20 children in this community.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: Is there -- does the
22 clubhouse feature any amenities that are suitable
23 for younger children?

24 MR. SMITH: Mostly I think it's

1 geared toward an older renter.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. The handicap
3 parking, you mentioned handicap accessible
4 garages.

5 MR. SMITH: Yes.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Do those potentially
7 connect to ADA compliant units?

8 MR. SMITH: Yes. There would be.
9 There would be an accessible route to those units
10 or accessible connection to those units.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: So you do have ADA
12 compliant units?

13 MR. MULCRONE: Right. We would
14 design in the required amount of accessible units
15 throughout the site, and those units would have
16 handicap accessible parking spaces that they
17 could utilize.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: Does that include --
19 I'm not only including handicap accessible but
20 features that are conducive to active seniors.

21 MR. MULCRONE: All of the ground
22 floor units will be what's called ANSI Type B
23 unit, which is not a fully handicapped unit but
24 will have an required blocking for future

1 installation of such features, and 30 percent
2 will be the fully handicapped unit.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: And my last question
4 concerns architecture.

5 You described the residential units as
6 contemporary in style. How would you describe
7 the clubhouse?

8 MR. MULCRONE: I would say the
9 clubhouse is also contemporary in style and is
10 picking up some of the tones of the existing
11 office buildings over there.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: So are there any --
13 when I look at the two designs, they seem
14 somewhat different to me, and I'm just wondering
15 if you could comment on the similarities and
16 contrasts between the architectural style of the
17 residential buildings and the clubhouse.

18 MR. MULCRONE: Well, we're utilizing
19 the same materials and same pallet of colors and
20 really want the -- in the Chicagoland market the
21 clubhouse tends to always look like someone's big
22 house on the site, and this is kind of a
23 departure from that, and it's what we've been
24 seeing as -- it becomes more of a feature and

1 focal point for residents to go, and it's really
2 inviting, a lot of glass, a lot of light to
3 create all the interactivity with the indoor and
4 outdoor spaces.

5 With the three-story building when you look
6 at a building, that roof really disappears when
7 you're on the ground. So when you're on the
8 ground walking around here, you'll still have the
9 same flavor of the architecture as you can see in
10 the two-story clubhouse. So we're just trying to
11 get the -- we're not trying to build this massive
12 clubhouse but play it down, make it a little fun.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: I'll save my comments.

14 MEMBER HENNINGSON: I have a general
15 question about traffic, and, Chris, you might be
16 the best one to answer it.

17 Right now there's a light coming out at
18 Oak Street? What's the status of that? The next
19 one is Peck, and will there be a need to have
20 anything between those two?

21 MR. TIEDT: Currently there is an
22 agency that is contracted to construct a traffic
23 signal at Oak Street and widen Route 64 from a
24 three-lane cross-section to a five-lane cross-

1 section.

2 The limits of that project are currently
3 just west of Randall Road, and then it will
4 eventually widen it all the way out to Campton
5 Hills Road and then shortly thereafter, to answer
6 your first question.

7 So currently a signal will be installed.

8 In relation to Peck Road, right now there
9 are some temporary traffic signals out there.
10 You know, my understanding is that IDOT is
11 looking to put some plans together to eventually
12 put permanent signals out there and get rid of
13 those wires.

14 The timing of that project, though, I'm not
15 sure. My understanding from public works was
16 they're putting the plans together to get
17 everything ready. So if grant or funding is
18 available at the State level, then IDOT would
19 proceed.

20 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Thanks.

21 MS. TUNGARE: At this point there is
22 definitely some uncertainty as to the status of
23 the signal at Peck Road.

24 MEMBER KESSLER: I just want to pick

1 up on that. You say "some uncertainty." There
2 will always be a signal there?

3 MS. TUNGARE: Correct. The permanent
4 installation, the timing of that is uncertain.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: The widening is
6 going on now from Randall to like in front of
7 Oak Street -- is it Oak?

8 MR. TIEDT: The widening right now --
9 three years ago the County and the State widened
10 Randall Road and kind of widened a portion of
11 Route 64. Currently it starts to taper down from
12 two lanes westbound and -- two lanes westbound
13 tapers down to one lane westbound.

14 These improvements right now that we're
15 undertaking will continue the two-lane westbound
16 all the way through, and then after Campton Hills
17 Road --

18 MEMBER KESSLER: One lane?

19 MR. TIEDT: It will continue through
20 from that point, continue west and taper down
21 from two lanes westbound to one lane shortly
22 after Campton Hills Road.

23 MEMBER KESSLER: And then eastbound?

24 MR. TIEDT: Eastbound same thing.

1 Just west of Campton Hills Road, it will go from
2 one lane eastbound into two lanes, and when you
3 get to Oak Street, there's going to be a traffic
4 signal there.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: That's what they're
6 doing right now?

7 MR. TIEDT: Correct. And then it
8 will continue to the two lanes that are at
9 Randall.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: Thank you.

11 I wanted to go back to the traffic study.
12 I understand that the office use would have
13 significant and higher a.m. peaks and p.m. peaks
14 simply because of its use; you're filling,
15 hopefully, the office buildings. And I can also
16 understand where a development might have a
17 reduction in those a.m. and p.m. peaks, but I've
18 gone through this traffic study, and I don't see
19 anything in there that talks about, you know,
20 trip usage throughout the day and throughout the
21 evening and on weekends. Because, I mean, that's
22 where the significant change is going to occur if
23 it's a residential development.

24 Has there been any discussion about that or

1 do you have anything to speak to on that?

2 MR. ROBERTSON: My understanding of
3 the traffic impact study is that it studied the
4 morning peak and the evening peak. That was the
5 purpose of the study, to look at where the
6 biggest problems were going to be. So it was
7 specifically designed to address that, and that's
8 where those numbers came out of.

9 MEMBER KESSLER: So there is no
10 information regarding any other traffic?

11 MR. ROBERTSON: No. That study was
12 commissioned by the City, and we didn't have any
13 further comment to it.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: I had one other
15 question for you. At the very beginning we
16 talked about the tax benefit between the office
17 research and the proposed residential, and when
18 you show those figures, my gosh, they were
19 shockingly different.

20 Are you suggesting, then, that -- in those
21 figures you quoted, did you mean that this
22 2.8 million without the rental multi-family, is
23 that with the site as it is right now or fully
24 developed as an office residential?

1 MR. ROBERTSON: As it is right now.

2 Frankly, I don't see --

3 MEMBER KESSLER: I'm just curious.

4 It seems like it's significantly different.

5 MR. ROBERTSON: It is because the
6 apartment development would kick-start the
7 frontage and get more activity going on the site.
8 If you take 20 acres out of 50 and put it in
9 service, that creates a lot of activity that
10 would further benefit the frontage.

11 And, again, those numbers really are based
12 on a very extended office lease-out schedule for
13 Lot 8.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: Okay. You may not
15 have this information -- maybe staff does -- but
16 how many parking spaces were there in the office
17 research proposal for those buildings? Do we know?

18 MR. O'ROURKE: I don't have that
19 information off the top of my head.

20 MEMBER KESSLER: But we're proposing
21 576 or something like that?

22 MR. ROBERTSON: I think back then we
23 were somewhere around 4 or 5 per thousand square
24 feet, so call it 2500 parking spaces, which is

1 pretty typical for a suburban office.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: I'll just point out
3 that there was a three-story-tall parking deck.

4 MR. ROBERTSON: And two two-story
5 parking decks.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: And then I just --
7 this is unrelated but I was curious. Are the
8 walkouts on the front, are they actually at grade
9 level or are they garden units?

10 MR. ROBERTSON: They'd be garden-
11 level units. What this doesn't pick up is the
12 topography along this edge comes down
13 significantly. There's quite a bit of difference
14 between this parking lot and this level where
15 this walking path is.

16 So what we did was we were trying to retain
17 the natural topography there and take advantage.
18 We'd have to put a big foundation or retaining
19 wall on the back of these buildings if we weren't
20 to do walkout units.

21 Actually, the way they're located here
22 overlooking the pond and the woods here, we think
23 those are going to be some of the nicest views on
24 the property.

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other
3 questions from the Plan Commission?

4 MEMBER DOYLE: This is a question
5 for staff.

6 Has there been any discussion about the PUD
7 committee or by the City Council in the open
8 meeting of inclusionary housing ordinance and not
9 enforcing it or putting it in a hiatus for a time
10 or in any way removing it from the books?

11 MS. TUNGARE: No. That discussion
12 has not been held by City Council or the
13 committee. So the inclusionary housing ordinance
14 is still in effect, and the requirements are
15 still in effect.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

18 Any other questions from the Plan Commission?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. At
21 this time I will take questions only, not
22 comments -- we'll do that in a minute -- but
23 questions only for the Applicant regarding the
24 presentation that they've made from members of

1 audience.

2 Yes, sir.

3 MR. EDGERTON: Good evening.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Were you sworn in?

5 MR. EDGERTON: Yes, I was.

6 For the record, my name is Patrick Edgerton,
7 E-d-g-e-r-t-o-n. I do reside at 181 Remington
8 Drive, St. Charles, and I would like to thank
9 everyone for taking their time here today.

10 I do have some questions with regard to
11 this development.

12 One thing is when we were here at the last
13 meeting, a discussion was had regarding the
14 buffer zone between the subject property on the
15 Remington property that is immediately to the
16 west of this property. In there they talked
17 about the tree line.

18 That tree line is not owned by the
19 Corporate Reserve; is that correct?

20 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. Nicor owns it.

21 MR. EDGERTON: One of my issues I
22 raised was they're relying on that as a buffer.
23 Is there any limitation as to elimination of
24 those trees?

1 MR. ROBERTSON: I can't patrol what
2 my neighbor does with their property.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Why don't you just
4 come up.

5 MR. ROBERTSON: There's no
6 restriction on Nicor's use of that land.

7 MR. EDGERTON: Okay. So we here
8 cannot rely on that tree buffer remaining between
9 the subject property and the Remington property
10 immediately to the left?

11 MR. ROBERTSON: No, you can't.

12 MR. EDGERTON: Now, when we were here
13 last time, if I recall correctly, you went from
14 having four-story buildings kind of in the center
15 and some three and some down the -- between
16 Remington and the subject property were two-story
17 units if I recall correctly. Is that accurate?

18 MR. ROBERTSON: No. These were
19 four-story units and these were three.

20 MR. EDGERTON: Okay.

21 MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah.

22 MR. EDGERTON: Someone said today
23 there were some two-story units that were going
24 to be built.

1 MR. ROBERTSON: That was a misstatement.

2 MR. EDGERTON: Fair enough.

3 Now, at the last meeting this development
4 was characterized as like an urban setting with,
5 I believe retail and what have you. I tried to
6 catch everything, but it was hard to hear,
7 especially when the fan went on, so I apologize
8 if I'm repeating something I missed.

9 Am I understanding that the retail part of
10 this development has now been eliminated?

11 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes. The commercial
12 part is now gone.

13 MR. EDGERTON: How do you define an
14 urban development, then, such as this?

15 MR. ROBERTSON: That was part of our
16 former plan and not part of this plan.

17 MR. EDGERTON: So your only
18 definition of calling it urban the last time was
19 because it included some retail development
20 within the plan?

21 MR. SMITH: Last time we probably
22 misspoke in using the term urban. It's really
23 not. This obviously is not an urban site, but we
24 tried to create somewhat of an urban character by

1 incorporating these two mixed-use buildings, as
2 well as a contemporary design and a gridlike
3 arrangement of buildings. We've obviously in the
4 current proposal taken out the mixed-use
5 component. We don't consider this necessarily
6 urban. This is not an urban, urban development.

7 MR. EDGERTON: Fair enough.

8 With regards to that, last time I think you
9 were directing it toward single people and
10 younger professionals, as well. Correct?

11 MR. SMITH: Correct.

12 MR. EDGERTON: And now you're still
13 marketing it towards single people and younger
14 professionals; correct?

15 MR. SMITH: Correct.

16 MR. EDGERTON: Is it fair to say that
17 single people and younger professionals would
18 normally gravitate towards a urban development
19 near retail, bars, restaurants, things of that
20 nature?

21 MR. SMITH: I can't comment to that
22 because I think that -- we had a market study
23 done by Tracy Cross & Associates that showed
24 there is demand for this particular rental

1 property type at this location.

2 As far as specifics and what single
3 people -- where they like to live, we think -- we
4 believe that -- we believe strongly that this
5 product type, this rental product type will rent.

6 MR. EDGERTON: So it's your testimony,
7 then, that single and young professionals will
8 choose to live west of Randall in the "No. 1 City
9 for Families," St. Charles, as dictated by Family
10 Circle Magazine.

11 MR. SMITH: Yes. Probably.

12 MR. EDGERTON: And what is it that
13 you believe single people and young professionals
14 will persuade them to come out west?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me just stop
16 you a second. I'll just ask you a question.

17 Which finding of fact does this line of
18 questioning have to do with?

19 MR. EDGERTON: "To promote a creative
20 approach to site improvements and a harmonious
21 mix of land uses." This is relevant in the sense
22 that they are marketing --

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Under which
24 application, the MAP amendment or the special use?

1 MR. EDGERTON: Special use requested
2 under the "Creative Approach."

3 MEMBER KESSLER: What line is it?

4 MR. EDGERTON: I1 under the "Planned
5 Unit Development Special Use Requests."

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Go ahead.

7 MR. EDGERTON: So what is it about
8 this plan that will persuade young professionals
9 and single people, in your words, to move out
10 west of Randall in the "No. 1 City for Families"?

11 MR. SMITH: First of all, I
12 appreciate that it is -- that St. Charles is a
13 terrific --

14 THE AUDIENCE: I can't hear.

15 MR. SMITH: We appreciate St. Charles
16 is a terrific place to raise families, but there
17 is something to be said for providing a cross-
18 section of housing types, and I believe this
19 particular housing type is important to even a
20 community like St. Charles that values families.
21 Having said that, let me just answer your
22 question.

23 We've put a substantial amount since the
24 last time we met, a lot of thought and effort

1 into the design of this facility. The amenities
2 we're providing, the pool, the outdoor cabanas, a
3 spa, gathering areas outside the club building;
4 you saw the slide that we showed the design of
5 the club facility, the social rooms, the great
6 room, exercise rooms, yeah, we believe strongly
7 that all those features will attract those types
8 of renters.

9 MR. EDGERTON: So your basis for
10 believing that the single people and younger
11 professionals will move west of Randall into the
12 suburban areas is because of the clubhouse.

13 MR. SMITH: We think that will be an
14 attractive feature.

15 MR. EDGERTON: Other than your
16 clubhouse, what is it that you think will attract
17 these people to move west of Randall in an
18 otherwise suburban family location?

19 MR. SMITH: Let's go back to the
20 building design, the unit designs that we've
21 created. That's going to be part and parcel of a
22 lot of these unit designs that were in process
23 that aren't -- we're working on those designs
24 now, but the design of those units we think will

1 be attractive to those types of buyers, as well.

2 MR. EDGERTON: I understand the
3 studios doing that, but why wouldn't a one-
4 bedroom or even a two-bedroom possibly bring out
5 families to move into a family neighborhood?

6 MR. SMITH: These aren't going to be
7 very large units.

8 MR. EDGERTON: Fair enough.

9 MR. MULCRONE: Couldn't a family be
10 considered a husband and wife?

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Were you already
12 sworn in?

13 MR. MULCRONE: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm sorry; did you
15 already state your name?

16 MR. MULCRONE: Jeff Mulcrone.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

18 MR. MULCRONE: We've got
19 one-bedrooms, two-bedrooms, and these are geared
20 towards singles, young professionals, and married
21 couples. Many married couples can't afford in
22 the economy to buy single-family homes in
23 St. Charles, but they love St. Charles; they'd
24 love to move here. This is a great place for

1 them to start. Maybe they're looking to start a
2 family, and this is a great place to start out.

3 MR. EDGERTON: Fine. I understand
4 your position. I'm just trying to clarify.

5 Last time we're here you talked about this
6 as an urban development. I know you don't like
7 that term now. But I asked you, "Is there any
8 other area locally, somewhere in DuPage, Kane,
9 what have you, where they have such a large
10 development in the middle of otherwise family
11 units?"

12 MR. SMITH: I don't know of one.

13 MR. EDGERTON: You don't? Okay.

14 Something like this is generally more
15 located in either a downtown area or near a
16 downtown area that would also attract single
17 people and young professionals; wouldn't you agree?

18 MR. SMITH: I don't believe this --
19 this particular community is fairly close to
20 downtown.

21 MR. EDGERTON: Would you characterize
22 it as walking distance to downtown?

23 MR. SMITH: No.

24 MR. EDGERTON: So everyone would need

1 a car if they wanted to go downtown.

2 MR. SMITH: Yes.

3 MR. EDGERTON: And there's no regular
4 busing, at least, to any sort of regular downtown
5 meeting place; do you agree?

6 MR. SMITH: Yes.

7 MR. EDGERTON: Correct me if I'm
8 wrong, sir. You do agree that the area
9 surrounding this is mostly single-family homes or
10 town homes with families in them.

11 MR. SMITH: And office.

12 MR. EDGERTON: And office, fair
13 enough; I apologize.

14 Would you agree that's most of the
15 characterization?

16 MR. SMITH: A little commercial, some
17 office, multi-family.

18 MR. EDGERTON: Given that, do you know
19 of any other buildings that are three stories
20 west of Randall along 64?

21 MR. SMITH: I honestly don't. I
22 don't know.

23 MR. EDGERTON: Just asking.

24 THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear that.

1 MR. ROBERTSON: Our current
2 entitlement does allow for a three-story building
3 on the site and a 60-foot building on Lot 8.

4 MR. EDGERTON: Fair enough. That
5 wasn't my question. I'm asking, are there any
6 that exist now west of Randall off of Route 64
7 that you know of?

8 MR. SMITH: Residential buildings?

9 MR. EDGERTON: Any buildings.

10 MR. SMITH: I don't know.

11 MR. ROBERTSON: Matt, maybe I can ask
12 you this question. Is the senior housing
13 development, the one on Campton Hills just south
14 of the intersection of Main and Campton Hills,
15 was that more than two stories?

16 MR. O'ROURKE: I believe you're
17 referring to Bickford Cottage. I believe that is
18 a three-story building.

19 MR. EDGERTON: For the record, that
20 isn't on 64; correct?

21 MR. O'ROURKE: It's technically on
22 Campton Hills Drive.

23 MR. EDGERTON: And it's one building;
24 correct?

1 MR. O'ROURKE: That's correct.

2 MR. EDGERTON: And it's buried in the
3 back towards the water tower; correct?

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What questions do
5 you have specifically regarding the presentation
6 that was made?

7 MR. EDGERTON: Moving on to the next
8 question.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You're soliciting
10 information that's beyond what was presented.
11 You're asking for information that you could just
12 present yourself. It's information that's beyond
13 the presentation that was made, and I'm giving
14 you a lot of latitude here, but I really want to
15 stick to the presentation that was made and
16 questions specifically regarding that
17 presentation that address our findings of fact.

18 Any other further case -- I mean, you can
19 give us opinion at the end, but any further case
20 beyond that, that goes beyond our findings of
21 fact can be made to the City Council.

22 MR. EDGERTON: I respect your
23 direction --

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

1 MR. EDGERTON: -- your Honor, and I
2 will try to keep it limited. At the same time,
3 for the record, this is -- you characterize it as
4 questions. The Court would characterize it as
5 cross-examination.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This isn't a court
7 and I'm not "your Honor."

8 MR. EDGERTON: I understand that.
9 There are some similarities. So I'll move on to
10 the next issue.

11 With regards to -- you talked about the
12 taxes and what you gentlemen were bringing up.
13 It was 2.8 million per 100.

14 What would the taxes have been if it was
15 developed with the offices over the same period?

16 MR. ROBERTSON: Our \$2.8 million
17 figure was based on the current entitlement
18 understanding that the office market is such that
19 we have no ability to develop out there right now
20 any further office. So that \$2.8 million assumed
21 that we would build a 45,000-square-foot building
22 in three years.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry; 45,000
24 square foot on which portion?

1 MR. ROBERTSON: It would have been on
2 Lot 5 where we have it entitled.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Which is directly
4 south of the buildings existing now?

5 MR. ROBERTSON: I misspoke;
6 30,000 square feet just south of the existing
7 office buildings.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So you have the
9 two existing office buildings, and that was under
10 the assumption that one additional office
11 building would be built directly to the south of
12 that in three years?

13 MR. ROBERTSON: I'm sorry; I meant
14 two single-story office buildings.

15 MR. EDGERTON: I just want to make
16 sure I've got it right then. So the 2.8 million
17 is the way it is with the development of Lot 5 in
18 the next three years. Is that my understanding?

19 MR. ROBERTSON: Let me make sure I
20 get the right lot number.

21 MR. EDGERTON: Because I thought we
22 were talking about Lot 8.

23 MR. ROBERTSON: Correct. That would
24 be on Lot 5.

1 MR. EDGERTON: Okay. What would the
2 tax revenue have been for Lot 8 if you had
3 developed it with the existing land use plan?

4 MR. ROBERTSON: Our estimates show
5 that not being developed over the next 10 years
6 due to the economic conditions and the office
7 market.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But the question
9 was if that were developed as entitled; correct?

10 MR. EDGERTON: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you know what
12 the tax revenue would have been?

13 MR. ROBERTSON: Taxes on office in
14 this township of Kane County are anywhere from
15 2.50 to \$3 a foot.

16 MR. EDGERTON: I'm not that good at
17 math. What does that come to, approximately?

18 MR. ROBERTSON: It's approximately
19 500,000 square feet of property that would be on
20 Lot 8. So a-million-five a year. So that would
21 be 15 million over the 10 years. But, again,
22 there's no ability to build that now.

23 MR. EDGERTON: I understand what
24 you're saying. Fair enough.

1 I have no further questions.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

3 Thank you.

4 Sir, in the back. Were you sworn in in the
5 beginning?

6 MR. MEYER: Yes, I was. My name is
7 Walt Meyer, M-e-y-e-r. I live at 296 Remington
8 Drive right across from there.

9 I'm a little bit puzzled about the traffic
10 estimates. You've dumped numbers out here, but,
11 actually, nobody ever mentioned that the traffic
12 flow would be different. One is flowing into the
13 development, while the other one is going out of
14 the development. So instead of having 700 cars
15 going into the development in the morning, now we
16 have 500 cars, which I find a little bit low,
17 mixing with the other residential areas, also
18 flowing out to Randall and to Peck and these
19 other areas. How are you going to handle it?

20 MR. ROBERTSON: Chris, do you want to
21 talk to the traffic study?

22 MR. TIEDT: Certainly. I guess that
23 was part of the reason why the City had pursued
24 wanting to have a traffic study is not only for

1 the impact on the change of office to residential
2 but also to see how the shift, let's say, of
3 traffic in the morning coming into the site and
4 then in the evenings leaving the site would
5 impact the surrounding areas.

6 With those numbers that were presented
7 earlier, what I guess the total numbers for the
8 a.m./p.m. peaks, with the Cardinal traffic, with
9 the office, original office, the a.m. peak in,
10 traffic coming in, was about 670 cars. Okay?
11 Now, with this residential development, the
12 traffic coming in would be 194 cars. And then
13 coming out at the a.m. peak the traffic study
14 identified that with the original office it was
15 about 95 cars, and with the residential the out
16 in the a.m. is about 168 cars.

17 I have the numbers for the p.m. peak, too,
18 and I'll quickly go over those. In the p.m. peak
19 for the office portion, the traffic coming in in
20 the evening would be 220, and it would be 650 cars
21 going out in the evening at the p.m. peak. With
22 the residential, what's proposed, the in would be
23 262, and the out would be 323.

24 I guess now to answer your question somewhat

1 based on those numbers, as part of the traffic
2 study, counts were done at four intersections
3 around to get an idea of current traffic conditions
4 out there.

5 Traffic counts were performed at Route 64
6 and Peck Road, Route 64 and Campton Hills Road,
7 Peck Road and Woodward Drive, and Woodward Drive
8 and Cardinal Drive. And then what HLR did, which
9 is in the traffic study, they took those actual
10 counts and used those, analyzed the current
11 traffic conditions, and they projected those out
12 over a 10-year term to get the base traffic
13 generated by background growth aside from -- you
14 know, not including this development.

15 Then, based on the trip generations, they
16 used that we discussed earlier, they added all of
17 that into the equation, basically, with the base
18 traffic and the traffic generated from the site
19 and, you know, they looked at all of that.

20 Bottom line, at the end of the day really
21 they did not see, aside from with the complete
22 development of the residential and all the
23 commercial outlots in this Corporate Reserve
24 site, when all of that is developed, traffic

1 warrants, traffic signal warrants were met or
2 anticipated to be met at Corporate Reserve
3 Boulevard and Route 64, and at that time it's
4 anticipated that IDOT would require Route 64 be
5 widened to two lanes going west and two lanes
6 going eastbound at the installation of that
7 signal.

8 Based on just this residential portion
9 alone, there are some concerns -- it was assumed
10 that, basically, with the new signal going in at
11 Oak Street that any residential traffic coming
12 from this -- or any traffic generated from this
13 site heading to the east would use that signal at
14 Oak Street, and as part of the analysis they
15 distributed traffic accordingly based on their
16 counts that they had taken when they were out
17 there.

18 With the residential portion of this site,
19 it was only anticipated that there only would be
20 like a one-second increase in delay at Peck and
21 Route 64 in the a.m. peak hour. Meaning that --

22 MR. MEYER: Westward or eastward?

23 MR. TIEDT: The overall intersection
24 delay at Peck and Route 64 as a result of just

1 the residential development would be about a
2 one-second delay. In the p.m., the afternoon
3 peak hour, there would be no additional delay in
4 the residential portion.

5 MR. MEYER: You say 160 cars. Is the
6 developer aware that he's only going to rent
7 about one-third of the buildings? Because there's
8 300-and-some units, which means 529 parking
9 spaces, which means roughly, I would say average
10 400 cars, 280 leaving every morning. So where
11 are the other ones going?

12 MR. TIEDT: The way the traffic study
13 is done with the trip generation -- it's a widely
14 accepted and it's a standard practice. The trip
15 generation is based on unit counts or square
16 footages, and that data is culled from all across
17 the United States and documented and categorized,
18 various developments in Texas, New York, all over
19 the place.

20 What it is is then every -- right now
21 in here they use the 8th generation or the
22 8th edition, and when the 8th edition was published
23 three, four years ago -- don't quote me on that --
24 since that time they're collecting more data

1 because there's new developments and new uses
2 that weren't originally identified in the trip
3 generation manual. So they take all this
4 information and analyze it, and that's where they
5 get the a.m. and p.m. peaks.

6 To say that based on that analysis that's
7 done why they did across-the-board traffic
8 studies, they don't sit down and say, "Well,
9 there's 331 units. Each unit would have less
10 than 1.5 cars so there's," you know, half of
11 those people work -- there's nothing -- there's
12 no assumptions made on that.

13 The trip generation manual basically uses a
14 mathematical algorithm with that data they've
15 taken to basically look at the worst case
16 scenario at the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

17 MR. MEYER: Well, going by the
18 assumption that this is the young urban
19 professional, that goes there -- I mean, that's
20 not me; it's more like you. These guys stay at
21 home? I mean, if these guys stay at home, they
22 probably can't pay for the expensive apartment
23 they have there. So I would say probably
24 300-plus cars in the morning is a better number.

1 MR. TIEDT: I understand what you're
2 saying, but with the trip generation manual, they
3 look at all sites. It's all taken into account.

4 MS. TUNGARE: If I can interject,
5 those types of subjective assumptions are not
6 taken into consideration. It's a widely accepted
7 industry standard and practice that is applied
8 and used by traffic engineers.

9 MR. MEYER: Well, I'm standing in the
10 traffic jam on Route 64 every morning. Why do
11 you use -- unfortunately, I have to drive it.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. Other
14 questions?

15 Sir?

16 MR. BURRELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 My name is Roger Burrell, B-u-r-r-e-l-l. I
18 reside at 283 Birch Lane here in St. Charles.

19 I'm just going to do a follow-up to a
20 couple questions that have been asked. I'm not
21 sure if one of the gentlemen can go back to one
22 of the maps that showed the lot setting up with
23 the housing and with the current path and so on.
24 I just have a question -- that's good.

1 What is the distance between the back of
2 the units and the prairie path? It appears that
3 the setback because of the balconies -- what is
4 the distance between the back of the building to
5 the prairie path? How does that work out?
6 Especially if Nicor comes in and wants to do a
7 clean cut like you guys did a couple years ago
8 and have these buildings right on top of these
9 homes, what does that work out to be?

10 MR. SMITH: Along the west property
11 line there's a 30-foot setback, but as you can
12 see, because of the jog of the building, most of
13 the building is set back a few feet from that,
14 and the actual path by this is, let's just say
15 35 feet from the edge of the building to the path.

16 MR. BURRELL: So if there was a
17 clear-cut by Nicor, which is a possibility, those
18 three-story buildings are going to be overlooking
19 those single-family homes with nothing to stop
20 them because of the minimum tree coverage there.

21 One of the questions that the Commissioners
22 was asking regarding trees. If those could be
23 pushed further east and a lot more trees put
24 there to cover that path and get some privacy

1 would make a little bit more sense. That's just
2 my thought. You answered my question, thank you.

3 Next question. You were talking about
4 parking spaces. How many handicap spaces will be
5 designated for handicap? I'm asking the
6 chairman. How many parking spaces would be
7 marked as handicap?

8 MS. TUNGARE: The Illinois
9 accessibility code has a general requirement on
10 how many spaces. I don't have that statement
11 memorized; I'm sorry.

12 MR. BURRELL: Do you know?

13 MR. SMITH: 4 percent.

14 MR. BURRELL: So you've got 300 parking
15 spaces not including the garages?

16 MR. SMITH: Seven spaces.

17 MR. BURRELL: 526 minus -- 120 -- I'd
18 say 400. So if 3 percent of that has to be
19 handicapped, what do -- you are not going to have
20 everybody that lives there be able to get a
21 parking space. You're going to have a little bit
22 of a distance with the number of cars that if
23 you're renting out to two-car families they can't
24 park -- and not everybody is going to be

1 handicapped to park in those spaces, so you lose
2 those spaces.

3 MR. SMITH: Keep in mind there are
4 handicap spaces on this.

5 MR. BURRELL: Will it meet State
6 requirement?

7 MR. SMITH: Yes.

8 MR. BURRELL: The question is, will
9 there be enough parking spaces based on what you
10 designed?

11 MR. SMITH: Absolutely, yes.

12 MR. MULCRONE: Just to clarify, the
13 number of handicap units onsite is currently
14 2 percent per State code. So that's seven units
15 on the site will be handicap. We have got
16 15 buildings. That will easily accommodate all
17 handicap units.

18 MR. BURRELL: So you basically have
19 100 parking garages -- ballpark -- garages and
20 another 300 on site?

21 MR. MULCRONE: Correct.

22 MR. BURRELL: So that's a little bit
23 better than one per household. So if people have
24 guests over, where does the overflow go? Do they

1 go on Corporate Drive? Where does that --
2 everybody has friends over Thanksgiving,
3 Christmastime.

4 MR. SMITH: This kind of speaks to an
5 earlier comment that it's been identified that
6 we're actually exceeding the City's code for
7 parking. That's why 1.6 parking --

8 MR. BURRELL: The thing to remember
9 is that all codes, regulations are made for the
10 public use, and we need to understand how that
11 really works out to be.

12 MR. SMITH: Let me also point out
13 something we really haven't talked about, but in
14 front of each garage space there's actually
15 sufficient room for stack parking for one car.

16 So when you consider the fact that we've
17 got 120 garage spaces, what we haven't really
18 added is the fact there's actually 120 tandem
19 spaces behind those garages. So if you add that
20 to the parking --

21 MR. BURRELL: There was a comment
22 regarding the source of revenue, 10.8, the
23 2.8 number. What percentage of that would come
24 to the city -- it says "paid in taxes." What

1 percent of that would go to the City? My tax
2 bill to the City is 500 a year, so what would
3 that be?

4 MS. TUNGARE: That question and that
5 discussion is not relevant to the Plan Commission's
6 consideration and the findings of fact here.

7 MR. BURRELL: Well, the only reason I
8 ask is because they said they paid that to the
9 government. So that doesn't come to the City?
10 That goes to all the government bodies then?

11 MS. TUNGARE: That is correct. There
12 is a very small portion that is assigned to
13 the City.

14 MR. BURRELL: And I think the
15 question is, they changed the model a little bit.
16 You made a statement back in November what you
17 thought the rents would be. How does that work
18 out in today's market? What does that look like
19 for an efficiency, one-bedroom, two-bedroom,
20 three-bedroom? How does that work out?

21 MR. ROBERTSON: We have a variety of
22 floor plans from smaller efficiencies up to
23 two-bedroom, two-bath units. When we were before
24 you in November, the average rent from our market

1 study was somewhere around \$1.41 a foot.
2 Tracy Cross, who did our market study, is
3 updating that, and in his estimation -- we don't
4 have a report yet, but rents in this market have
5 gone up 6 percent since then. So I think in the
6 aggregate you could assume somewhere around
7 \$1.50 a square foot.

8 MR. BURRELL: I would guess that the
9 plans have been sent to all the other government
10 bodies and they have looked at them. What were
11 the responses from the school district, the fire
12 department, things like that?

13 MR. O'ROURKE: They received copies
14 of all the information, and we have not heard any
15 comments from them. They did not respond.

16 MR. BURRELL: Will the streets all be
17 dedicated to the City, or will they be by the
18 developer?

19 MR. SMITH: All the internal streets
20 will be privately owned and maintained.

21 MR. BURRELL: We have how many
22 streets -- how many other streets are within the
23 community that are privately held?

24 MS. TUNGARE: There are several

1 residential developments are private.

2 MR. BURRELL: Just a couple.

3 MS. TUNGARE: Quite a few.

4 MR. BURRELL: Does that not concern
5 you? My past experience is when there's a
6 problem with the road or something like that,
7 they're going to call the City government and
8 say, "Why don't you fix it?" Does that not
9 bother you that that may be an issue?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. BURRELL: Will these units all
12 have sprinklers?

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Fire sprinklers?

14 MR. BURRELL: Will they have
15 sprinklers? Are you going to have sprinklers?

16 MR. MULCRONE: All the buildings will
17 be to the current national building codes and
18 local amendments.

19 MR. BURRELL: That's not answering
20 the question. So will they have sprinklers? So
21 the answer is no.

22 MR. MULCRONE: No, I do not know
23 that. I haven't reviewed the code.

24 MS. TUNGARE: I believe the building

1 codes require sprinklers for multi-family
2 residential.

3 MR. BURRELL: So all these units will
4 have sprinklers?

5 MS. TUNGARE: Yes -- well, I can't
6 say that there will be sprinklers, but we do
7 require sprinklers for multi-family residences in
8 St. Charles.

9 MR. BURRELL: So any approval
10 recommendations should include adding sprinklers
11 to that to make sure it's part of the
12 recommendation?

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, any --

14 MR. BURRELL: I just want to know --

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on, hold on.

16 As a practice, we don't include conditions
17 that it comply with specific aspects of the
18 building code. They have to comply with the
19 building code or else they can't build it.

20 MR. BURRELL: I just want to make
21 sure. They said it may not, so that's why I
22 asked the question.

23 MS. TUNGARE: Let me stand corrected
24 here. What I stated was in St. Charles we

1 require sprinklers for multi-family residential.
2 Whether the Applicant's plans currently call for
3 sprinklers or not is something -- they can speak
4 for the plans. I can't. Having said that, we
5 will require them to adhere to all the City's
6 building codes.

7 MR. BURRELL: The question is, will
8 your design have sprinklers in it?

9 MR. STILLWELL: There's been no
10 construction plans submitted. That will all be
11 dealt with when the applications for permit are
12 submitted at a later date.

13 So you're getting ahead of yourself, Roger.
14 We'll fully comply with all application
15 standards.

16 MR. O'ROURKE: I don't think you
17 stated your name for the Court Reporter.

18 MR. STILLWELL: Oh, I'm sorry;
19 Henry Stillwell, S-t-i-l-l-w-e-l-l, 300 East
20 Roosevelt Road, Wheaton, Illinois. I'm the
21 attorney for the Applicant.

22 MR. BURRELL: I guess the last
23 question I have is pertaining to -- you mentioned
24 that single, upper movement, dual-income

1 families. How is this all going to be marketed,
2 and how does this relate to -- how are you going
3 to market this to bring those people into the
4 community? Take the project across the street
5 for 175 units that's been announced in the
6 newspaper for apartments that are more urban in
7 design.

8 How do we handle this? There's one
9 meeting, I think somebody said that's 3500 rental
10 units that they know of. That did not include
11 single-family homes and other real estate being
12 announced. How do we manage this process and
13 make sure where these people go?

14 So that's my final comment. Thank you
15 very much.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you, sir.

17 Any other questions?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. No
20 other questions.

21 At this time are there any other follow-up
22 questions from the Plan Commission?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. At

1 this point in time we will take comments from
2 members of the public. If you wish to offer any
3 testimony either for or against the application,
4 you can do so now.

5 MR. MEYER: Just want to add one
6 little comment to what I said and what the
7 gentleman from the developer said here. He just
8 increased the number of cars significantly
9 because he said in front of each garage there's a
10 second parking spot.

11 So I think we should really start to work
12 on the numbers and what the actual numbers are
13 before any other decision is made.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You mean the
15 number of parking spots?

16 MR. MEYER: The number of cars, the
17 number of parking spots. I have a very unclear
18 picture here because if I take all the parking
19 garages that he has in the development and now I
20 say there's not just one car, like the gentleman
21 said himself, there's two cars now, plus the
22 additional -- I'm starting to look at 500-plus,
23 600 cars there, which is a tremendous change from
24 the 160 that the gentleman was quoting from the

1 study and I'm concerned.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

3 Yes, sir.

4 MR. EDGERTON: Again, for the record,
5 Patrick Edgerton, E-d-g-e-r-t-o-n, 181 Remington
6 Drive, St. Charles, Illinois.

7 As to some of the issues I raised where you
8 indicated you'd rather have testimony or comments
9 versus questions, first of all, one of the issues
10 that -- or the factors that has to be considered
11 by this panel are public convenience for the
12 special use at the proposed location.

13 This is marketed towards the urban dweller,
14 basically, young professional, but this is not an
15 urban setting. Something like this would be more
16 appropriate for downtown St. Charles or, more
17 conveniently, or usage and custom, Schaumburg,
18 things like that, or downtown Schaumburg, not
19 even the outskirts. This is not something that's
20 convenient for the public based on this location,
21 based on this surrounding community.

22 For example, through testimony, a lot of
23 single people, what have you, a lot of people
24 might not have cars. Urban people generally

1 don't want cars. They want to be able to walk
2 everywhere. By their own admission, this is not
3 within walking distance of downtown; by their own
4 admission, there is no busing from this
5 development to downtown even to St. Charles.

6 With all due respect to the development, I
7 personally -- I cannot speak for other people in
8 the room -- I'm not against rentals, but I guess
9 I would assume if there would be rentals in
10 there, it would be similar to single-family
11 homes, maybe smaller town homes or what have you
12 that are more like apartment/rentals. Fair
13 enough. But this is kind of a monstrosity put in
14 the middle of a suburban area that is a
15 significant difference than this area and, by
16 their own admission, any other area. There is no
17 development like this. That by itself should
18 question, why is there no development like this.

19 Now, I'm only 42 years old. I got married
20 at 36. I grew up on a farm west of St. Charles.
21 I lived within 20 miles of St. Charles my entire
22 life. I also went from living on a farm to
23 working in one of the largest law firms in the
24 world in downtown Chicago. Kind of all the way

1 in between; that's kind of a unique experience.

2 I can assure you, this is not what urban
3 people go to. They want downtown; they want to
4 go to restaurants nearby; they want to go to bars
5 nearby; they want to go to shops nearby. They
6 don't live in suburban, west of Randall
7 St. Charles. So they're, in essence, marketing
8 toward this group being the young professionals,
9 but they're aiming for the wrong location.

10 Next, one of the factors that you list in
11 your stuff that was sent to us is the nearby
12 properties. Obviously, a lot of people went into
13 traffic. We all know that under any scenario,
14 traffic is going to go up. That to me, fair
15 enough. But I do live on Remington. I do not
16 live in the houses that adjoin this, but when I
17 coming here, those were available. One of the
18 reasons I didn't buy them is because they charged
19 a premium. And they argued about the tree line
20 that is east of Remington but the west side of
21 the property. The reason I did that is because I
22 knew this offer of the trees, they're beautiful,
23 but it's just an easement.

24 There is no requirement for those trees to

1 remain in place, and they are trying to argue
2 that because of this beautiful tree line -- and
3 it is a beautiful tree line -- separating out the
4 subject property and the Remington property it's
5 a plus as to why they have this buffer between
6 this monstrous development adjoining Remington.
7 They don't create their own buffer, you'll
8 notice. They're relying on one that exists.
9 They're making assumptions that it will always
10 exist, but we as a community have to think
11 long term.

12 Their goal is to make a profit. Our goal
13 is to build the No. 1 city for families in
14 America, and part of that is having buffers
15 between different developments. Fair enough,
16 whether it be office or this or what have you,
17 but everybody seems to be relying on these tree
18 lines. If they are going to have a development
19 like this and they want to argue that there is a
20 buffer and that buffer will remain in place, they
21 have to create one, too, or they have to leave
22 the space to put the buffer up if for some reason
23 there's -- I think they said Nicor -- whatever
24 utility company owns those assessment rights or

1 owns that property in fee simple, if they ever
2 chop those trees down they can still make a
3 buffer. They can't rely on it as a positive
4 factor for this panel.

5 They're making lots of assumptions, and the
6 assumptions really aren't supported by their own
7 testimony or what you might say a reasonably
8 prudent person would believe. The younger people
9 aren't going to move here. If anything, it's
10 going to be families, and it's not set up for
11 families. They are going to move there because
12 they can't afford anything else, and families
13 with multiple people there, it's going to create
14 a different impact on our school system,
15 different impact on driving.

16 With regards to driving, they talk about
17 how the minimum is generally 1.6, 1.7. That
18 probably factors in a development like this
19 that's in walking distance of places. If you're
20 moving west of Randall, you need vehicles. One
21 of the arguments they used to rebut me was these
22 are going to be married couples. How many
23 married couples don't have two cars? I live out
24 there. I don't know any of them that don't.

1 Some of them have three. My family has three
2 cars and a motorcycle. That is the nature of
3 living in the far west suburbs.

4 There are -- 1.6 for an urban development
5 that far west not in walking distance will
6 require more parking, which will also lead to
7 more, you might say concrete that kind of doesn't
8 look very appealing and bring in more people than
9 anticipated.

10 Now, they're going to argue that with
11 regard to, well, there was going to be an office.
12 Office and residential is a little different.
13 First of all, office doesn't have as much of a
14 financial impact on the schools. Fair enough.
15 That's kind of a basic understanding. But, also,
16 office people go home at night. They're not
17 there when the families are there in the
18 surrounding community. It does make a difference.

19 When this was developed as an office, I
20 didn't come to meetings because that sounded like
21 a good idea. First of all, that will bring us
22 good tax dollars to the city of St. Charles and
23 the school district of St. Charles. It will have
24 less of a financial impact on the surrounding

1 area merely from the fact that when the residents
2 are at work, they're being used. The residents
3 come home, they leave.

4 Now, yes, the driving -- like I said,
5 driving isn't much of a deal to me because either
6 way we're going to get caught with traffic, but
7 the reality is this is more of an impact; it is
8 an urban place in the middle of a suburban
9 section, and you can tell that there's more
10 objections to that than with the office setting.

11 The developers are basically having a
12 knee-jerk reaction to this current economic
13 environment, which I understand and I think
14 everybody in this room understands is a valid
15 concern. I want them to make money, too. But I
16 still care about this community. Even though I
17 didn't grow up here specifically, this is what I
18 thought was my hometown. When you live in the
19 country, you kind of go to the closest town.
20 St. Charles was it. It kind of was in my heart
21 coming back here and I am.

22 I think long term for this community if
23 this is permitted, this is not a long-term
24 solution for St. Charles or the surrounding area

1 that they're trying build this. This would be
2 great along the river where they built those
3 other town homes, where people could walk to the
4 bar, walk to the retail downtown. This would be
5 great, something similar to this, but there, it
6 is not and that's the reality.

7 They want to force as many units in there
8 to make money. We as a community want it good
9 for everybody and I am -- at least I'm not
10 against it being rental, but I wish it would be
11 kind of a more traditional look like the
12 surrounding community.

13 That being said, I do appreciate your time,
14 and I do feel yourselves have asked many
15 questions and care about this community. There's
16 a lot of people here. I can't speak for them
17 specifically, but I do know there's a lot of
18 people concerned about this urban development
19 based in the far west suburbs west of Randall,
20 and we do ask that you deny these requests
21 because it does not fit the surrounding areas.

22 Thank you for your time.

23 (Applause.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other comments?

1 Yes, sir.

2 MR. BURRELL: I also thank you for
3 your time.

4 I think we all realize that the owner of
5 the property has the right to come back to the
6 City and apply for rezoning, and we think that's
7 the only fair way to look at things. But I think
8 you need to keep in mind that as you have heard
9 in past meetings, we truly believe, the residents
10 out there, that this is going to be detrimental
11 to our area.

12 Whether it's the three-story buildings, the
13 line sights of the path, increased traffic, we
14 just see that it's going to be difficult with
15 this 330 units. We just see it's going to be
16 very challenging for us. So when you're looking
17 at things, I ask you to really consider that.

18 My second comment is really to many of the
19 people on this committee now. I want you to kind
20 of think back to 2008 when this was submitted to
21 you, the original plan, what the vision was for
22 the City and why the City did what it did to zone
23 this the way they did.

24 There was a reason for it. It was talked

1 about. It was talked about that there was going
2 to be a need. This is probably one of your last
3 sites that you will be able to have this type of
4 development on that you currently have the
5 zoning. So keep that in mind. Look back and
6 say, when this is all done, what do you now do?
7 What do you do to keep the revenues coming into
8 the city on the timely basis?

9 I think that I truly believe that this
10 rezoning the way it's being described today is
11 going to be a huge impact to all of us from all
12 the comments you hear now. I think that you're
13 sitting here saying, "What is the vision that we
14 see for our community?" Are we reaching that
15 vision, or are we taking something that the
16 original owner said -- we gambled back in 2008
17 because this is the market study we had. The
18 market study said this is going to work really
19 good and here's why.

20 We now have a market study that says
21 residential is going to work. We do see it's
22 changing and people that are -- when you see
23 30-year fixed rate mortgages less than 3 percent,
24 that is going to get people off the bus and buy

1 some, or at least we hope so.

2 So keep those comments in mind and say,
3 "What do we do when the housing market does come
4 back?" Is that the type of project that you want?

5 Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
7 other comments?

8 Yes, ma'am.

9 MS. WATSON: Patricia Watson,
10 318 Remington Drive.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Were you sworn in
12 in the beginning.

13 MS. WATSON: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If could you just
15 pull the microphone down. Thank you.

16 MS. WATSON: Now, we were talking
17 about marketing to people, and our development,
18 Remington Glen, is only halfway finished. Part
19 of it has to do with the economy, the housing
20 market and so on. Part of it has to do with the
21 developer not marketing it right, whatever.

22 How are we going to be guaranteed that this
23 is not going to start, you're going to get a
24 couple buildings up, and nobody is going to come

1 and fill them and we're going to have a whole
2 bunch of half-started communities in St. Charles?

3 The demographics and market studies show
4 right now that rental is the way to go. That was
5 what, 2008. It didn't say that. So here we come
6 two, three years later, and now two, three years
7 later this grand plan, oh, it changes. What are
8 we doing with all the houses that are foreclosed
9 on and sitting empty? Are we going to bulldoze
10 them because nobody wants to live in them
11 anymore? They're all going to go to the
12 apartment buildings; correct? So are we going to
13 have all these partially started developments
14 and, is this going to be another one because the
15 demographics are going to change again, and the
16 marketing is going to be different? Are we going
17 to have a halfway started complex here, also,
18 that's going to sit as an eyesore?

19 As far as the buffering goes, Cardinal
20 Trucking was totally divorced how many years ago.
21 Everything that was on that entire parcel was
22 taken down. The Great Western Trail is now
23 exposed because of all the trees that were taken
24 down on the north end there. You know, there

1 should be something from the forest preserve that
2 there should be more buffer than besides just a
3 retention pond.

4 And the easements, isn't there -- like
5 Great Western Trail was a railroad. There was
6 always an easement off of the side of that that
7 did not belong to anybody except for the
8 railroad, and now does that belong to the forest
9 preserve because it's a trail, and is that still
10 existing, or has that been totally decimated
11 again by them taking down all of those trees?

12 So there's no buffering to kind of ease it
13 into the rural area that it is. It's more, like
14 everybody said, a downtown thing and more that it
15 should be situated somewhere other than in this
16 green, rural area.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

19 All right. Any other comments?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, are
22 there any additional comments or questions from
23 any member of the Plan Commission?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Then I guess if
2 the Plan Commission feels -- well, we'll go to
3 the developer for final comment, but if there's
4 any information that the Plan Commission feels it
5 needs in order to make a recommendation, obviously,
6 this is the time to speak up about that.

7 Brian, were you about to say something?

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes. I was going to
9 ask for your permission, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: It was testified to
12 during presentation that a number of aldermen and
13 representatives from the City advised the
14 Applicant that there is not a desire to enforce
15 the inclusionary housing ordinance. We also
16 heard testimony from the staff that there is no
17 resolution or recording on record, discussion on
18 record by the committee or by the City Council
19 that suspends our inclusionary housing ordinance.

20 So I am very concerned that we cannot as a
21 city afford to waive that requirement without
22 some sort of affirmation from the legislative
23 body that, in fact, there was desire to suspend
24 it. Otherwise, the ordinance itself will become

1 defunct, and I don't feel that it is in the
2 purview of this body to do that. So that is a
3 large concern for me.

4 I want to give you a couple of comments.

5 I really like the clubhouse. I think that
6 the design is really sharp. I think it's
7 attractive.

8 I, frankly, share the concerns with some of
9 the members of the community here about the
10 density and size of the development, and it's an
11 interesting question about the urban nature of
12 the development.

13 At the concept plan, the concept proposal
14 has this Main Street entrance with mixed use on
15 that Main Street entrance, and that, by my
16 recollection, was the basis of this description
17 of this as an urban sort of lifestyle area. Now
18 the mixed-use portion is gone and I think rightly
19 so. I don't see retail being very viable in this
20 parcel. And, yet, the basic layout is still
21 there, the layout of the Main Street entrance
22 which is conducive to that kind of mixed-use land
23 use, and it seems a little bit disjointed.

24 Part of my feeling here and the dilemma I

1 have is that I sympathize with the comments of
2 the members of the community who say that once
3 you're west of Randall Road you're in a semi-
4 rural area and that we have to really think about
5 our vision for development in these areas as we
6 move forward, and that is to say that I'm not
7 sold yet this is the right kind of land use.

8 I believe that the residential development
9 is probably warranted. I think it's the density
10 that I'm having trouble with, and the
11 architecture of the residential building is not
12 as compelling as the architecture of the
13 clubhouse. At the concept plan public hearing, I
14 mentioned -- I said -- I advocated for sort of a
15 prairie style architecture in contrast to what
16 has been described here as a contemporary style.

17 I think that it would behoove the Applicant
18 to rethink whether or not there's still a remnant
19 sort of -- is there still an urban feel to this
20 development, is there still an urbanist imprint
21 on the design that would be more appropriate in
22 downtown St. Charles. And if that's true, is
23 there a way to amend the design that fits better
24 with this site and with the surrounding area of

1 the site.

2 Because as it stands, with the request for
3 the waiver, including the inclusionary housing
4 ordinance, I think you've made progress since the
5 concept plan -- I think this is a much better
6 plan. I'm not certain it's there yet and that
7 I'm prepared to recommend approval.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

9 Thank you.

10 Other comments from members of the Plan
11 Commission?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Does
14 the Applicant wish to offer rebuttal.

15 MR. STILLWELL: Again, Henry Stillwell.

16 I'll just offer a few concluding comments
17 on behalf of the Applicant.

18 First, let me just say that some of the
19 conclusions and assertions made by some of the
20 objectors perhaps took a statement by one witness
21 and extrapolated it into a general statement of
22 authority which is not necessarily correct.

23 For example, Mr. Edgerton felt comfortable
24 saying there's no such development of this nature

1 anywhere because Mr. Smith couldn't answer that
2 question. If you'd asked me, I know of a lot of
3 these locations, actually, including in Glenview
4 an area developed on Maple Avenue between Yackley
5 and Route 53, and I'd be happy to submit those.
6 This is not unique. Take a look at AMLI on
7 Kirk Road near Butterfield Road kind of adjacent
8 to residential immediately to the east of that
9 development.

10 Remember this. This project when it was
11 originally approved and as it stands today is a
12 mixed-use development. The fact that a portion
13 of this subcomponent being requested, apartments,
14 has eliminated the concept of the nonresidential
15 uses, the retail, office, service-related uses of
16 the interior doesn't change the fact that the
17 overall PUD as it currently is zoned provides for
18 commercial uses on the property, the parcels
19 immediately adjacent to Main Street.

20 So this project will, in fact, have
21 diversity of activities. It will have offices;
22 it will have retail/commercial, probably some
23 service uses, as well as part of that retail/
24 commercial, and then we're proposing multiple-

1 family residential.

2 I would take issue with the notion that
3 this is a semirural environment from the
4 standpoint of how it currently exists, as well as
5 how it is already entitled. I think it would be
6 inaccurate to identify the intensity of office
7 use that is already approved for this development
8 as semirural. In fact, it is a fairly intensive
9 office use. This particular Lot 8 identifies a
10 five-story office facility, along with four-story
11 and two-story parking decks. It's very much of
12 an intensive use.

13 So I don't think that it's inappropriate to
14 say that what's being requested is a substantial
15 reduction on the intensity of use. It doesn't
16 just reduce the intensity of traffic movements --
17 which, by the way, has been reviewed by your own
18 consultant and found to be acceptable -- and the
19 challenge of that is I think ill-conceived
20 because that's the way this City has always
21 handled the analysis of those issues, as every
22 city does.

23 It needs to be an authoritative source.
24 Anyone can throw out a question or a challenge.

1 You have to at some point look to the
2 authoritative source and how they have structured
3 the proper methodology for examining whether or
4 not the traffic impacts will be negative or
5 acceptable, and I think Chris did an excellent
6 job of explaining it.

7 So traffic certainly I think, in my
8 opinion, is not worsened by this development;
9 it's improved. It certainly isn't more intense
10 with respect to the massing and physical aspects.
11 A three-story multi-family residential development
12 certainly is not as intense visually or from the
13 standpoint of building mass as a 60-foot-tall
14 office building with structured parking associated
15 with it.

16 What's interesting about this situation is
17 it's almost the reverse of what I've normally
18 experienced over the years that I've been
19 involved with this type of activity. Usually
20 where the human cry arises is when you have a
21 multi-family or attached single-family such as
22 Remington. And by the way, I represented the
23 developer on that project. So I'm familiar with
24 it, and I understand what the assumptions were

1 when that project was approved.

2 And when there's an adjacent multi-family
3 use as we're proposing and then you seek at a
4 future date to amend that multi-family three-story
5 use and say, "By the way, we think that the
6 market now supports five-story office buildings
7 with four-story parking garages," that's usually
8 where you hear some concern raised. In essence,
9 this is what most people would categorize as a
10 down-zoning; it's a reduction in the intensity
11 of use.

12 It's been designed in compliance with
13 professional guidelines. People who engage in
14 this type of undertaking with the incredible
15 amount of capital that's required not just to
16 build it but to go through the entitlement
17 process do their homework. When Tracy Cross, who
18 is a recognized expert in this marketplace with
19 respect to market analysis viability of proposed
20 uses is commissioned and provides a report that's
21 utilized in the guidance of preparation of a land
22 plan, product type, marketability, feasibility
23 for the type of individuals who would rent the
24 facility and finds it acceptable and in compliance

1 with market demand, that means something. You
2 pay a lot of money for those market studies, and
3 you do it for a reason. No one, especially the
4 developer, wants to get approved and develop a
5 project that doesn't fit in.

6 When markets change -- and we've had a heck
7 of a market change -- circumstances require
8 reassessment. Contrary to the characterization
9 that this is a knee-jerk reaction by this
10 developer, this is a very considered analysis of
11 the realities that face not just this developer,
12 this land owner, but everybody in the current
13 environment, not just locally but nationally and
14 beyond.

15 And at some point we have to make a
16 decision. Either we will sit tight and we will
17 hope for the best and perhaps it will succeed,
18 perhaps it will never succeed and never get
19 developed, and who knows what the consequences
20 might be, or you can engage in a proactive effort
21 to find creative solutions.

22 I will tell you this is something that's
23 going on routinely. I'm involved in other
24 efforts to find positive, viable resolutions to

1 facilitate the development of projects that have
2 already been approved and find successful means
3 by which what's currently foul land could be
4 converted into productive land and serve community
5 benefits, as well as economic advantages.

6 My client has tried to identify the types
7 of benefits, relative projections of revenues
8 that will be derived from this project. Those
9 are estimations, but the point is is that
10 currently, as it sits, this Lot 8 is not yielding
11 any meaningful economic return, and it will not
12 for many years to come.

13 You can't find any kind of expert who is
14 familiar with this marketplace that will give you
15 any encouragement that this has the potential to
16 build out anytime within the foreseeable future,
17 and I mean beyond 5 to 10 years in all likelihood.

18 All you have to do frankly, is take a look
19 at projects that have been approved that are
20 located right in the heart of urban areas or
21 semi-urban areas that themselves cannot be built
22 out just because the market has changed. In a
23 dynamic location similar to St. Charles,
24 which I think is a very dynamic community, but

1 Naperville is a very dynamic community, has a
2 nice downtown, as well, and it has the promenade
3 which has been going for a period of time.

4 This is a tough challenge for everyone.
5 This developer has made a commitment to find
6 solutions and to get this project moving forward
7 in a way that will be positive and beneficial not
8 just to itself, which it has to be, but also for
9 the community and we think reasonably balanced
10 for the neighbors' considerations. Again, I
11 think the down-zoning of this, the reduction of
12 intensity, the reduction of height is reasonable.

13 The issue of Nicor and the tree line is one
14 that is curious and interesting to me. I don't
15 know how long that tree line has been there. I
16 didn't hear anyone who was concerned about it
17 identify it. They live out there; maybe they know.

18 I don't know where that line is constructed
19 but I might -- my understanding is that it's not
20 constructed beneath the tree line. I don't know
21 whether or not Nicor would ever remove that tree
22 line or portions of it, and if they did whether
23 or not they would replant it and provide for its
24 maintenance, but it kind of begs the question to

1 a certain degree because that's a situation that
2 we deal with all the time when we do land
3 development transitions, what's located off-site
4 and on-site.

5 What's more important when it comes to that
6 is looking at how this developer, this Applicant,
7 has proposed to do on-site landscaping.

8 The only landscaping issue that has been
9 sought for relief has been where there is a
10 problem planting trees where driveways are
11 located, but the overall count in landscaping
12 density is met or exceeded. Can we add
13 additional trees? Those kinds of things can
14 always be looked at. That's not something that's
15 a big stumbling block.

16 But to divert attention and say it's all on
17 what happens in Nicor is somewhat disingenuous
18 because you have to relate it back to our plan.
19 Is it a reasonable request in light of those
20 types of requirements?

21 There's not a lot of variation requested
22 here. There is certainly a change; there's no
23 question there's a change, but if something
24 doesn't change, then the site will remain foul,

1 and that's not to anyone's best interests,
2 including, quite honestly, the economic interests
3 of the residential uses to the west, those
4 town homes.

5 Because I will tell you that I've done it
6 long enough, I'm dealing with some of these
7 projects right now, and one of the most difficult
8 things that people deal with when they're trying
9 to sell in a good market, let alone a stressed
10 market like we have today, is the unknown.
11 What's going to be there when you have a large
12 20-acre area that's part of a PUD and is
13 uncertain as to what its future may be? That's
14 what creates more concern when you approve a plan
15 and that plan is implemented and it establishes a
16 known quantity, especially when that quantity is
17 certainly recognized in the plan of prevention as
18 compatible uses.

19 Single-family town homes, multiple-family
20 apartments, there are so many examples of that
21 type of transitional or adjacent land use, I
22 cannot begin to tell you how many times I've
23 worked with that myself, how many times you'll
24 find that located throughout the Chicago

1 metropolitan area.

2 After all, those town homes have commercial
3 units as part of that overall project that was
4 approved when Remington Glen was approved for
5 development. This project has commercial zoning.
6 It also has office but technically what's being
7 requested now is not just a viable land use, but
8 it's also an appropriate traditional land use.

9 So from that vantage point we believe that
10 what has been requested is reasonable, it's
11 consistent with what market conditions dictate
12 today and for many years to come, and we would
13 hope that the Plan Commission recognize that
14 substantial effort has been made by this
15 Applicant to accommodate some of the concerns, if
16 not most of the concerns that you raised
17 previously at the concept level, and, therefore,
18 this is a proposal that's worthy of your
19 favorable recommendation.

20 I did want to make one final statement, and
21 it is an issue with respect to -- that Mr. Doyle
22 raised with respect to the inclusionary housing.

23 We're not asking you to step into new shoes
24 with respect to that issue. We understand

1 exactly where that responsibility lies.

2 I'm not sure that the City Council or the
3 planning and development committee said that they
4 don't want additional inclusionary housing at
5 this point; I'm not sure where they are today on
6 that. I know that your current percentage of
7 affordable housing meets the goal of the
8 ordinance. It exceeds the State standards of
9 15 percent. In fact, I think you're 17.5 percent,
10 and in that mix there's a preponderance of that
11 located in multi-family.

12 So we understand that that's not something
13 that you certainly want to step into the
14 legislative body's purview or authority. We had
15 to identify that that's something we are
16 requesting, and that will be on the table in
17 front of the City Council when you're trying to
18 deliberate on this and make a determination
19 whether this is worthy of approval.

20 So we respect your concern, Mr. Doyle.
21 Whether or not the City Council considers it
22 appropriate at some point to actually take action
23 to do a text amendment to that ordinance, they'll
24 have to make that decision, and perhaps this will

1 help generate some discussion.

2 That being said, we do believe that we've
3 done what we can to preserve a very reasonable,
4 viable, and what we think will be a very
5 successful proposal to move this development
6 along and support all of the agendas that both
7 the city developer and the community have.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

10 Thank you.

11 Anything further from staff?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If the
14 Plan Commission feels that it has heard enough
15 evidence --

16 MEMBER KESSLER: I make a motion to
17 close the public hearing.

18 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved
20 and seconded. Is there any discussion on the
21 motion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

24 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

1 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

2 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

4 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

7 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

8 MEMBER KESSLER: Henningson.

9 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. The public
14 hearing is now closed.

15 And as a note, as I previously said at the
16 beginning, we aren't going to vote on a
17 recommendation tonight. We've closed the public
18 hearing. However, there will be a meeting at
19 some point in the future. I don't know if it's
20 our next meeting, which will be the third week in
21 July, I believe because --

22 MR. O'ROURKE: It will be the second
23 scheduled meeting here in June.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Will it be on the

1 agenda at the next meeting?

2 MR. O'ROURKE: I anticipate it will.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So we anticipate
4 that it will be on the agenda at the next
5 meeting, which is June 19th, for action.

6 So that concludes Item No. 4 on the agenda.
7 Thank you.

8 We have a few other items which certainly
9 people are welcome to stay around for. However,
10 I would just ask that you be quiet, please.
11 Thank you.

12 All right. Item 5 on the agenda is general
13 amendments, Chapter 17.22 signs related to
14 provisions for temporary signs during
15 construction projects.

16 (The witness was thereupon duly
17 sworn.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

19 MR. COLBY: Okay. This is a general
20 amendment application to modify the requirements
21 for temporary signage. This came out of the
22 discussion at the PUD committee in May.

23 Some concerns have been expressed by
24 businesses along the east Main Street corridor

1 about the City's limitations on temporary
2 signage.

3 So there was a discussion that it would be
4 a good idea to add into the zoning ordinance some
5 provisions to allow for flexibility of temporary
6 signage in certain situations where there's a
7 construction project going on and the access and
8 visibility of the property being impaired by that
9 construction project.

10 Right now the ordinance requirements for
11 temporary signs require they do apply for a
12 permit. You're only allowed to have a temporary
13 sign displayed for 14 days at a time, and you can
14 only have them displayed four times in a calendar
15 year, and they have to be spaced out over the
16 year. So it's restrictive in terms of the number
17 of signs you can have and also how long they can
18 be in place, and the sizes vary by the size of
19 the lot, and it's listed in the staff memo.

20 What's being proposed is to allow for
21 flexibility during construction projects, and
22 this will be authorized by the director of
23 community development, the determination that the
24 construction will obstruct access and visibility

1 of the lots directly due to construction.

2 What would be allowed is that, firstly,
3 temporary signs would not be subject to the time
4 limitations that exist in the ordinance.

5 Secondly, one additional temporary sign
6 would be permitted per lot. You see existing
7 recommendations depending on lot size. There's
8 different sizes and height limitations. Those
9 would apply the same, but you'd be allowed a
10 second sign, and those signs would be able to be
11 placed for the duration of the construction
12 project. So this authorization would apply to
13 certain lots that are affected by the construction
14 for the duration of the construction project.

15 And I should clarify that this is only for
16 commercial districts and industrial districts in
17 the staff report under Section B where it lists
18 zoning districts.

19 That is all.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

21 Questions?

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have a quick
23 question. On the additional sign is that more or
24 less in and out? Basically, come in here,

1 leave there?

2 MR. COLBY: Well, you'd be allowed
3 two signs, and you can use those wherever you'd
4 like. It can be a banner on the building, a
5 freestanding sign. It would be up to the business
6 to decide what they wanted to display. The
7 intent would be to increase the visibility for
8 the business that's being impaired.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: You say in your
10 analysis that the sign placement, temporary
11 signs, the duration would not exceed the length
12 of construction project. I'm just curious as to
13 who determines when the construction is finished.

14 MR. COLBY: That would have to be a
15 determination made by the director. What we
16 would look to are the conditions under which the
17 authorization is made, are they still present.
18 So is the access and visibility still somehow
19 impaired by the construction.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

22 Questions?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Comments?

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Make a motion to
2 close the public hearing.

3 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any comments from
5 members of the audience?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions? Does
8 the Applicant wish to offer rebuttal?

9 MEMBER KESSLER: Come on.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry. Was there
11 a second?

12 MEMBER AMATANGELO: It was.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's
14 been moved and seconded.

15 Discussion on the motion?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

18 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

19 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

20 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

24 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

1 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

2 MEMBER KESSLER: Henningson.

3 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

4 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
8 motion passes by a vote of 6 to 1, and that
9 concludes the public hearing portion of our
10 agenda.

11 On to Item No. 6, Chapter 17.22, "General
12 Provisions" and Chapter 17.30, "Definitions"
13 related to provisions for donation boxes.

14 Anything further to add from last time?

15 MR. O'ROURKE: Just based on the last
16 two public hearings, what you see in the staff
17 report is basically a combination or inclusion of
18 all those comments into one clean ordinance. At
19 the last meeting there was a few options, and
20 what the staff has done is put them into one
21 final ordinance, and we are recommending approval,
22 and we have included draft findings of fact.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And this is a very
24 fine staff memo.

1 MR. O'ROURKE: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Not that yours
3 wasn't, Russ.

4 Any motion?

5 MEMBER KESSLER: I would move to
6 recommend approval of the General Amendment,
7 Donation Boxes -- I make a motion to recommend
8 approval of Chapter 17.22, "General Provisions"
9 and Chapter 17.30, "Definitions," related to
10 provisions for donation boxes. And I would also
11 include in the motion the option -- I would
12 recommend that we suggest one of the options in
13 the staff report.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just to make our
15 motion clean, based on the staff -- in the staff
16 report there was a proposed amendment, and the
17 proposed amendments were contained in "A," which
18 I believe included everything we had discussed
19 all in one list, "B," which is general
20 definitions, and then "C," which is building
21 permits.

22 So you would include all of the proposed
23 amendments with that motion?

24 MEMBER KESSLER: That is correct.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is there a
2 second?

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.
5 Discussion?

6 MEMBER DOYLE: In the minutes from
7 the last public hearing there were two different
8 options that were being discussed, Option 1 and
9 Option 1A.

10 Option 1A was the more restrictive of the
11 two. Am I correct? Here looking at A1, it
12 limits this to commercial properties defined as
13 shopping centers. So is this Option 1A?

14 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. That was
15 basically what was incorporated as Option 1A.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: This is the more
17 restrictive?

18 MR. O'ROURKE: That's correct.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And, also, one of
20 the things that we discussed was putting boxes
21 on -- in vacant buildings -- or, rather,
22 prohibiting boxes from being placed in vacant
23 buildings, and that was A2, "Boxes shall not be
24 permitted on properties where shopping center

1 buildings are 100 percent vacant."

2 MEMBER DOYLE: I'd like to discuss A1
3 and discuss more as to why other members of the
4 Commission feel that that further restriction is
5 required or beneficial.

6 For instance, if it was a commercial
7 property, if it was a sports complex, I would
8 assume that that would not fall within this
9 definition.

10 MR. O'ROURKE: You're referring to
11 the sports complex that's north of Dean in the
12 business park?

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Correct.

14 MR. O'ROURKE: It's in a zoning
15 that's not BC or BR.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: It wouldn't apply
17 at all?

18 MR. O'ROURKE: That's correct.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: So what kind of
20 properties does Clause A1 restrict this to that --
21 or exclude that --

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If this was a
23 single business property.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Like a big box?

1 MR. O'ROURKE: It could be. It
2 depends on the big box. Some of them are located
3 in what we call shopping centers. I think of
4 Target that's in the East Gate Commons PUD.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Walmart?

6 MR. O'ROURKE: Walmart, to be honest,
7 is tricky. The original PUD did incorporate
8 other properties besides the Walmart property.
9 If that proposal came up, we'd have to give it
10 some scrutiny at that time.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: May I suggest that
12 this is the more preferred option?

13 MEMBER KESSLER: It is. This would
14 exclude a gas station, just boxes that are
15 plopped all over town. I think it speaks a
16 little bit more to one of the first conversations
17 we had is they picked two spots they could take
18 it to in town. Well, this is kind of a blend
19 between. We'll allow them around town, but we're
20 going to say in certain types of businesses.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: My general feeling is
22 I prefer very restricted. My actual preference
23 would be not to have any, but I thought that this
24 was more controllable in the city.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
2 comments?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Matt, did you want
5 to add anything, or is it pretty much all taken
6 care of in the staff report?

7 MR. O'ROURKE: Just anecdotally, I
8 think there are a lot of properties in the BC
9 districts that would be considered shopping
10 centers, so it's not just a couple places.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Matt, do you think
12 that there's any issue just reading back through
13 on A10 where it says, "Boxes should be located so
14 that they are inconspicuous from the public
15 right-of-way," do you think there's any issue
16 with that being too ambiguous?

17 MR. O'ROURKE: It was written and it
18 was something that we noticed in other
19 ordinances. It was written specifically to not
20 100 percent limit it, basically, being excluded
21 from being viewed because in some instances it
22 probably makes sense.

23 So it is somewhat designed to give staff
24 some room. That was intentional.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

2 Anything else?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: Move to recommend
6 approval of the donation boxes ordinance
7 incorporating the proposed amendments in staff
8 report A, B, and C.

9 MEMBER AMATANGELO: No.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

11 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

12 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: No.

16 MEMBER KESSLER: Henningson.

17 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

18 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

22 All right. That motion passes by a vote of
23 5 to 2. And that concludes Item No. 6 on the
24 agenda.

1 Item 7 is general amendment, City of
2 St. Charles, Chapter 17.28, "Signs" related to
3 temporary signs during construction projects.

4 Is there a motion?

5 MEMBER KESSLER: I would move to
6 recommend approval of Chapter 17.28 "Signs"
7 related to provisions for temporary signs during
8 construction projects.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Second?

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved
12 and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, nothing
15 to add?

16 MR. COLBY: No.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

18 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

19 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

20 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

24 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

1 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

2 MEMBER KESSLER: Henningson.

3 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

4 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

6 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
8 concludes Item 7 on the agenda.

9 Next meeting announcements, next meeting
10 June 19th. The meeting after that is canceled;
11 we will not be having a meeting on July 3rd, and
12 then on July 17th, if anyone knows that they
13 cannot attend any of those meeting, excluding the
14 July 3rd meeting, please let staff know.

15 Any additional business?

16 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

17 I don't know if this happened when the new
18 Web site went up or whatever, but it seems that
19 our vice chair is missing from the list.

20 MEMBER KESSLER: I just pointed that
21 out to him.

22 MEMBER AMATANGELO: The only reason I
23 say that is because that did become an issue at
24 one of our other meetings where the date was

1 incorrect, so I just want to make sure.

2 MR. COLBY: We'll get that fixed.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Unless you're just
4 trying to send a message.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: I would have left an
6 hour ago.

7 MR. COLBY: I'm sure it was an
8 oversight.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Staff?

10 MR. O'ROURKE: I don't think we have
11 anything.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion
13 to adjourn?

14 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

17 (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

18 (Which were all the proceedings
19 had in the above-entitled matter
20 at the hour of 9:38 p.m.)

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

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

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified
Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and
a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane,
State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I
reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the
above-entitled matter and that the foregoing is a
true, correct, and complete transcript of my
shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my
hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this 11th day
of June, 2012.



Paula M. Quetsch

Certified Shorthand Reporter
Registered Professional Reporter

My commission expires
October 16, 2013