

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2012**

---

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

Members Absent:            Tom Schuetz  
                                      Brian Doyle

Also Present:                Matthew O'Rourke, Planner  
                                      Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager  
                                      Sonntag Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chairman Wallace.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**3. Presentation of minutes of the August 21, 2012 meeting.**

**A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the August 21, 2012 meeting.**

Chairman Wallace suggested addressing item 5 prior to item 4 on the Agenda. **A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to change the order of the Agenda.**

**5. 1915 W. Main Street (McDonald's)**

Application for a Concept Plan for the proposed demolition and reconstruction of the McDonald's restaurant located at 1915 W. Main Street.

Supporting Documents:

- Concept Plans dated 11/15/12
- Parking Analysis dated 11/14/12

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

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**4. General Amendments (City of St. Charles).**

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, November 20, 2012**

**Page 2**

Chapter 17.04 “Administration”, pertaining to Planned Unit Developments and deviations from Chapter 17.18 “Inclusionary Housing”.

Chapter 17.18 “Inclusionary Housing” pertaining to the percentage of affordable units required to be constructed as part of residential developments and to create a process and requirements for an Alternative Affordable Housing Plan.

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

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

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Amatangelo, Henningson, Kessler, Wallace, Pretz

Nays:

Absent: Doyle, Schuetz

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 17.04 “Administration”, pertaining to Planned Unit Developments and deviations from Chapter 17.18 “Inclusionary Housing”.

Chapter 17.18 “Inclusionary Housing” pertaining to the percentage of affordable units required to be constructed as part of residential developments and to create a process and requirements for an Alternative Affordable Housing Plan.

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to recommend approval of the application conditioned upon modification of the proposed wording in the financial hardship section from 10% to 15%.** Mr. Wallace seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Wallace, Kessler

Nays: Amatangelo, Henningson

Absent: Doyle, Schuetz, Pretz

Motion failed.

**Mr. Henningson made a motion to recommend approval as presented.** Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, November 20, 2012**

**Page 3**

Ayes: Wallace, Amatangelo, Henningson

Nays: Kessler

Absent: Doyle, Schuetz, Pretz

Motion carried.

**7. Update on the Comprehensive Plan Project**

Open House for Draft Plan, Wednesday, November 28, 2012 from 6:00pm to 7:30pm

**8. Meeting Announcements.**

Tuesday, December 4, 2012 at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers

Tuesday, January 8, 2013 at 7:00pm in Council Chambers

Tuesday, January 22, 2013 at 7:00pm **Century Station Training Room**

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

**10. Adjournment at 9:13 p.m.**

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

S62057

STATE OF ILLINOIS )

) SS.

COUNTY OF K A N E )

BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES PLAN COMMISSION

In Re the Matter of: )

)

Regular Meeting. )

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the  
above-entitled matter, before the St. Charles  
Plan Commission, taken in the offices of City of  
St. Charles, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles,  
Illinois, on November 20, 2012, at the hour of  
7:01 p.m.

1           **PRESENT:**

2                   **MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;**

3                   **MR. TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman;**

4                   **MS. SUE AMATANGELO, Member;**

5                   **MR. CURT HENNINGSON, Member; and**

6                   **MR. TOM PRETZ, Member.**

7           **ALSO PRESENT:**

8                   **MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager; and**

9                   **MR. MATTHEW O'ROURKE, Planner.**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

4                   Tim, roll call.

5                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Amatangelo?

6                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Here.

7                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

8                   MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

9                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

10                  MEMBER HENNINGSON: Here.

11                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace?

12                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

13                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

14                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

15                  Presentation of the minutes of the last meeting  
16                  which was August 21st, 2012.

17                  Is there a motion to approve?

18                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

19                  MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

20                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved  
21                  and seconded.

22                  All in favor?

23                                 (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion passes  
3 unanimously.

4 Before we get to the next item on  
5 our agenda, I would suggest that we address  
6 Item 5 prior to Item 4, so the 1915 West Main  
7 Street McDonald's concept plan would occur first,  
8 and then we would conduct the public hearing and  
9 take action on the other items.

10 Is there any objection from members of the  
11 Plan Commission?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Do we need a motion  
15 for that?

16 MR. O'ROURKE: I think so, to  
17 formally amend the agenda.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is there a  
19 motion for that?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

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

24 Any discussion on the motion?

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

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Amatangelo?

MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz?

MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace?

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The

next item on the agenda is Item 5, 1915 West Main Street, McDonald's application for a concept plan for the proposed demolition and reconstruction of the McDonald's restaurant located at 1915 West Main Street, supporting documents, concept plans dated November 15, 2012, and parking analysis dated November 14, 2012.

For those of you who are not familiar with our process, the Plan Commission, at the request of the Applicant, will conduct a concept plan review. This is voluntary on the part of the Applicant, but it's always encouraged before



1 applicants spend a great deal of money and time  
2 doing an application for whatever it is they're  
3 wanting to do. That's what we're doing tonight.

4 At this point in time, the Plan Commission  
5 is not going to take any action because there is  
6 no application that is pending before the Plan  
7 Commission. Rather, we will allow you to present  
8 the plans that you have, and we're hoping that  
9 the Plan Commission will be able to give you our  
10 thoughts, both favorable and not favorable, if  
11 any, regarding the plan, and then at that point  
12 you can make whatever revisions you feel  
13 necessary before coming back before us with a  
14 formal application.

15 As I said, there won't be any action that's  
16 taken, and unless there's action by you, nothing  
17 further will happen on this matter.

18 Are there any questions regarding procedure?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

21 MR. O'ROURKE: Todd, actually, if  
22 you're requesting a PUD, if you know that that's  
23 the process you're going to be pursuing, then a  
24 plan is required.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

2                   MR. O'ROURKE: I just wanted to  
3 clarify that point so everybody knows that  
4 they're here to meet that requirement, as well.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Got it.

6                   All right. And so what we're doing tonight  
7 is, if the Applicant would like to make a  
8 presentation, then we will -- the Plan Commission  
9 will ask questions. We'll allow the audience to  
10 ask any questions that they may have, and then at  
11 the end of the present -- or the end of this  
12 item, Plan Commissioners will make comments  
13 regarding the application.

14                  All right. Anything further from staff  
15 before we go to the Applicant?

16                  MR. O'ROURKE: That's all.

17                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is the  
18 Applicant ready?

19                  MR. STILLWELL: Yes.

20                  Mr. Chairman, members of the Plan  
21 Commission, thank you for indulging us this  
22 evening and amending your agenda to allow us to  
23 proceed ahead of schedule. We appreciate that  
24 very much.

1                   We'll try to be thorough but brief and give  
2                   you the essential elements with respect to what  
3                   the Applicant is proposing.

4                   My name is Henry Stillwell. My address is  
5                   300 East Roosevelt Road, Wheaton, Illinois. I am  
6                   the attorney for the Applicant this evening,  
7                   McDonald's Corporation.

8                   McDonald's, as you know, has an existing  
9                   store on the west side of town on Main Street on  
10                  the south side just west of 19th, and that would  
11                  be the store that is the subject of tonight's  
12                  discussion.

13                  There are other individuals present with  
14                  the Applicant this evening that I'd like to  
15                  introduce briefly.

16                  First of all, Mr. John Lardas, in the  
17                  second row. Mr. Lardas is the franchisee  
18                  operator of this store and other stores in the  
19                  community and the Fox Valley area.

20                  Behind him is Mr. Ted Feenstra, who is  
21                  withV3 Engineering. He's the engineer and  
22                  designer on this site, and Keith Demchinski is  
23                  with Norris, and Norris Design is the landscape  
24                  consultant, and Keith will actually go through

1           some landscape plans a little bit later, but, to  
2           begin with, I'll give the initial presentation  
3           and then turn it over to Keith to finish it up.

4           As I indicated, we're seeking to demolish  
5           the existing McDonald's located at the subject  
6           property, as identified in the staff report, and  
7           to rebuild that facility with a new, up-to-date  
8           McDonald's restaurant, with a new restaurant  
9           design, as well as a new drive-through system  
10          that incorporates the most current technology  
11          being utilized by McDonald's with respect to the  
12          side-by-side order system, which has proven,  
13          through a great deal of effort and  
14          experimentation and implementation, to be an  
15          extremely effective and efficient system that  
16          immensely helps the operation and efficiency of  
17          the store and the on-site circulation of the  
18          shortening of the stacking and a better overall  
19          environment for customer service and public  
20          safety. So that's our goal.

21          To accomplish that we're asking for the  
22          community to approve a special use for a planned  
23          unit development. We do believe that we have  
24          justification for that, and I'll get into those

1 discussions after we go through some of the  
2 actual aspects of those standards in what  
3 we're going to present this evening.

4 But in accordance or in a part of that PUD  
5 application, we're also going to be requesting  
6 certain specific deviations to your ordinance,  
7 and I'll kind of briefly mention the categories  
8 now and then we'll go through them more  
9 specifically as I go through the plans.

10 First, we are seeking to reduce the parking  
11 from a required 52 spaces to 49, and we have  
12 submitted a traffic parking occupancy study that  
13 supports that request, and I'll go through that  
14 in a little bit.

15 Secondly, we are going to be requesting a  
16 deviation to the width of the green space setback  
17 or setback of the pavement on the south side of  
18 the property immediately adjacent to the south  
19 property line from 10 feet down to 5 feet.

20 We are asking for certain deviations to  
21 landscape standards relative to certain numbers  
22 of trees and plantings, and I'll let Keith go  
23 into the specifics of that when he goes through  
24 the landscape plan and the explanation as to why

1           that's necessary and the justification for those  
2           requests.

3                   And, finally, we'll be asking for a  
4           deviation on your signage standards focused  
5           specifically on wall signage, not on the  
6           freestanding monument sign, with respect to  
7           allowing more than one wall sign on the building,  
8           and to allow on two of the elevations -- the east  
9           and west -- signage that otherwise would not be  
10          permitted and a size that we are specifically  
11          requesting, and we'll go through the specifics of  
12          that, as well.

13                   The site, as currently is configured, is  
14          1.13 acres in size. As I've indicated, it  
15          already is improved and has been for many years  
16          operating as a McDonald's restaurant with a  
17          drive-through facility.

18                   It is surrounded by -- well, it is adjoined  
19          by commercial, rather extensive commercial uses  
20          to the west, to the north, and to the east. To  
21          the south is a large parking lot facility. It's  
22          a grade-level parking area for multiple-family  
23          uses.

24                   There are no buildings immediately adjacent

1 to the rear property line. It's all basically  
2 one large parking lot as I've observed. That is  
3 screened by a fence with slatting that currently  
4 exists along the entire south property line of  
5 the subject property which would remain in place.

6 We have a site plan on the --

7 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. Just scroll down  
8 with the mouse. It's all in the PDF packet  
9 there, I think.

10 MR. STILLWELL: Oh, great. Thank you.

11 The way that the site is currently  
12 configured, the building is located on the  
13 easterly portion of the site and is oriented in a  
14 north-south fashion so that the narrow portion of  
15 the building faces towards Main Street and then  
16 the depth of the building runs north and south.  
17 Then there's a large area of parking field, and  
18 the drive-through system currently exists.

19 There is also a total of four access  
20 locations on and off of Main Street serving the  
21 existing facility.

22 The proposal is to incorporate the type of  
23 site layout that you've seen previously with more  
24 up-to-date McDonald's facilities, so I want to

1 walk through briefly with you this proposed site  
2 plan.

3 First, the access location will be altered.  
4 Two current access locations will be eliminated,  
5 so that there will just be two full-access curb  
6 cuts servicing the building following  
7 redevelopment. Those are identified on the site  
8 plan on the east side and on the west side.

9 Just for purposes of orientation, north is  
10 to the top, Main Street is right along this north  
11 side or this upper side of the property, and then  
12 east, west, north.

13 The site will be laid out with the  
14 traditional counterclockwise one-way rotation  
15 circulation path for McDonald's, moving around  
16 counterclockwise with a full through-clearance  
17 circulation lane that is 20 feet wide on the  
18 east, north, and west, and 18 feet wide on the  
19 south.

20 The drive-through facility will be entered  
21 in the northwest portion or area of the site, as  
22 shown on the plan, and will divide and separate  
23 into two order lanes. This is what we call the  
24 side-by-side order system, which has two separate



1 menu boards, customer order display facilities  
2 that allow two cars at one time to present their  
3 order.

4 That's where the real efficiency of the  
5 system is found. It avoids, for the most part, a  
6 circumstance when a car with a large order or a  
7 little bit of uncertainty as to what they want to  
8 order takes more time than usually expected and a  
9 line starts backing up and it gets really  
10 congested and inefficient.

11 When we first introduced to system -- and I  
12 probably have said this to you in the past, so  
13 I'm hoping you will indulge me -- we actually ran  
14 a study, because I was doing a project in  
15 Bensenville at the time, when the City fathers  
16 had questions, "Does this really work?" And  
17 my -- my client, who was a franchisee of that  
18 particular area, had already done this in the  
19 store on River Road in Rosemont that was having a  
20 lot of problems with backup on River Road, and so  
21 he implemented the side-by-side system.

22 We had a letter from the police department  
23 and chief of police that said, "This is great."

24 We ran a test on the Thursday and the

1 Friday, closed it. Went through one facility or  
2 one of the order systems on one day and then  
3 double on the other day, and the day that we had  
4 both lanes open, there was 25 percent greater  
5 volume of activity and, yet, the stacking was  
6 reduced 60 percent, so it is a very effective  
7 system.

8 And it's really important for the  
9 organization because what has happened with our  
10 more convenience-oriented society is that the  
11 amount of drive-through volume has grown  
12 considerably over the last three decades; whereas  
13 when McDonald's first introduced the drive-through,  
14 they were doing, say, 20 to 30 percent. Then  
15 they were going to 50 percent.

16 It is routine now to have 70 percent of  
17 total sales volume at certain locations, 80 to  
18 82 percent of total sales volume generated by the  
19 drive-through facility.

20 That adds interesting impacts as far as  
21 making sure you have an efficient system, and  
22 that's why they poured so much money researching,  
23 implementing this system.

24 But it also has an impact relative to some

1 of the observations pointed out in the parking  
2 study that you received relative to the ability  
3 of people to make a choice that does not require  
4 them to park if they don't want to, and in the  
5 past oftentimes during peak hours, if it got too  
6 busy and the line was too long, people would opt  
7 to park, if there was a space available, putting  
8 greater demand to onsite parking, so that ties  
9 together with some of the requests that we have  
10 in this application.

11 Going back into the site plan, after the  
12 two order points, there is a merge of the  
13 different cars and a then circle around behind  
14 the building on the south side and proceed first  
15 to the pay window and then move forward secondly  
16 to the pickup window.

17 And in this particular building they have  
18 now incorporated -- and I'll go through this in  
19 the elevations -- what's called a pull-forward  
20 window, so there will actually be three windows  
21 for the drive-through on this store, and the  
22 pull-forward window is utilized when an order is  
23 not quite ready, but rather than hold up the  
24 line, the car is asked to pull forward and then

1 the order is brought out and will service that car.

2 And as a result of adding that, we now have  
3 15 total stack spaces within the drive-through  
4 facility. The staff report indicated that, as  
5 originally submitted, there was only 14, so we  
6 have cured that and we're only seeking a  
7 deviation as to cars being capable of being  
8 stacked in the drive-through system.

9 The trash corral is located in the  
10 southwest corner of the site. We'll be in  
11 compliance with your standards relative to the  
12 appropriate enclosure, matching materials, gates  
13 with materials that will be low maintenance, so  
14 that should be an accommodation that would not be  
15 inconsistent with your ordinance.

16 Parking, as I have alluded to, is provided  
17 primarily along the perimeter of the site with,  
18 also, some parking adjacent to the building on  
19 both the north and south side.

20 We're showing a total of 49 spaces, which  
21 do include 5 parallel spaces adjacent to the  
22 north property line, and those are referred to in  
23 the staff report.

24 With respect to these spaces, there are

1           certain spaces that will be identified for  
2           employee parking, such as locations that affect  
3           the trash enclosure pads, a conflict relative to  
4           a garbage truck when it comes periodically,  
5           which, I believe, is probably twice a week.

6                       Is that right?

7                               MR. LARDAS: Twice.

8                               MR. STILLWELL: The -- the store is  
9           serviced by on-site sidewalks that people access  
10          out of the parking fields.

11                              As you can see, they run -- there's a  
12          customer entrance in the southeast corner of the  
13          site that faces east and there's a sidewalk  
14          looping around the entire east extension of the  
15          outdoor space and running along the north side of  
16          the building.

17                              There is a customer access in the center of  
18          the north side of the building shown on the site  
19          plan. The sidewalk continues onto the back, to  
20          the westerly portion of the building, the north  
21          side, closer to the service doors which  
22          accommodate off-loading for various types of  
23          supplies for the restaurant.

24                              And there's one third access that's a

1 service access also located in the southwest  
2 corner of the building facing west. That's  
3 utilized for access to -- from the trash corral.

4 The site plan does provide for the  
5 opportunity for outdoor patio seating in that  
6 large area to the east of the building, and Keith  
7 will get into that in his plan presentation,  
8 along with the landscape elements that would be  
9 associated with that area and other planting  
10 areas located throughout the site.

11 The lighting will be in compliance with  
12 your ordinances. All of the photometric  
13 requirements will be fully complied with.

14 Let me shift, if I could. I'll skip over  
15 the landscape plan and leave that to Keith and go  
16 to the exterior elevation.

17 This is what's called the Signature Series  
18 prototype. This was first introduced in the  
19 Chicago market with the Spring Road building in  
20 Oak Brook near the corporate campuses of  
21 McDonald's by Cermak Road, I believe, or  
22 22nd Street and Spring Road.

23 This is literally the new brand image of  
24 McDonald's. There is an enormous campaign that

1           has been rolled out now over the last few years  
2           throughout the nation to rebrand the company with  
3           a more up-to-date image that has more  
4           architectural appeal.

5                       As you know, for a long time McDonald's  
6           buildings were primarily what we called the  
7           double mansard design, and those clearly became  
8           obsolete, out of date, and needed to be replaced.

9                       This is the new look for McDonald's, and as  
10          you travel throughout the country, you'll see  
11          this routinely throughout a variety of communities.

12                      I've just completed four buildings --  
13          four McDonald's facilities in Naperville.  
14          One was brand-new in the Design Pointe shopping  
15          center on Route 59. Three of them were remodels,  
16          where they take an existing store and they  
17          totally remodel the building into this design so  
18          it basically has a Signature Series appearance.

19                      It has been warmly received in the  
20          communities that we've dealt with. It is a brick  
21          veneer facade on all four exterior elevations,  
22          with accents on these cultured stone arcades  
23          located -- as you look at the center drawing,  
24          that's the north elevation facing Main Street.

1           It's labeled "Nondrive-through side" elevation,  
2           and you can see that we have a cultured stone  
3           arcade around the customer access, and then, at  
4           the corner, the south -- I'm sorry -- the  
5           northeast corner of the building, the wraparound  
6           cultured stone arcade, as well.

7                     That is also shown expansively on the front  
8           elevation on the top line which faces to the  
9           east, and then with the -- the arcade on the rear  
10          elevation facing west, and then on the drive-  
11          through side they're facing south in this  
12          particular instance.

13                    There is what we call the tower element,  
14          which, again, is better seen -- excuse me -- from  
15          the front elevation looking from the east to the  
16          west.

17                    Again, this is a cultured stone element  
18          that provides some architectural relief. The  
19          purpose of the design is to introduce shadow  
20          lines with some indentation in the brick lines,  
21          as well as some dual tones in the brick as  
22          demonstrated on the drive-through side elevation  
23          at the bottom of this exhibit.

24                    This drawing also addresses or identifies



1 elements with respect to signage, and let me hand  
2 out a more up-to-date drawing of this because,  
3 actually, we did make a couple of changes to this.

4 Let me first just identify the changes that  
5 we made since you had the other one you've  
6 probably looked at, and this is where we get into  
7 the wall signage issue I discussed earlier  
8 where -- this is where there's some deviations  
9 involved.

10 The difference between what you see on this  
11 plan that's on the computer and what I just  
12 handed out, if you go to the bottom elevation,  
13 which was the drive-through side elevation facing  
14 south, the arch sign which is located on that  
15 drawing has been removed as required by the  
16 ordinance. There's not allowed to be a sign on  
17 that -- that facade.

18 Looking to the center drawing, which is the  
19 nondrive-through side elevation facing north  
20 toward Main Street, that has stayed the same,  
21 with the arch sign by the main entry and the  
22 McDonald's script sign located on the parapet  
23 that screens the mechanical drawings.

24 The areas of deviation are located on the

1 top line of drawings, one front elevation facing  
2 the east, the second rear elevation facing west.

3 The elevation facing to the east has  
4 remained unchanged relative to the signage that  
5 we're requesting.

6 We're requesting the arch sign on the  
7 cultured stone arcade, as well as the script sign  
8 reading "McDonald's" on the parapet.

9 On the rear elevation we have a new drawing  
10 you'll see where we're still requesting the arch  
11 on the stone arcade, but we're also -- we're also  
12 requesting, again, the McDonald's script sign  
13 facing to the west.

14 All of that that I just identified are  
15 deviations to the ordinance.

16 As identified in the staff report, under  
17 the existing ordinance, no wall signs are  
18 permitted on the east or west elevations and only  
19 one wall sign is permitted for the whole side  
20 elevations.

21 We are requesting that you allow us to  
22 increase the number of wall signs from one to a  
23 total of six. That would be two on each of these  
24 three facades: East, north, and west.

1           Again, north is in full compliance and, in  
2           fact, it's well under what's allowed. If you  
3           look at the staff report, the mass identified on  
4           that facade, we would have a mass, I believe, of  
5           177 square feet versus only the 45 that we've  
6           provided.

7           We're asking for the indulgence and  
8           consideration of the community to allow us to  
9           also have a traditional-type signage on the east  
10          and west.

11          Because of the nature of the environment  
12          that we're in, it's really a fairly intensive  
13          commercial area, and identification of the  
14          facility is extremely important to McDonald's to  
15          provide for identification and site recognition  
16          as early as possible so that it's easy for people  
17          to prepare to make the turn and to access the  
18          facility before they get by it.

19          We believe that this is a -- a consistent  
20          design that's been utilized by McDonald's  
21          throughout most communities.

22          We recognize that the St. Charles community  
23          has its own standards, and we are respectful of  
24          your standards, but we believe at this particular

1 location that the economic commitment being made  
2 by this owner/operator and McDonald's Corporation  
3 with this reinvestment and the importance in this  
4 economy and throughout the competitive  
5 environment we deal with justifies the need to  
6 provide for effective recognition of this store  
7 by the passing public.

8 This is -- what people don't realize, this  
9 is not a destination location. McDonald's  
10 business is driven by impulse traffic, and it  
11 varies with -- with location. But it is not  
12 uncommon for impulse traffic to represent 60 to  
13 70 percent of total sales volume, a very  
14 important component of the business model for  
15 this organization.

16 And that's why you always see the effort  
17 made to make sure that there's good opportunity,  
18 visibility, and customer recognition of the store  
19 before it's too late because impulse traffic is  
20 driven by convenience, convenience, first and  
21 foremost, recognizing and easily accessing the  
22 site, and, secondly, once upon the site, being  
23 able to easily navigate the site and get in and  
24 get out very quickly.

1                   So that being said, we don't believe that  
2                   it creates any undue burden upon the public  
3                   interest, but serves a great benefit to the  
4                   property and the substantial investment that will  
5                   be made in this location by the organization and  
6                   the operator.

7                   There is a proposed free-standing sign that  
8                   is in full compliance with your sign ordinance.  
9                   There will be a single sign that will be located,  
10                  naturally, towards Main Street, and it will comply  
11                  with the minimum setbacks and it's located, I  
12                  believe --

13                  MR. LARDAS: It's in the middle.

14                  MR. STILLWELL: It's in the middle.

15                  MR. LARDAS: Right.

16                  MR. STILLWELL: I can't see the  
17                  labeling. The print is so small.

18                  I think it's right here. That's where we  
19                  would get the setback, so that's what I assume,  
20                  that's the sign, freestanding sign right there.

21                  So when it comes to signage, the deviations  
22                  that we're seeking deal with the wall signage on  
23                  the east and west elevation.

24                  What I'd like to do at this time is turn

1 the podium over to Keith and let him run through  
2 the landscape drawing, and after he's done that,  
3 then I will do a little summation relative to  
4 your community standards and why we believe that  
5 this is an appropriate request for PUD  
6 consideration.

7 MR. DEMCHINSKI: Good evening. Keith  
8 Demchinski with Norris Design, 540 Duane Street,  
9 Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

10 We're a landscape architecture and  
11 planning firm working with -- we've been working  
12 with V3 Company and McDonald's for the last  
13 approximately four years on roughly 50 McDonald's  
14 renovations, and with each and every project,  
15 we -- our goal is always to comply with or exceed  
16 the local jurisdiction's landscape codes, and in  
17 this case, I'll run through our concept and a few  
18 of the design elements, and then go through the  
19 few deficiencies in the landscape tree counts  
20 that Hank spoke of earlier.

21 As you can see, this is a color rendering  
22 here. In front of you is just the black-and-  
23 white plan, but up along Main Street we're  
24 currently showing adequate landscape shrubs and

1           perennials along the street frontage there and  
2           also street trees, canopy trees. Those are  
3           proposed to be maple, maple trees, and then along  
4           the west side of the building we're also showing  
5           a significant amount of landscape material, a mix  
6           of evergreen trees, canopy, and also some other  
7           ornamental trees.

8                     You can see the landscape island. We're  
9           currently proposing a mix of perennials,  
10          ornamental grasses, drought-tolerant landscaping,  
11          and some native landscaping, as well, and in the  
12          elevations that you saw earlier, you noticed the  
13          cultured stone, some of the natural elements that  
14          McDonald's incorporates into their building  
15          materials, and our goal, as landscape architect,  
16          is always to complement the architecture, and so  
17          that's our goal, is always to introduce as much  
18          native and drought-tolerant landscape materials  
19          as possible to complement the architecture.

20                    On the east side of the building, we're  
21          also providing a significant amount of  
22          landscaping.

23                    Up around the outdoor dining area we're  
24          proposing some screening along the south edge

1           there and also along the west side.

2                       We're proposing a water feature, which you  
3           can see in the photo below. It's just a  
4           character photo. We will be incorporating some  
5           additional natural stone that complements and  
6           matches the stone in the architecture of the  
7           building, and that -- that water feature will  
8           actually be visible from Main Street, but it will  
9           also serve as an amenity for guests who decide to  
10          dine outside.

11                      And then along the south edge we're also  
12          proposing some additional trees, columnar trees  
13          and additional shrubs and landscape material.

14                      So the few deviations that -- that we're  
15          requesting at this point in time, there's  
16          currently 12 trees that are required along --  
17          within the foundation landscape, so on the west  
18          side of the building, also the east side of  
19          the -- of the building, currently we're 1 tree  
20          short of that 12 -- of the 12 that are required.

21                      And then along the public street frontage,  
22          there are 6 shade trees that are required. We  
23          are -- we're in compliance with the shade trees.  
24          However, there are 12 ornamental and evergreen



1 trees that are required, and in order to meet  
2 that requirement, we need to shift the landscape  
3 buffer along Main Street approximately 20 to  
4 30 feet to allow for 12 ornamental and evergreen  
5 trees, so, unfortunately, that's just -- it's not  
6 feasible to propose that amount of trees along  
7 Main Street at this time.

8 So with that, if there are any questions --  
9 or we'll take questions after Hank closes, but if  
10 there are any questions regarding landscaping,  
11 I'd be happy to answer them.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have  
13 one question.

14 What is the landscaping along -- on the  
15 southern boundary there? I mean, I see the  
16 trees, but what is -- what's there?

17 MR. DEMCHINSKI: There is --  
18 apparently, there is a -- there is a retaining  
19 wall along the south side.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But, I mean,  
21 are you proposing any landscaping where that  
22 retaining wall is right now?

23 MR. DEMCHINSKI: Currently, no.  
24 There is an adequate space right now between the

1 sidewalk and the retaining wall for that.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What is going  
3 to be the demarcation between the parking lot to  
4 the south on this property?

5 MR. DEMCHINSKI: There's a curb but  
6 then there will be either turf or mulching  
7 between the curb and the wall.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Will this be  
9 at the same grade?

10 MR. DEMCHINSKI: It will be the same  
11 grade.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Will you be  
13 able to go from one to the other; not legally,  
14 but you can?

15 MR. DEMCHINSKI: There is a fence at  
16 the top of the retaining wall.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And is  
18 there -- whose fence is that?

19 MR. DEMCHINSKI: That would be  
20 McDonald's.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, okay.  
22 Okay. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a question  
24 on landscaping, as well.

1           One of the things that was mentioned that I  
2           think might be a general concern is the parking  
3           space reduction, and comment was made of sharing  
4           the parking lot, or at peak hours there are a  
5           number of cars that are parking in the McDonald's  
6           lot and walking across to the Beef Shack, and  
7           one of my questions would be, was there any  
8           thought into putting some type of a landscape or,  
9           you know, even just minimal landscaping on the  
10          west side of the property to try to prevent that  
11          cross-over?

12                   MR. DEMCHINSKI: I believe there's  
13           been discussion as to proposing something along  
14           that edge to deter people from walking over to  
15           the adjacent property. However, we haven't -- we  
16           haven't looked at any alternatives at this point  
17           in time.

18                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there any  
19           proposal to change the elevation from that lot --  
20           I mean, I've seen numerous people drive literally  
21           from McDonald's lot into --

22                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's the  
23           thing.

24                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- the Beef Shack

1 lot over the curb.

2 So, I mean, that will be one of my comments  
3 at the end regarding the landscaping, some type  
4 of an -- even if it's a minimal landscape buffer  
5 there, I think it would be advantageous.

6 All right? That's all I have for  
7 landscaping.

8 MR. DEMCHINSKI: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. STILLWELL: Well, let me just  
10 take a few minutes, if I could, and address the  
11 community standards that were identified or  
12 referenced by the staff report relative to  
13 Section 17.04.400 of the zoning ordinance.

14 And I think the important aspects of what's  
15 being sought through that section of the  
16 ordinance is to look at a variety of different  
17 things that can provide benefit and  
18 justification. It's not a list of mandates but,  
19 rather, are there elements that are consistent  
20 with what's sought or looked at and located in  
21 the certain circumstances, and I believe that we  
22 do that in more than one instance.

23 First of all, and most importantly, I  
24 believe that one of your objectives with the PUD

1 is to help promote economic development,  
2 redevelopment, and to help to eliminate or remove  
3 obsolete buildings, and that's really what we  
4 have here.

5 This building is -- and the purpose of  
6 today's activities -- it is obsolete. It is out  
7 of date. Technologically it's a dinosaur.  
8 Architecturally it's not up to speed with what  
9 the expectations of the company or of the public  
10 or the community are, so we believe that, from a  
11 standpoint that this will facilitate the ability  
12 to redevelop this site and to make a major  
13 economic commitment to the site with millions and  
14 millions of dollars, that it is appropriate for  
15 the PUD.

16 In addition to that we have tried to  
17 incorporate into the site some amenities which we  
18 believe will provide a benefit to our customers,  
19 but, also, the public because the public are our  
20 customers, and that is being addressed through  
21 the outside patio dining areas identified in the  
22 plan.

23 We have also looked at incorporating a  
24 water feature, as identified on the landscape

1 plan by Keith, trying to find ways to actually  
2 make this an integrated component of the area and  
3 to be attractive and harmonious with the  
4 objectives of the City as its community continues  
5 to redevelop.

6 This is a pretty intense area. It's, I  
7 guess, best described as that portion of the  
8 commercial component of the city that's really  
9 strip shopping, so it's pretty intense. It  
10 doesn't have as much character, as much  
11 architectural and landscape beauty as you find in  
12 your downtown area, and we believe that, with  
13 this redevelopment, we are inserting elements  
14 that are more consistent with the type of look  
15 and quality that the community has grown to  
16 respect of its citizens, its corporate citizens.  
17 Again, the PUD helps to promote and enable that  
18 to be accomplished.

19 Your standards actually provide specifically  
20 for this encouragement of redevelopment. So  
21 given that, being a specifically stated objective,  
22 we think it's appropriate to rely upon.

23 I also believe that the landscaping that  
24 will be provided -- McDonald's, I think, has

1           earned a reputation justifiably of providing  
2           enhanced landscaping. We normally provide  
3           overdensity of landscaping. We have some issues  
4           relative to deviations under your ordinance with  
5           respect to certain components which Keith has  
6           addressed, but, for the most part, as you look at  
7           the way the island around the drive-through, the  
8           back of the building, the front of the building,  
9           and those perimeter areas are landscaped, they  
10          are intense and they are very attractive with a  
11          lot of color and foliage that provides nice site  
12          appeal.

13                 Also, the PUD standards make reference to  
14          buildings which offer high-quality architectural  
15          design. And I realize architecture is in the  
16          eyes of the beholder, and anyone could take issue  
17          with it, a given design. I will say that we have  
18          found the reception warm with this architectural  
19          design in most communities, and we do believe  
20          that it's a culmination of a number of efforts to  
21          test what would be the most attractive and  
22          effective image for the corporation. That's why  
23          it's being rolled out in such a broad fashion  
24          throughout the nation.

1                   So, again, the PUD, I think, will help to  
2                   implement the utilization of our superior or  
3                   high-quality architectural design on the site.

4                   The site will also incorporate appropriate  
5                   stormwater management requirements, bring us up  
6                   to compliance under your ordinance, so, again,  
7                   meeting one of the objectives of your PUD  
8                   standards.

9                   So given those positive elements and what I  
10                  believe to be a dearth of negative impacts to the  
11                  public, I believe that the PUD does serve a  
12                  purpose and that it is appropriate, and the  
13                  deviations, I believe, are, in fact, consistent  
14                  with those objectives.

15                  The traffic study or the parking study that  
16                  has been done by V3 and submitted as a part of  
17                  the application goes through an analysis basically  
18                  of three components.

19                  One, what does the City's Code require?  
20                  Which is 52 spaces for this 5,200-square-foot  
21                  building.

22                  What is the current building demand as  
23                  currently exists, with the less efficient -- far  
24                  less efficient drive-through system as in place



1 at this time, which is 48 spaces, based upon  
2 peak-hour operation, which includes some of that  
3 borrowed parking from adjacent users, and what's  
4 happening, what's been the experience with other  
5 facilities that have incorporated this far more  
6 efficient system and similar types of store with  
7 similar capacity, what have they needed to  
8 effectively operate in the marketplace, and what  
9 have studies demonstrated during peak hours that  
10 the parking occupancy consists of?

11 When we did those four stores in Naperville  
12 over the last 12 months, we did a number of studies  
13 associated with each of those applications to  
14 address all of those same questions, and  
15 consistently, based upon extensive examination on  
16 a large number of existing stores where there's  
17 been redevelopment -- new development or  
18 redevelopment with the side-by-side drive-through  
19 system, consistently the required number of  
20 spaces, depending on the size of the buildings,  
21 ranged anywhere from 32 up to 42 spaces. 32 to 42.

22 The only time -- the only time that we have  
23 experienced the need to get a 50-space count is  
24 if there's a Play Place associated with that

1 store, and the reason for that is that the Play  
2 Place changes the demographic and the customer  
3 preference and orientation. There's a larger  
4 component that comes at lunch that has an intent  
5 with children to stay longer.

6 The average turnaround per customer at a  
7 McDonald's restaurant ranges from 15 to 20 minutes.  
8 That changes with the Play Place, and that means  
9 that cars stay in the parking lot longer  
10 associated with that component of the customer  
11 base that utilize the Play Place with their  
12 children, and as a result of that, we found  
13 through studies that is when we start pushing  
14 into the 50-car count range and only then.

15 But there's not a single store, whether it  
16 be stores we have studied in West Chicago, at  
17 Washington and 59, or the Wheaton stores on  
18 County Farm and Danada and Naperville Road, the  
19 Glen Ellyn store, we've studied no less than  
20 12 different stores to make sure that our data is  
21 reliable and consistent, because as much as you  
22 might not want to accept this, it's very  
23 important for McDonald's that they be accurate,  
24 in tune with their customers.

1                   We do want these stores to operate  
2                   effectively. We want to make sure that we hit  
3                   the amount of parking that's reasonably needed to  
4                   address the normal peak hour.

5                   There is no question that occasionally you  
6                   can get an unexpected surge, whether it be a  
7                   special event, a holiday, kids are out for  
8                   teacher conferences and all of a sudden a lot of  
9                   people come. Those kinds of surges can sometimes  
10                  create an overcapacity or undercapacity situation.

11                  That's the rare exception. Our studies  
12                  have clearly demonstrated, consistent with what  
13                  V3 has identified in their report, the  
14                  appropriate demand for this type of store, this  
15                  size of store, is around 41 spaces.

16                  So the 49 spaces we propose will, in fact,  
17                  accommodate and will also provide for a bit of a  
18                  buffer for surge times or in the event that we  
19                  are not able to effectively control some of that  
20                  off-site utilization as identified in the report.

21                  With respect to the signage deviation, it's  
22                  not the deviations -- clearly they're not the  
23                  variations solely. Technically it's not really  
24                  the variation standards that are applicable, but

1 I do think that there's a component of -- of how  
2 you analyze variation standards as appropriate  
3 for consideration with deviations, and one of the  
4 key things, when you talk hardship associated  
5 with variations, that certainly is not a  
6 deviation standard, but one of the elements of  
7 how you determine hardship is, there is a -- it's  
8 a weighting, it's a weighting effect. You weight  
9 and consider the public benefit to be served by  
10 enforcing the ordinance versus the private  
11 detriment to be experienced if it's not varied or  
12 deviated from.

13 And what we're seeing here, in our opinion,  
14 is that, given the nature of this environment,  
15 the type of traffic volumes that exist in this  
16 location and the intensity of the commercial  
17 development that's around this site, that the  
18 proposed signage is -- is attractive; it's  
19 consistent; it's justified; it's serving an  
20 important purpose for the Applicant, and there's  
21 not an offsetting public interest to be  
22 accomplished or achieved by strictly enforcing  
23 the letter of the ordinance with respect to the  
24 east and west elevations in this instance, so we

1 believe it's appropriate to allow this signage  
2 for this particular fact and circumstance.

3 That concludes our presentation this  
4 evening. We'll all be very happy to answer any  
5 questions that you might have relative to the  
6 plans or the other elements that we've addressed  
7 this evening.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

9 Thank you.

10 Questions from Plan Commissioners?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a few.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Hank, I  
14 probably mentioned this at the beginning, but I  
15 know we talked about eliminating curb cuts, but I  
16 don't think I saw where they were going to occur.

17 MR. STILLWELL: Let me show you those.

18 Currently what you'll see is, I believe --

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There's

20 four now.

21 MR. STILLWELL: Yes. There's four cuts.

22 I'm not sure -- Ted, are these actually --

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Where are

24 they?

1 MR. STILLWELL: Are they currently  
2 located -- so you've got one, two, three, four,  
3 or something like that currently.

4 These are being closed in in the middle, so  
5 those two are lost, and then you just have the  
6 remaining two on each extreme on the east and the  
7 west.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.  
9 Each end?

10 MR. STILLWELL: Right.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I'm  
12 curious -- and I may be jumping around a little  
13 bit but allow me.

14 What is the -- do you have a percentage of  
15 the business that's drive-through at this location?

16 MR. LARDAS: 72 percent.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 72 percent.

18 And you're anticipating that may increase  
19 as a result of this?

20 MR. LARDAS: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. All  
22 right. And I thought you mentioned -- did you  
23 mention a third pull-up window, a pull-ahead  
24 window? But I only see two.

1 MR. STILLWELL: Let me show you on --  
2 well, you know what? Look at the new elevation.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, it's on  
4 the new?

5 MR. STILLWELL: I'm sorry. I failed  
6 to mention that. I didn't point that out when I  
7 handed that out.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

9 MR. STILLWELL: When you look at the  
10 bottom drawing, you'll see it's added on the east  
11 side of that elevation.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh.

13 MR. STILLWELL: The east of that  
14 elevation.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And 49 is the  
16 reduction that you're looking for. I notice it's  
17 also in here -- it says "50."

18 MR. STILLWELL: We -- we had to  
19 eliminate a space because we were in violation of  
20 our stacking requirement. We couldn't have the  
21 stacking behind it so we took a space out.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Okay.

23 And then -- oh, this was curious.

24 I noticed somewhere it said that there was

1 reduction in the impervious surface because of  
2 the size of the building on the property.

3 What -- why is there a reduction in  
4 impervious surface?

5 MR. STILLWELL: Well, if you go to  
6 the site right now, it's a huge parking lot.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

8 MR. STILLWELL: So it's a sea of  
9 asphalt currently.

10 So with the redevelopment of this site and  
11 redesign relative to -- the building is bigger,  
12 going from 4,500 to 5,200 square feet, but  
13 there's a more efficient design relative to the  
14 layout of the circulation, parking, and exterior  
15 drive-up facilities which then results in  
16 actually more open space than currently exists  
17 today.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So -- so  
19 there's -- I mean, there's still parking.  
20 There's still asphalt so because of the size of  
21 the building, you're reducing impervious space?

22 MR. STILLWELL: Well, it's not  
23 because of the size of the building, but the  
24 building is larger.



1                   The reason that there's more --

2                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Less  
3                   impervious.

4                   MR. STILLWELL: -- there's less  
5                   impervious space, and that really relates into  
6                   more of the up-to-date standards that you're  
7                   seeing implemented here than you see routinely,  
8                   which is, there's lot more emphasis on green  
9                   space and landscaping today than there ever was.

10                  We all embrace it. We all like to go a  
11                  place that feels comfortable because it's  
12                  attractive and that's -- I mean, that's a very  
13                  important component for the Applicant, as well,  
14                  believe me. Those are dollars well spent, and  
15                  the Applicant wants to enhance the aesthetics of  
16                  the site with landscaping, so that's why you're  
17                  seeing, as much as possible, greater emphasis on  
18                  that in this redevelopment.

19                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I think I  
20                  have a couple of questions for staff.

21                  I understand the discussion about why you  
22                  might make this a PUD, but -- or why it might fit  
23                  into the PUD ordinance, but I want to know why  
24                  would you do that? I mean, I understand that you

1           could say --

2                         MR. STILLWELL: Why are we asking?

3                         VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Why are we  
4 asking for it?

5                         MR. STILLWELL: I'll tell you why  
6 we're asking for it, and I -- I have to tread  
7 lightly on this because I think that there's more  
8 to why we're asking than just that we're trying  
9 to circumvent a provision of the ordinance.  
10 There's more to it. I want to preface those  
11 comments with that statement.

12                         But there is a dilemma under your existing  
13 zoning ordinance, and I will say this is fairly  
14 unique. I haven't run across this in other  
15 communities, and I have been in an awful lot of  
16 communities, but under your zoning ordinance, you  
17 cannot vary the parking count requirement.

18                         VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Unless it's  
19 in a PUD.

20                         MR. STILLWELL: Unless it's in a PUD.

21                         It's a deviation; it's not a variation. So  
22 you structured your Zoning Ordinance and you all  
23 made the decision as to what was appropriate, but  
24 you very narrowly defined what can be varied, and

1 parking is not part of it, and I'll tell you the  
2 problem with that.

3 That's probably one of the examples of  
4 something on the standard that should be far more  
5 dynamic than static because of the changes that  
6 are occurring routinely in various types of uses.

7 It's awfully hard to put these activities  
8 in a box and say they apply evenly to all comers  
9 no matter what the circumstances, and it probably  
10 should have more flexibility relative to whatever  
11 the established experience and norms based upon  
12 the methodologies used and implemented by that  
13 particular user.

14 McDonald's has spent a lot of money to  
15 design a system that is so much more efficient  
16 than used to be. And just so you understand --  
17 and I hope I'm not repeating things I've said  
18 before -- but this side-by-side drive-through  
19 system goes far beyond what you see outside with  
20 two order locations. It's a total revamp of all  
21 of the technology associated with it: New  
22 computer systems, new hardware and software that  
23 helps them make sure that all of the cars get the  
24 correct order relative to the picture-taking

1 of -- of the car when it takes the order, and,  
2 also, redesigning the whole kitchen so that,  
3 based upon the geometric analysis and distance  
4 between the pickup window and the order point,  
5 they will have, on balance, a great majority of  
6 the time the food will be ready because the food  
7 is made to order. It's not made -- prepared in  
8 advance.

9 So there was a tremendous amount of  
10 technological evolution that went into that whole  
11 redevelopment of their image and how their system  
12 works, and that's why there's so much more and so  
13 much more efficiency in this than you would  
14 expect just by adding that second order location.

15 MR. O'ROURKE: Hank, if I can just  
16 ask this, too. I think this serves Mr. Kessler's  
17 questions very well.

18 Could you explain to me the conversation  
19 you had with staff regarding the size of the  
20 building and how you're not -- there's really no  
21 flexibility as to how big it can be, because I  
22 think that's very important to what can fit on  
23 this site and what can't, in terms of there's the  
24 prototypes and there's really no variation in

1           between. I think that might help explain a  
2           little bit of --

3                       MR. STILLWELL: As I mentioned earlier,  
4           the -- the company is involved in extremely,  
5           extremely extensive and expensive rebranding  
6           throughout the nation.

7                       As a result of that, they took extreme  
8           steps to protect what they were doing, including  
9           trademarking all of these designs.

10                      That's good in some ways; it's bad in some  
11           ways because it creates much less flexibility in  
12           what the organization can do without violating  
13           its trademark protections, and so we have  
14           specific standard prototypes, architectural  
15           designs, elements within those architectural  
16           designs that through trademarking have to be  
17           protected.

18                      And what happens whenever there's an  
19           attempt or request for a change, I literally have  
20           to submit that request back through the corporate  
21           legal team because they have to determine whether  
22           or not it can even be done without violating  
23           trademark protection which would then erode the  
24           statutory protection.

1                   And I'm not using that as an excuse. It's  
2                   just a fact. There is such a major economic  
3                   investment that the company found it necessary to  
4                   protect what it was doing, and it did create a  
5                   little bit less flexibility than we used to have  
6                   relative to changing certain things, so we're  
7                   pretty well committed relative to what this  
8                   building consists of at this location.

9                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That still  
10                  doesn't answer my question about parking, the  
11                  overflow lane, because they didn't actually meet  
12                  the on-site parking standard at that other  
13                  location.

14                 MR. O'ROURKE: They -- they did not  
15                 meet the stacking space requirements. They --  
16                 they were not in the PUD, so they had to meet the  
17                 on-site parking.

18                 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I thought  
19                 they reduced the adjoining properties. They used  
20                 shared parking.

21                 MR. O'ROURKE: They may have done  
22                 that. I'd have to -- I don't recall but that's  
23                 something that is allowed through the Code.

24                 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And how would

1 we treat these other deviations if it wasn't  
2 a PUD?

3 MR. O'ROURKE: Certain ones that are  
4 being proposed -- the landscape buffer yard  
5 requirement on the south property line, for  
6 instance -- can be varied by the Zoning Board of  
7 Appeals. There are very limited items that are  
8 allowed to be.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Signage.

10 MR. O'ROURKE: Signage is one of the  
11 things that is allowed to be varied through these  
12 four things, limited to setbacks, lot area, lot  
13 width --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And a PUD is  
15 not just for parking, but for the signage, as well?

16 MR. O'ROURKE: Pretty much every  
17 deviation that's been requested, except for that  
18 setback deviation request, that could be handled  
19 as a variance; but the other ones, it could not be.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right.  
21 Thank you.

22 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Earlier you were  
23 asked a question about the three windows.

24 That's a similar system that is shown at

1           Burger King, as well.

2                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
3 other questions?

4           Sorry. Sue.

5                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Mr. Stillwell,  
6 the space -- spaces that we're counting for,  
7 there are supposed to be 49 of them.

8           Does that include spaces across the front  
9 along the North Avenue street?

10                  MR. STILLWELL: It does.

11                  MEMBER AMATANGELO: The parallel  
12 parking?

13                  MR. STILLWELL: Five spaces are  
14 included in that.

15                  MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. Very good.

16           Then, also, where exactly are the -- the --  
17 is the lighting going, the posts for the lighting  
18 and so forth?

19                  MR. STILLWELL: Well, this is really  
20 a concept plan, so we haven't really done  
21 preliminary engineering.

22           Have we located the light standard or is  
23 that coming at the preliminary level?

24                  MR. FEENSTRA: It would be located at



1 the preliminary level. We do have a board with  
2 that.

3 MR. STILLWELL: There's a preliminary  
4 photometric plan.

5 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Well, actually,  
6 it's part photometric and part landscaping that  
7 I'm after here.

8 MR. STILLWELL: Okay. Well,  
9 understand -- I'll pull this down so you can see  
10 it a little bit and I'll get by the microphone.

11 It looks like we do have some photometric  
12 analysis based upon some projected locations for  
13 the free-standing monument within the parking  
14 area, but you can see the standards that are  
15 called out.

16 Their height will be consistent with the  
17 Code. Their -- their wattage, illumination, and  
18 the whatever intensity is allowed at the property  
19 line will be complied with.

20 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Is this going to  
21 be a 24-hour --

22 MR. STILLWELL: Yes.

23 MEMBER AMATANGELO: -- location?

24 Okay.

1 MR. STILLWELL: Now, one of the  
2 things that McDonald's is doing and what we would  
3 like to have for this location -- I believe,  
4 John, the drive-through and --

5 MR. LARDAS: -- and dining room  
6 weren't all open right now.

7 MR. STILLWELL: McDonald's is now  
8 moving to a 24-hour, not just drive-through, but,  
9 also, inside seating operation.

10 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. And then,  
11 that way, the lighting will have to be on all  
12 night long, I take it.

13 MR. STILLWELL: Correct.

14 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. All right.

15 If you had only three places that you could  
16 put signage on the building, where would they be?

17 MR. STILLWELL: Three places.

18 MEMBER AMATANGELO: You're asking for  
19 six; right?

20 MR. STILLWELL: Right.

21 Well, we -- we would -- I'd have to turn  
22 that over to John and corporate because that's  
23 not my call. I mean, I can speculate on where I  
24 think it would be appropriately located.

1 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Certainly.

2 MR. STILLWELL: You have to remember  
3 that, of those six, three of them are just the  
4 arch logos, so they are -- it's not like they are  
5 imposing signage because there's more elements,  
6 but I can't honestly find out -- where is John --  
7 whether you have a smile right now.

8 MR. FEENSTRA: It's very hard.

9 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Sure.

10 MR. STILLWELL: I think we would have  
11 to sit down internally and analyze that and  
12 determine where would those signs most effectively  
13 be utilized and what signs would be appropriate.

14 MEMBER AMATANGELO: And how many signs  
15 are on the building today?

16 MR. STILLWELL: John?

17 MR. LARDAS: Pardon me?

18 MR. STILLWELL: How many signs are on  
19 the current building?

20 MR. LARDAS: Four or five. I'm not  
21 sure.

22 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay.

23 MR. STILLWELL: Four or five.

24 MR. LARDAS: But the building is set,

1 the new building, this is going sideways.

2 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Right.

3 MR. STILLWELL: Yes. It is an  
4 east-west.

5 MR. LARDAS: It's an east-west.

6 MEMBER AMATANGELO: But the position  
7 of the signage on the building today, is it  
8 somewhat like what you're proposing here, where  
9 there's one on each elevation? Is that -- is  
10 that the way it's set up today?

11 MR. STILLWELL: Why don't you come up.

12 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Come on up.

13 MR. LARDAS: John Lardas.

14 MEMBER AMATANGELO: The signage on  
15 the building today, is this set up the same way  
16 as you're proposing, to have it on the new  
17 building where there's one on each -- each  
18 elevation?

19 MR. LARDAS: There's a large -- we've  
20 got the sign "McDonald's" in the front, and I  
21 think there's arches on both sides of the building,  
22 but now, by turning it around, we are trying to  
23 get the arches -- I mean, the "McDonald's" to  
24 face 64, but, also, the front of the building

1 sort of faces east, so I think that's where the  
2 dilemma is that we're in, but we're trying to put  
3 the building sideways. It will be facing 64. We  
4 need signage over there on 64.

5 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So -- so you  
6 don't think that the -- the sign right up on the  
7 street sign itself will be enough, sufficient  
8 enough?

9 MR. LARDAS: No. We're going to  
10 monument signs for the big sign, and those  
11 monument signs, you probably see them when you're  
12 on -- basically, on the sign, and that's one of  
13 the problems that we run into with the monument  
14 signs.

15 MEMBER AMATANGELO: All right.  
16 Thank you.

17 Also, I was curious as to if there was a  
18 reason why you chose not to go with the  
19 two-colored bricking on the other side of the  
20 building, as well.

21 MR. STILLWELL: The reason that it  
22 has normally been done that way is that, on the  
23 drive-through side, there's no opportunity for a  
24 foundation landscaping at all, and so to break up

1           the horizontal nature of it and create some  
2           verticality, they used a different shading of  
3           brick, whereas on the nondrive-through elevation,  
4           there's more opportunities for landscaping and  
5           vertical relief through landscaping components.

6                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. All right.  
7           And one more.

8                   I don't know if you actually pointed out  
9           where the fountain will go.

10                   MR. STILLWELL: I was hoping that  
11           Keith would identify that. I think that that's  
12           really something that's still in process that  
13           will have to be designed into the preliminary  
14           plans which will be the next step --

15                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay.

16                   MR. STILLWELL: -- if the concept  
17           makes sense.

18                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: All right. Very  
19           good.

20                   MR. O'ROURKE: Right now, it's just  
21           to the west of the outdoor seating area, so to  
22           clarify that, but the property will move a  
23           little bit.

24                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. Thanks.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, my question  
3 pertains to the signage.

4 You had in your presentation spoken about  
5 the prototype and then the protection that the  
6 AT&T corporation has to protect their image, and  
7 I am -- I understand concerning the McDonald's  
8 and the arch because those are very -- you know,  
9 from -- that design and protection of that, but  
10 getting away from the prototype of the building  
11 and the Signature Series here, do you have  
12 flexibility as it relates to the amount of signs  
13 that are placed on the building or is there a  
14 directive in the -- in -- in the prototype itself  
15 which says signs should be on the various  
16 elevations? Or do you have freedom to be able  
17 to --

18 MR. STILLWELL: There is. That is  
19 not mandated by the trademark protection, this  
20 specific -- particularly the signs in those  
21 locations. There's some tie-in relative to the  
22 arch sign element with the arcades and the roof  
23 cap element, but -- but with respect to --  
24 directly to your question, we are not

1 specifically locked into the exact sign plan that  
2 we have shown you.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else?

5 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I do have one more  
6 question.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

8 MEMBER AMATANGELO: On the outdoor  
9 seating area, it looks like there's parking.  
10 There is some landscaping but there's also  
11 parking around that.

12 MR. STILLWELL: Yes.

13 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Are there going  
14 to be planned provisions to have some sort of a  
15 fencing or something to protect the diners there?

16 MR. STILLWELL: Well, you do have the  
17 curb element.

18 Whether or not -- I mean, they do --  
19 actually, quite frankly, I wouldn't be surprised.  
20 They intend to use that with that outdoor patio.

21 John, what do you have with that guard  
22 type --

23 MR. LARDAS: If we put an outdoor  
24 patio, there will be a fence around it.



1                   MEMBER AMATANGELO:   Okay.   Good  
2                   enough.   Thank you.

3                   MEMBER HENNINGSON:   I did have another  
4                   question on the signage.

5                   On your location in Naperville, do you have  
6                   any locations where the building is parallel to  
7                   the street like this one is --

8                   MR. STILLWELL:   Yes.

9                   MEMBER HENNINGSON:   -- and you've  
10                  done signage on all three sides on those?

11                  MR. STILLWELL:   I'm thinking of --

12                  MR. LARDAS:   Randall Road is facing  
13                  the one side street, where we sort of -- it's  
14                  facing Randall Road, but the sign has the  
15                  McDonald's sign plus the sign in the front plus  
16                  the Play Place in the back.

17                  MR. STILLWELL:   I would have to look  
18                  at that Naperville store.   It's on Route 59 in a  
19                  shopping center called Design Pointe.   It's a  
20                  little bit south of I-88 past Diehl Road.   I  
21                  would have to check.

22                  Their sign ordinance on wall signage -- our  
23                  normal sign package, which this is pretty much  
24                  it, was in full compliance with their Code.   We

1           didn't have to have any deviations. You're far  
2           more restrictive.

3                     Wall sign -- I'll tell you where you're  
4           really restrictive is really shocking to me --  
5           that's probably an overstatement. It's  
6           surprising to me -- sorry about that.

7                     I was very surprised to see one wall sign.  
8           That's really surprising in today's climate,  
9           especially with a business like this. We're not  
10          the only one where you have logo elements which  
11          are considered signs. They are not imposing like  
12          these arches, and suddenly you've got three right  
13          off the bat just using the logos, so that's  
14          pretty surprising.

15                    But we have, I would guess, on that  
16          building -- I would say we have five or six wall  
17          signs easily, but I'd have to go back and look at  
18          the plan to give you an honest answer. I just  
19          know we had no problems with our standard package  
20          at that location.

21                           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anyone  
22          else?

23   (No response.)

24                           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any

1 members of the audience wish to ask any questions  
2 of the Applicant or offer any comments?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have just a --  
5 you know, one of the things that I've noticed --  
6 and this wasn't in the report but I just want  
7 to -- maybe the owner would know about this.

8 I've noticed quite often in the current  
9 parking lot, the way it's configured, we have a  
10 lot of commercial trucks and buses.

11 MR. LARDAS: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Buses parking.

13 Has that become an issue as of late? And  
14 I'm assuming that, hopefully, setting the parking  
15 up this way will serve to eliminate this issue.

16 MR. LARDAS: Right now, it's no  
17 issue. It's no issue.

18 But a lot of times, like I say, we get  
19 commercial trucks or landscapers pulling the  
20 trailer, they'll take three or four parking  
21 spaces, and lot of times, when you go down to  
22 41 spaces, that starts really hurting you at that  
23 point.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

1                   MR. LARDAS: I know, with that  
2                   parallel parking, I think will help with those,  
3                   with the trucks or trailers. They will use those  
4                   right away if they're open.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

6                   By the way, who -- who will use them?

7                   MR. LARDAS: The trucks, stuff like  
8                   that, because they're -- they're longer spaces at  
9                   that point.

10                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Well, I  
11                  guess what my concern is, I mean, I've noticed  
12                  buses -- you know, school buses coming in and  
13                  taking up eight spaces.

14                  When we drop down to 48 spaces, does that  
15                  mean that we're going to have 40 spaces because  
16                  we have a --

17                  MR. LARDAS: If there's a school bus  
18                  that's parking along there --

19                  MR. STILLWELL: That's the kind of  
20                  dynamic that we obviously can only so much -- if  
21                  we -- if we actually came in with 75 spaces,  
22                  people we say, "Wait a minute. We're paving the  
23                  landscape unnecessarily."

24                  But I understand what you're saying, and

1           just -- this is not particularly relevant here,  
2           but that does happen.

3                     For example, at the Danada store in Wheaton,  
4           on Naperville Road, there's an Aldi's just to the  
5           west of that store. There's a private access  
6           road and an Aldi's, and all the school bus  
7           drivers go over to Aldi's and they park over  
8           there and they walk over.

9                     Normally these sites -- and this one will  
10          be the same as we develop it -- do not  
11          accommodate school bus parking on them, and you  
12          will not see school buses being bold enough to  
13          come onto this site. I've never seen a school  
14          bus on a redeveloped site.

15                    It doesn't mean it doesn't happen because  
16          I'm not there all the time, but when the site has  
17          the one integrated circulation system like this  
18          does, with the perimeter parking as opposed to  
19          the multiple parking aisle configuration that  
20          exists today which invites -- especially with the  
21          number of curb cuts there -- it invites a large  
22          vehicle to pull in off that curb cut without  
23          having to negotiate anything, that you just park  
24          right there because it's an oversized parking

1 field.

2 That's going to go away with this new design.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. That's  
4 exactly what I wanted to know.

5 Everything else was answered. Okay.

6 Oh. There isn't any type of a shared  
7 parking agreement in effect now with Beef Shack  
8 or --

9 MR. LARDAS: No.

10 MR. STILLWELL: No. There is no  
11 joint parking.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. All  
13 right. If there aren't any other questions, then  
14 what I'll do is poll the Plan Commission --  
15 anything from staff?

16 MR. O'ROURKE: Just -- just a  
17 highlight that there were some things in the  
18 staff memo, the end of the memo, some particular  
19 questions that I think the Applicant would like  
20 to answer; for staff, as well, so just to  
21 highlight those, in your summation, if you can  
22 comment on those, that would be a big help for  
23 us. In particular, they are on page 8 of the  
24 staff memo.

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'll answer  
2                   those questions. I'll run through them and tell  
3                   you what I think.

4                   I think it does advance one or more of  
5                   the -- where is that? Page 1 of this?

6                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

7                   The questions are, "Does the proposal  
8                   advance one or more of the purposes established  
9                   in Section 17.04.400.A," as in, "Is this an  
10                  appropriate project for the use of a PUD."

11                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I think  
12                  that -- I think that it advances a few of them.

13                  Without going through them all, it's a  
14                  creative approach to site improvements, preserving  
15                  some native vegetation, promote economic  
16                  development, encourage redevelopment of the site,  
17                  and it encourages a collaborative process.

18                  I, frankly, you know, don't have a problem  
19                  with the deviation from 52 to 50 parking spaces.  
20                  I can't see that that's going to change the  
21                  course of events, but, you know --

22                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What is this,  
23                  "Should the Applicant remove the proposed  
24                  parallel off-street parking spaces?"

1                   MR. O'ROURKE: That was an idea  
2 promoted by staff in the staff memo.

3                   Basically, when we looked at that, we  
4 thought there could be some problems with folks  
5 entering the site from that easternmost curb cut  
6 off Route 64 and some conflicts of interest of  
7 people backing out of those spaces, maybe taking  
8 some time.

9                   What we were suggesting is, if the parking  
10 study shows that those are not needed, do you  
11 have any comments on whether you feel they're  
12 needed? Would you rather see them or not? We're  
13 just looking for some --

14                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: How many are there?

15                  MR. O'ROURKE: I believe five total.  
16 So instead of reducing it to 49 spaces, there  
17 will be a reduction to 44 total or some  
18 combination thereof, and maybe a couple of them  
19 go away.

20                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We don't have  
21 a potential reduction in the drive-through  
22 facility because you addressed that with your  
23 window.

24                  I do -- I don't have an issue, but the



1           proposed deviation of the landscape buffer yard,  
2           I'm not -- Todd brought up one, and that's to the  
3           west, and that's between the Beef Shack, and I  
4           think there needs to be some sort of --

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think there is a  
6           demonstrated need.

7                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There's a  
8           demonstrated need.

9                   And in addition to that, I'm not really  
10          thrilled with the south having a concrete wall  
11          with a fence on top of it. I'm not sure what you  
12          can do there, but I think we need to have some  
13          sort of -- it doesn't look great. I mean, it's  
14          got a beat-up fence, so somehow we could  
15          incorporate, perhaps, a, you know, planting,  
16          planter-type demarcation between that and the  
17          south lot.

18                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me ask you  
19          this, Tim.

20                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Sure.

21                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If there was a  
22          determination that those parallel parking spaces  
23          are not necessary --

24                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, you

1 know --

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- and the building  
3 would be moved --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I thought of  
5 that, again.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- and a landscape  
7 buffer on the south side --

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I also  
9 said at the beginning a reduction of two spaces,  
10 to me, doesn't -- isn't going to change things  
11 much, but now you're talking about seven spaces,  
12 and now you're starting to get a little bit --

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's  
15 starting to take --

16 MR. STILLWELL: Eight spaces.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pardon me?

18 MR. STILLWELL: Actually, eight spaces.  
19 We're out at 49 right now, not 50, because we had  
20 to remove one more space so there was no conflict  
21 with the drive-through.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

23 Even 49.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Removing the

1           parallels bring us to what?

2                           MR. O'ROURKE: 44.

3                           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 44.

4                           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

5                           And now you think we're starting to run  
6           into some problems.

7                           MEMBER PRETZ: And I think you had  
8           mentioned that there -- in your studies, 41 is  
9           what this store probably would -- definitely needs?

10                          MR. STILLWELL: Right.

11                          We would not even consider going below  
12           41 spaces. We feel that that's really our peak  
13           demand need based upon the projections and the  
14           analysis done by the traffic consultant.

15                          But we also feel that 49 is a much more  
16           comfortable number simply because there are those  
17           special occasions when we get spikes in activity  
18           beyond the normal peak, or if we have some  
19           problems, we'll look at that west side.

20                          Clearly we prefer not to have people  
21           utilize our site for off-site facilities. That's  
22           going to be challenging almost to the point of  
23           looking at maybe a fence or something. I don't  
24           know how that plays out, whether you get rid of

1           maybe some type of adaptive-type fence, but  
2           there's definitely room for something there.

3                         CHAIRMAN WALLACE: One of the  
4           McDonald's that I'm thinking of -- and I don't  
5           know if -- I mean, I'm sure that you're familiar  
6           with it. Maybe I'm thinking of it wrong -- but I  
7           believe it's in Glen Ellyn on Route 38, and they  
8           have a black wrought-iron fencing which actually  
9           is attractive, and it has plantings along it.

10                        The reason I thought of it is, the buffer  
11           is probably -- it's probably wider than that. It  
12           seems like it's only that wide, but it's -- you  
13           know, they have just tall plantings along the --  
14           the fence and I don't think --

15                        MR. STILLWELL: That's the one.

16                        CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- it's a stockade  
17           fence or something like that.

18                        MR. STILLWELL: Right.

19                        I think the challenge here is that to have  
20           any kind of viability in the back would probably  
21           need at least 3 feet.

22                        Is that about right, Keith?

23                        MR. DEMCHINSKI: Yes.

24                        MR. STILLWELL: We just don't have

1           3 feet of plantable area in that portion of the  
2           site plan.

3                   We're looking -- we'll definitely look to  
4           what possibly could be done that would be  
5           attractive that helps create what -- the effect  
6           you're trying to achieve, but landscaping is  
7           going to be really challenging for that.

8                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: You know, you  
9           could even try a mural of some sort. Of course,  
10          that would have to be kept up every so many years  
11          and, you know, it's not a blank, ugly wall. You  
12          can paint a mural on there.

13                   You could even do -- and this is getting a  
14          little fancy -- but I think it's called an  
15          espalier, where it's a type of planting that is  
16          almost like a tree, that is specifically grown to  
17          go that way, you know, just flat.

18                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vertical  
19          garden.

20                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Like vertical  
21          gardens, right.

22                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right up the  
23          wall.

24                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Or spike strips.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Or promote --

2 MR. STILLWELL: Remember, they won't  
3 see the store from the street. You have to --

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I want --  
5 and just I asked that because I know we're  
6 talking about that western boundary. I think we  
7 should -- you should consider something similar  
8 along this southern boundary, something to  
9 beautify the southern boundary somehow. Perhaps  
10 it isn't --

11 MR. STILLWELL: We'll look at that.  
12 Right now it's a chain link with slats.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

14 MR. STILLWELL: We'll take a look  
15 at it.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The slats  
17 regularly come out and dangle and --

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: They're bent.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They don't look  
20 great.

21 MR. LARDAS: We'll have to change it  
22 because it's falling down anyway.

23 MR. STILLWELL: That's really not up  
24 to current standards, and so I think that's --

1           that fence is going to go and we'll look at what  
2           are good options relative to that, but the thing  
3           is there it's not just a decorative fence. You  
4           want some real screening benefits there. Even  
5           though it's just a parking lot, I think you want  
6           to screen it.

7                         VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So instead  
8           of, you know, perhaps in those locations  
9           landscape buffers, come up with some sort of  
10          attractive buffer between them.

11                        I think the architecture of the building is  
12          appropriate. I think it's nice looking.

13                        My only concern with the proposed signage  
14          is, what happens when the next guy comes along  
15          and wants to do the same thing? I mean --

16                        MR. O'ROURKE: They'd have to -- from  
17          a staff perspective, they would have to also make  
18          the case that their site and their particular  
19          redevelopment project is worthy of a PUD. You  
20          know, it's a case by case kind of consideration,  
21          so it depends on what they're doing and how it  
22          goes at that time.

23                        I don't -- you know --

24                        VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think one of

1           the issues that you have to deal with is, this  
2           sign is looking so nice; it's going to stick out  
3           like a sore thumb.

4                   MR. STILLWELL:  Actually, our signage  
5           is so attractive that actually it becomes an  
6           architectural element.

7                   MEMBER HENNINGSON:  You know, in  
8           mind, as to the signage, of course, it's to the  
9           benefit of McDonald's to have signage, but it's  
10          also a benefit to the community because people  
11          can see signs prior to pulling in at the last  
12          minute.

13                   You know, if you have just one on the north  
14          side, you know, all of sudden you don't realize  
15          it's a McDonald's and then you try and get in.

16                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER:  Who of us  
17          here doesn't drive down the road looking so far  
18          ahead so they can find a McDonald's?  Everybody  
19          here does it.

20                   No, we don't.

21                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  All right.  Any  
22          other comments?

23                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER:  No.

24                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  Okay.  Did you



1 want to make a comment or --

2 MEMBER HENNINGSON: I like the  
3 proposal. I like the concept as proposed by the  
4 owner. I think it's a very attractive building.  
5 I think it's going to be an addition to the west  
6 side of St. Charles.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Sue.

8 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I just wanted to  
9 comment that I like the new design. I like the  
10 way that you've utilized the property itself. I  
11 think the way it was set up before was a big tar  
12 and cement area, it felt like, more than anything  
13 else.

14 Now it's -- it looks like it's going to be  
15 a destination, a place where you want to go and  
16 just kind of hurry up and get through the  
17 drive-through and get out.

18 It's an attractive design. I think it will  
19 complement the west side beautifully, and I do  
20 agree with the landscaping along the side by the  
21 Beef Shack. I think that that would really be  
22 very, very beneficial if we could. You know, it  
23 doesn't have to be a lot, just something, and I  
24 think that that would be a nice addition.

1 I have no issues with the 49 versus  
2 52 spaces. It looks like you've done a great job  
3 of fitting them in and, you know, there is a  
4 little caution with those that would be parallel  
5 parking, parking in the front and the potential  
6 for those backing out to have -- you know, to run  
7 into someone that's trying to parallel park. It  
8 could be a little bit of confusion there, but --  
9 but, all in all, I think I'm okay with that.

10 MR. STILLWELL: Could I just  
11 interject one thing? Because I've heard it  
12 mentioned twice, people backing out.

13 With the parallel, there actually is a  
14 protected barrier. If you look at the plan at  
15 the end of the space, you have landscaping here.  
16 So with respect to that east entry, there will be  
17 no backing. The area is protected.

18 MEMBER AMATANGELO: No. But I was  
19 talking about the spaces right across -- right up  
20 against the building there.

21 MR. STILLWELL: These right here?

22 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Right.

23 MR. STILLWELL: Oh. I'm sorry.

24 MEMBER AMATANGELO: That would be my

1           only concern there.

2                   I don't have an issue with the -- the green  
3           space setback from 10 to 5 feet on the south side  
4           of the building. Again, I think there are  
5           alternatives.

6                   You know, there is a company in West  
7           Chicago called the Ball Horticultural Company,  
8           and they have cleverly put up a fence that is  
9           very unique. It's kind of like a box-type fence,  
10          although it's made out of wrought iron, I  
11          believe, and it -- it serves two purposes.

12                   One, it will help to -- to encourage the  
13          growth of, say, put a vine or an ivy or something  
14          on it, but in addition to that, when nothing is  
15          going on, it's still a very unique and  
16          attractive-looking fencing so -- and it doesn't  
17          take up a lot of space and could very easily be  
18          put along that wall.

19                   So there are a lot of different  
20          alternatives, I think, Tim, to your point of what  
21          you could do to take care of that wall there,  
22          and -- and I'm sure you will do that.

23                   The signage, going -- going from what you  
24          have now, I know it will feel like a loss if you

1 don't have equal to the number of signs that you  
2 have now. McDonald's is a very well-known name.  
3 The Golden Arches all by themselves will stand  
4 alone.

5 My -- my concern is that, you know, we do  
6 right now say one. I might be willing to find a  
7 compromise at three with you, meeting you halfway,  
8 but -- and -- and I -- I applaud going from  
9 four curb cuts to two. That was well designed.

10 I have to tell you there, pulling into that  
11 lot in days past, it's been, you know, which --  
12 which lot or which -- which driveway am I pulling  
13 into? And it was just very confusing, so -- but  
14 I do like the design, again, and I do like the  
15 way you've positioned it, and I look forward to  
16 seeing this go forward so thank you.

17 MR. STILLWELL: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tom.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Can I just add  
20 two comments?

21 One was as it related to the signage, and I  
22 did understand the argument, and I do believe  
23 that the signage is attractive, but I do have --  
24 I would prefer to see less, so I would hope that

1           you would be able to consider that as you're  
2           moving forward with that.

3                     And the other thing is in relation to the  
4           buffers. With the -- with the effort that you've  
5           put in here in the -- the overall beauty, the  
6           architecture and that, and the amount of money  
7           that you're going to be putting into this, I  
8           think it's in your best interest to help continue  
9           the beautification of your entire property, which  
10          would be the buffer areas and to put that effort  
11          into there and -- and to come up with something  
12          that is both attractive to the new building and  
13          the property, as well as then provide that  
14          separation between the property and the  
15          neighbors, but the rest of it I'm fine with.

16                     CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17           Thank you.

18                     We like to kind of go through everything  
19          because I think a lot of applicants, as we're  
20          going through the presentation, only hear  
21          negatives, but I just want to make sure that you  
22          hear the -- you know, the positives, and even  
23          though the majority of the time may be spent on  
24          certain things, in general, we're happy with

1           what's before us. I think that's what is being  
2           communicated here, and I certainly feel the same.

3                   I don't -- my only concerns I've already  
4           voiced, which is regarding the landscape buffer,  
5           and I also agree with Tim regarding the south --  
6           the south side of the property.

7                   The one other thing that I did want to make  
8           a comment on, though, was I know that there's  
9           another fast food establishment that recently  
10          came in through the approval process in town that  
11          may be located near Lowe's, but one of the things  
12          with their drive-through, it seems like maybe  
13          there's some conflicts that were not a hundred  
14          percent anticipated there because of parking on  
15          both sides of the entry into the drive-through,  
16          and that's one of the things, when you made the  
17          comment about the parallel parking on the site, I  
18          may tend towards not having the parallel parking,  
19          not for the reason of a conflict of people  
20          turning in, but, you know, when people are going  
21          into the drive-through, if there's only people  
22          parking on one side, it's less confusing than  
23          people parking on both sides and having to kind  
24          of shoot down the middle of it.

1                   MR. STILLWELL: Let me just identify  
2                   one thing, and Mr. Lardas just reminded me of this.

3                   Because that raised a question on that, we  
4                   would be willing to actually limit it to employee  
5                   parking. That would give that no movement for  
6                   several hours at a time per shift. That would  
7                   eliminate some of your concerns just voicing  
8                   relative to potential conflict with the  
9                   drive-through, and that would be beneficial.

10                  We -- we normally find that about  
11                  70 percent -- we'll get into the details in the  
12                  preliminary presentation, but about 70 percent of  
13                  the -- of the employees -- staff -- per shift  
14                  bring vehicles, and it varies with different  
15                  stores and location and that type of thing.

16                  So generally speaking, with an average  
17                  shift of about 15 --

18                  MR. LARDAS: 15.

19                  MR. STILLWELL: -- 15 employees.

20                  MR. LARDAS: 15 is a good number.

21                  MR. STILLWELL: So you're shooting  
22                  for 10 to 11 spaces for on-site employee parking.  
23                  So those five spaces, plus the two spaces back by  
24                  the trash corral, we would tend to focus in on

1           employee parking because we know we're going to  
2           need that anyway, and that allows for a more  
3           flexible utilization, and so it will resolve  
4           those conflicts.

5                         CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.  
6           Then I think that's everything I have.

7                         Nothing else from staff?

8                         MR. O'ROURKE: No.

9                         CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then  
10          that concludes Item No. 5 on the agendas.

11                        And thank you, gentlemen.

12                        MR. STILLWELL: Thank you.

13                        CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We appreciate it.  
14          Good luck.

15                        MR. DEMCHINSKI: Thank you.

16                        CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17                        Item 4 on the agenda, then, is a public  
18          hearing. This is general amendments, City of  
19          St. Charles, to two chapters.

20                        The first is Chapter 17.04,  
21          "Administration," pertaining to Planned Unit  
22          Developments and deviations from Chapter 17.18,  
23          "Inclusionary Housing," and Chapter 17.18,  
24          "Inclusionary Housing," pertaining to a



1 percentage of affordable units required to be  
2 constructed as part of a residential development  
3 and to create a process and requirements for an  
4 alternative affordable housing plan.

5 This is a public hearing, and for those of  
6 you who aren't familiar with our process, the  
7 Plan Commission is charged by the City Council  
8 to conduct public hearings for certain purposes,  
9 one of which is this one, which is an amendment  
10 to our Zoning Ordinance.

11 The Plan Commission conducts the public  
12 hearing. Notice is sent out for this hearing,  
13 and our purpose is to gather as much information  
14 as we deem necessary in order to make a  
15 recommendation to the City Council to either  
16 approve or deny the application.

17 Tonight we actually have both the public  
18 hearings as well as the action items on our  
19 agenda, so what we will be doing tonight is, we  
20 will be taking evidence in the form of written  
21 and verbal evidence from the Applicant, which is  
22 the City of St. Charles, as well as questions or  
23 additional evidence from members of the public,  
24 if necessary, and once we feel that we have

1           enough evidence, there will be a motion to close  
2           the public hearing, at which time we will move on  
3           to -- or if we don't feel we have enough  
4           evidence, we will continue the public hearing to  
5           another date in order to get that evidence.

6                     If we feel we have enough, then we will  
7           address the item for action and we will make a  
8           recommendation tonight to the City Council to  
9           either recommend or deny these applications.

10                    Does anyone have a question regarding the  
11           process?

12                                     (No response.)

13                    CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.  
14           At this time I would ask anyone who intends to  
15           give testimony or ask any questions, that you  
16           raise your right hand and be sworn in.

17                                     (One witness was thereupon duly  
18                                     sworn.)

19                    CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

20                    And for anyone else, if you decide that  
21           you're going to ask questions or offer any  
22           testimony, I would ask that you let me know and I  
23           will swear you in, and for anyone who wishes to  
24           speak, please approach the lectern and speak into

1 the microphone, state your full name, including  
2 the spelling of your last name for the record,  
3 and also state your address, and please just  
4 keep in mind that there is a Court Reporter  
5 that's here in the room, and so we can only have  
6 one person talking at a time. He's not that  
7 talented.

8 You don't have to put that down.

9 So at this point in time, we will go ahead  
10 with the Applicant, and then, following that, we  
11 will continue with the rest of our procedure.

12 Is the Applicant ready?

13 MR. O'ROURKE: I am.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. You  
15 may proceed.

16 MR. O'ROURKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 The City of St. Charles staff is bringing  
18 forward tonight a general amendment application  
19 basically to work around two chapters in the  
20 existing Zoning Ordinance; one for  
21 administration, more particularly as it involves  
22 PUDs and approval of the PUDs and, what can be  
23 varied through PUDs as specifically relates to  
24 the other chapter we're looking at variances for,

1 which is Chapter 17.18, "Inclusionary Housing,"  
2 inclusionary housing and our zoning Code.

3 Just to provide a little bit of background  
4 on what's involved with this, the Housing  
5 Commission was formed in 2005.

6 After a few years of work and a lot of  
7 effort, they brought forward the inclusionary  
8 housing ordinance that was approved and adopted  
9 by the City Council in February 2008.

10 What this ordinance does is basically  
11 requires, for all new residential developments,  
12 that a certain percent -- and that is based on  
13 size -- have to be considered affordable, and we  
14 use ISD, the Illinois Housing Development  
15 Authority's standards to establish what that  
16 affordable rate is, and so this ordinance has now  
17 been on record for a few years, and since then we  
18 have had a few sort of high-level residential  
19 development applications come forward, and they  
20 were both in PUDs. They were both proposing to  
21 utilize a PUD, I should say, and they both  
22 requested deviations through the PUD to not  
23 conform to the inclusionary housing, basically  
24 waiving the entirety of the requirement because

1           they thought that that's what they needed to do,  
2           and this is about a year to a year and a few  
3           months ago, and the Housing Commission responded  
4           to these developments as they were going through  
5           the process, and it kind of sparked a bit of a  
6           question on, "Well, these requests are coming in,  
7           and what does that mean? And is the ordinance  
8           really properly equipped to address those when it  
9           happens?"

10                   And after some evaluation we realized, you  
11           know, there probably is some items of this that  
12           have some merit, but we'd like to vet those out  
13           and maybe come up with something that makes it a  
14           little more usable in terms of the Zoning  
15           Ordinance.

16                   So after that effort we've come up with the  
17           ordinances that are being presented here tonight.

18                   In particular, we talked about amending the  
19           Zoning Ordinance -- so this is the administration  
20           chapter of the Zoning Ordinance -- to basically  
21           eliminate the inclusionary housing portion of the  
22           Zoning Ordinance as being an ineligible deviation  
23           for the PUD.

24                   When we examined it, particularly the

1 purposes of the PUD, I think one of them  
2 specifically says, "Are you providing affordable  
3 housing?"

4 It's kind hard to weigh the deviation  
5 request for affordable housing against the fact  
6 that you're supposed to use that as a reason to  
7 establish a PUD, so that's one of the items we  
8 looked at.

9 But, you know, I think the Housing  
10 Commission, through the discussions, really  
11 looked at this and said, "There are times when  
12 maybe that has some merit. You know, there are  
13 properties out there that are problems, and maybe  
14 the financials or some other circumstances on  
15 those don't work out."

16 So rather than just saying, "Let's get rid  
17 of this and say it can't be deviated through the  
18 PUD," what the Housing Commission has done is  
19 come up with an alternative housing plan, so  
20 instead of the deviations through the PUD, they  
21 go through more of a set process that's  
22 specifically for housing and how affordable  
23 housing can impact through this whole process.

24 And then, finally, what's come out of these

1           discussions between the Housing Commission and  
2           also presenting this concept to the Planning and  
3           Development Committee of the City Council, is  
4           that there's been this idea of, you know, times  
5           have changed since this has been put in place,  
6           and now that there's kind of a need maybe to come  
7           up with some way to have the ordinance ebb and  
8           flow with the market.

9           So what we've also come up with is  
10          something called the "sliding scale." I'll get  
11          to a little more detail as we go through the  
12          presentation.

13          So I think the first amendment is pretty  
14          straightforward, and I detail these at a higher  
15          level in the staff report, and it was just  
16          distributed last week.

17          Essentially we're just amending the  
18          Ordinance to say, you know, "PUDs, you can vary  
19          certain things through them" or -- excuse me --  
20          "deviate from the Ordinance for certain  
21          standards, but Chapter 17.18, "Inclusionary  
22          Housing," not one of them.

23          So it's pretty straightforward. It's just  
24          not eligible for a PUD.

1           The next part is instead of that, we have  
2           come up with this alternative housing process,  
3           and, basically, what the Housing Commission tried  
4           to do was come up with something that sort of  
5           wove into the fabric of the existing Ordinance,  
6           maybe come up with an alternative to any great  
7           extent. We wanted to find something that really  
8           kind of interacts with it.

9           So, basically, what -- what we've come up  
10          with is, you have to have this alternative  
11          housing plan in mind from Day 1. You know you  
12          have a problem site. You come to us and first  
13          thing you have to look at is, there's going to be  
14          some criteria that are established in the  
15          Ordinance.

16          You have to justify the fact that you can't  
17          provide affordable housing, for whatever that  
18          reason is, and the criteria that have been come  
19          up with are, one is a financial hardship and  
20          there's some costs that are out of the control of  
21          the developer, so we're talking about blight or  
22          environmental remediation, you know, outdated  
23          buildings that have to be removed, something that  
24          amounts to 10 percent of the total project cost,



1           so something that's kind of clearly defined, and  
2           it's easier to have to say -- you know, this  
3           isn't somebody just coming into the city and  
4           saying, "I don't want to do affordable housing."  
5           There has to be a reason for it.

6                        So that -- that's the first one.

7                        The second one is that there's no density  
8           bonus available. Part of the methodology of the  
9           existing Ordinance is you provide affordable  
10          units on-site. The Ordinance allows you or  
11          permits you to go and build more units than the  
12          underlying zoning district would allow.

13                      There's times when that's not possible.  
14          You know, maybe it's a very unique parcel with a  
15          lot of steep slopes and just can't fit that many  
16          houses on there, or there -- you know, there's  
17          other situations.

18                      Maybe there's a wetland on the site that  
19          can't be developed on, so there's something  
20          limiting you from going over the density that  
21          would be allowed in the Zoning Ordinance, so  
22          we -- so that's one of the ideas you can use.

23                      There's some other alternative City policy  
24          or goal that's been established that you're

1           trying to establish -- you know, work with, such  
2           as a vacant or underutilized parcel.

3                     And the fourth criteria that we came up  
4           with, somehow you're doing something that's  
5           better than the Ordinance. So instead of  
6           providing rental units that are at 60 percent of  
7           the area median income, maybe you're providing at  
8           40. You know, you might not be able to provide  
9           all the units that you need to per the standard  
10          of the Ordinance, but you're doing something  
11          above and beyond the minimums of the ordinance,  
12          so in this case you're providing, instead of  
13          moderately affordable housing, very affordable  
14          housing.

15                    Do you have a question?

16                             VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't quite  
17          get that.

18                    I understand you're providing homes that  
19          are -- that are 40 percent median, 40 percent  
20          median, but does that mean the whole project is  
21          that, so you don't have to meet the inclusionary?  
22          I don't understand that.

23                             MR. O'ROURKE: It's not quite that  
24          specific.

1                   It's -- it's one of the criteria that can  
2                   be used to examine this alternative affordable  
3                   house plan.

4                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't  
5                   understand the criteria. Explain it to me.

6                   MR. O'ROURKE: Basically, right now,  
7                   if you're doing a rental project --

8                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

9                   MR. O'ROURKE: -- the Ordinance would  
10                  require you to build affordable units.

11                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

12                  MR. O'ROURKE: And that price point  
13                  is 60 percent of the area median income, and  
14                  there's a formula that calculates what rent is  
15                  affordable for that parcel.

16                  We're saying what you -- you make it  
17                  affordable to people who only are earning  
18                  40 percent of the area median income, and that is  
19                  just an example. There could be other ways to do  
20                  this. That's the one that -- that we examined.

21                  So, basically, instead of meeting the bare  
22                  minimum of the Ordinance at 60 percent affordable,  
23                  meaning, to families that earn 60 percent of the  
24                  area median income, that you're going to have

1 units that are affordable to people that earn  
2 40 percent of the area median income so that --

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But then you  
4 have met the requirement.

5 MR. O'ROURKE: Well, you might not be  
6 providing all the units.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, got you.  
8 So that's what I didn't understand. Okay. I  
9 understand. Go on.

10 MR. O'ROURKE: In addition to these  
11 criterias, you actually -- it's going to be  
12 required that the Applicant submit information  
13 that proves what these hardships are. You know,  
14 it's not really a face value, "We can't do it."

15 So our concept is that we've come up with  
16 some specifics. You know, "Here's the items of  
17 how the affordable housing will be identified,  
18 and you have to tell us right up front what your  
19 plan is to do that."

20 Instead of just saying, you know, "We'll go  
21 out and we'll try to build some homes that are  
22 affordable," you have to show us exactly what  
23 you're planning to do.

24 So if you're going to go out and chase

1 grants, you know, from State and Federal agencies  
2 that provide funding to do affordable housing, we  
3 want to know what ones you're going to apply for,  
4 how you're going to do it, what your timetable  
5 requires. You have to submit those to us up  
6 front before the project even is taken through  
7 the process.

8 You have -- so if you're going to do --  
9 purchase off-site units, you have to give us some  
10 sort of indication of where these units are, how  
11 many you're going to be able to purchase, how  
12 you're going to rehab them and/or you can do a  
13 combination of any of these or other -- you know,  
14 other items. But the point is we want to know up  
15 front what you're doing and, you know, it's  
16 not -- we -- the whole of this is that you have a  
17 well thought-out problem and you're coming up  
18 with a well thought-out solution, and we want to  
19 know that right from the get-go.

20 More of these requirements are the front  
21 end. You know, if somebody said they have a  
22 financial hardship, the Housing Commission feels  
23 "You should tell us what that is and prove it, so  
24 we want to see project pro formas, purchase price

1 of the property. We want to know what these  
2 financial hardships are and how much it's going  
3 to cost to mitigate them," just so there's some  
4 real numbers to kind of put together with this  
5 request.

6 So, again, it's all about -- you know,  
7 this -- this isn't a work around the Ordinance.  
8 You have to have a legitimate problem and we are  
9 trying to figure out what that is and the best  
10 way to address it.

11 These are just kind of some more detail on  
12 what the different funding sources are. I don't  
13 think I need to go through all these.

14 If you do an alternative affordable housing  
15 plan, if you choose to do external funding sources,  
16 these are the items you have to go -- these are  
17 the items that you have to give us.

18 So just to name a few, you have to show us  
19 copies of the grant applications you'll be using.

20 If you're going to purchase resale and  
21 resale off-site units at an affordable price,  
22 show us where they are, what are the anticipated  
23 costs of the renovations, the timing of purchase,  
24 when you're going to be able to get them back on

1 the market. You know, it's all this idea that we  
2 want to know up front what your plan is.

3 And then the final portion of the proposed  
4 amendment is what's called the "sliding scale."

5 Just a refresher, for units or -- excuse  
6 me -- developments that are 10 units or less,  
7 5 percent of that development is required to be  
8 affordable.

9 You can pay 100 percent of this as a fee-in-  
10 lieu-option, but typically with that many units,  
11 you're not going to get -- your whole unit  
12 requirement isn't going to be one whole unit  
13 anyway. You'll be using a fraction, so we have a  
14 per-unit fee-in-lieu-of that you can meet that  
15 requirement a hundred percent.

16 As we move up the scale and more units are  
17 required, as a development gets larger, and for  
18 the top two categories, you can only use  
19 50 percent of your requirement, so there's no  
20 option to do completely no units on-site and pay  
21 all fee in lieu.

22 The sliding scale affects this. It's,  
23 basically, the concept, as proposed, is every  
24 year staff puts together an analysis that

1 estimates where St. Charles is in terms of  
2 affordable housing in their housing stock, so  
3 there's a number out there: What are the homes'  
4 rent in St. Charles and what is that number?

5 So if we have 10 percent, which is what the  
6 State would mandate, are we higher than that?  
7 Are we below that? That is an important number  
8 to know as we go through the process.

9 So what we've come up with is -- you know,  
10 right now in the Ordinance there's a hard  
11 25 percent. You know, the community development  
12 director can say, "All right. We have a lot of  
13 affordable housing. Something has happened in  
14 the market where one out of every four units in  
15 town is affordable. We're not sure if we need to  
16 require new units be created because of this. We  
17 have a lot."

18 And then anything -- if we're not at  
19 25 percent, you have to meet the ordinance.

20 What this idea is, you know, there's a lot  
21 of area between 10 percent and 25 percent in the  
22 real world and as the market ebbs and flows.

23 What this concept is, for different levels  
24 of the City's housing stock, existing being



1           affordable, we've come up with kind of percentage  
2           requirements, so if the current housing stock of  
3           St. Charles that is considered affordable is  
4           13.75 percent or less, you have to meet the  
5           Ordinance 100 percent, and as that total housing  
6           stock requirement increases, based on these  
7           categories, you would only have to meet 75 percent  
8           of the requirements, so if you had 10 units,  
9           you'd only be required to meet 7 1/2 if the  
10          City's affordable housing stock is at 16 percent.

11                   And it would basically kind of scale back  
12          the requirement until that 25 percent number is  
13          ever reached, if it is ever reached, and then --  
14          then the Ordinance, just as it sits now, you  
15          know, the community development director could  
16          expand those requirements.

17                   And this is also in your packet of  
18          materials, but I put together these tables to  
19          just kind of highlight what all that means.

20                   So if, let's say, you have a medium-size  
21          development in an 11-to-49 unit area, and the  
22          City's housing stock is currently at 20 percent,  
23          so the normal requirement would have been, you  
24          know, you have to do 3 units on-site or -- excuse

1 me -- a 30-unit development, you would have to do  
2 10 percent of them as affordable. That would  
3 have been three units.

4 If you come down here and we're at  
5 16 affordable, that would reduce your unit  
6 requirement to .3, and then this just kind of  
7 goes through the whole process, so you could only  
8 use half of that, being, you know, you have  
9 on-site, et cetera, and it kind of works through  
10 the math there.

11 So that's -- what we're trying to show is  
12 that, as the percentage of St. Charles housing  
13 stock increases on its own or through the  
14 development of these affordable units, you know,  
15 the need maybe isn't as great, so this is  
16 designed to kind of add a little more flexibility  
17 and create a little bit more of a tradeoff  
18 between where the City's currently at and what  
19 the Ordinance requires.

20 So that's -- that's the majority of the  
21 concept there, and just -- I put this slide in  
22 here just to show you where the report that staff  
23 creates every year is at.

24 Right now we're currently at 18.01 percent,

1 and that really summarizes all the Ordinance  
2 amendments that staff is proposing this evening.

3 I will take any questions and comments.

4 And so there are members of the Housing  
5 Commission here in the audience, as well, if you  
6 have any questions.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Don't we have  
8 a member on our Commission here?

9 MR. O'ROURKE: I'm sorry. I didn't  
10 hear you.

11 MEMBER HENNINGSON: (Indicating.)

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We have him  
13 right here.

14 Yeah, I have a question.

15 First of all, it's a lot of math. Geez,  
16 it's a lot of math.

17 How do you administer that? I don't know  
18 how you guys do it.

19 MR. O'ROURKE: You should have been  
20 there when we wrote the amendment.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, see,  
22 that was another one of my questions, and this is  
23 somewhat procedural.

24 Why is this coming before us? If it has

1           been -- if it has been hammered out and, you  
2           know -- well, it hasn't been totally agreed to,  
3           but, as you say, the Planning and Development  
4           Committee, which is the entire City Council, so  
5           everybody has already gotten together, figured  
6           out a plan here, and I just -- I'm curious why.

7                       MR. O'ROURKE: And I probably failed  
8           to mention that in my presentation.

9                       There has been joint meetings between the  
10          Housing Commission and the Planning and  
11          Development Committee, and part of the reason is  
12          that this was very conceptual in those meetings.  
13          You know, it wasn't put into a hard ordinance for  
14          formal review, but the technical answer is, this  
15          is a requirement in the Zoning Ordinance, and it  
16          has to go through the required, you know, public  
17          hearing process and amendment process as any  
18          other general amendment would.

19                      So, I mean, more than anything, it's to  
20          give you a chance, because you folks do look at  
21          the Zoning Ordinance, and that's the Plan  
22          Commission's -- you know, it's an ordinance that  
23          they refer to a lot, but it is also the duty of  
24          the Plan Commission to review these amendments.

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. What's  
2                   the likelihood of us coming back and saying, "Not  
3                   recommending"? It's probably slim to none but  
4                   regardless --

5                   MR. O'ROURKE: We definitely want to  
6                   hear any comments to make it better.

7                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do have a  
8                   question, and at the very beginning you talked  
9                   about -- can you go to the very first?

10                  MR. O'ROURKE: Sure.

11                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 10 percent.

12                  MR. O'ROURKE: This?

13                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. No. All  
14                  the way up. All the way. All the way.

15                  MR. O'ROURKE: That?

16                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That  
17                  10 percent of the total project cost and purchase  
18                  price.

19                  What exactly does that 10 percent mean?  
20                  What is that?

21                  MR. O'ROURKE: Basically, if -- you  
22                  know, some of the -- from the development  
23                  proposals that have been reviewed, one of the  
24                  comments was, you know, "We have this extra cost

1           that we can't control ourselves, such as  
2           environmental remediation."

3                   What this is is basically a hard number  
4           that says, you know, "If you have a financial  
5           hardship, whatever that might be, it has to be at  
6           least 10 percent of the overall project cost of  
7           the project based on estimates."

8                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I want  
9           to know what the "10 percent of the project cost  
10          and purchase price" means.

11                   Does that mean you paid, you know, a  
12          million dollars for the property, and that  
13          project is estimated at \$2 million, so it's  
14          10 percent of \$3 million?

15                   MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

16                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's what  
17          you're saying?

18                   MR. O'ROURKE: The financial hardship  
19          would have to be equivalent to 10 percent of that  
20          \$3 million.

21                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It would have  
22          to be equivalent to 10 percent of the total  
23          project cost plus the purchase price of the  
24          property?

1                   MR. O'ROURKE: Well, the purchase  
2 price would be included in the part of that total  
3 project cost.

4                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, you  
5 don't say that. You say "Total project cost and  
6 purchase price." That's two things.

7                   MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah.

8                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which is --

9                   MR. O'ROURKE: This -- this was kind  
10 of a bigger discussion at the Housing Commission  
11 level, so I wanted to make sure I highlighted  
12 that the cost of the land does -- is being  
13 incorporated into that 10 percent. It's not  
14 being left out.

15                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

16                   MR. O'ROURKE: That was kind of a  
17 matter of discussion at one point.

18                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Then to --  
19 and I think what you put together here really  
20 keeps the teeth in it, and I'm actually glad to  
21 see it because I was -- I was more than a little  
22 put out by an Applicant who was here recently who  
23 blithely decided that they didn't want anything  
24 to do with inclusionary housing, and it's their

1 right not to want to do that, but then they need  
2 to go and get the Ordinance changed. They can't  
3 just say no, so this does address that.

4 I would say that I think that 10 percent of  
5 the total project cost plus the purchase price --  
6 which are two different things to me -- but is  
7 low. I think that, you know, to -- in  
8 construction, 10 percent of the total cost in  
9 unexpected -- 10 percent of unexpected costs is  
10 not uncommon. It's a pretty common thing.

11 MR. O'ROURKE: Sure.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So to save  
13 10 percent, people could easily say, "Well, I  
14 don't have to do it."

15 I think it should be higher.

16 MR. O'ROURKE: I think they do have  
17 to -- there's a couple points, that they still do  
18 have to go through this whole plan process being  
19 proposed to prove that that's what their hardship  
20 is, and I can just state that was an item that  
21 was talked about a lot. It was discussed a lot  
22 at the Housing Commission level, and I think the  
23 conclusion that was basically formed is, at that  
24 10 percent level is really close to where you're --



1           you're not hedging. You know, there's no margin  
2           for error in the development anymore, and that --  
3           that's the point to where your -- your profits  
4           and your margins are probably almost depleted,  
5           and that's why the number was chosen. You know,  
6           there's no failsafe for the developer at that  
7           point to make a profit was the rationale that was  
8           discussed.

9                           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I'm in  
10           construction and I don't agree with that. I  
11           think it should be higher in large projects,  
12           though, so I would still think it should be  
13           higher.

14                           But I really I think you've done a lot of  
15           nice work here. I do think there's an awful lot  
16           of matters for you guys to keep track of so you're  
17           good.

18                           That's all I have.

19                           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
20           other questions from Plan Commissioners?

21   (No response.)

22                           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any  
23           questions from members of the audience?

24                           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Woo-hoo.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
2                   other comments or testimony to be offered?

3                                   (No response.)

4                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything further  
5                   from the Plan Commission?

6                                   (No response.)

7                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any rebuttal from  
8                   the Applicant?

9                                   MR. O'ROURKE: No.

10                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion  
11                  to close the public hearing?

12                                  MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

13                                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Second.

14                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's  
15                  been moved and second.

16                                  Any discussion on that motion?

17                                   (No response.)

18                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seeing none, Tim?

19                                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Amatangelo?

20                                  MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

21                                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

22                                  MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

23                                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace?

24                                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. This  
3 public hearing is now closed.

4 Which moves us on to Item No. 6 on the  
5 agenda, general amendment, the City of  
6 St. Charles, Chapter 17.04, Chapter 17.18.

7 Do we have any motion in regards to -- is  
8 it -- yes, it's all contained as one application  
9 logistically; correct?

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

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is there  
12 any motion? The Chair would entertain a motion  
13 for approval of the application.

14 Just make it easy.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I know.

16 But they have to come back and talk to -- I  
17 think -- well, no, I'm not going to make a motion.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.  
19 Well, the Chair will entertain any motion.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well -- well,  
21 let me put it this way: I think this has come to  
22 us and you're -- you're looking for a  
23 recommendation based on the way it's written  
24 right now?

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

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

3 MR. O'ROURKE: Unless you have any  
4 comments or modifications that you would like.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to  
6 have that 10 percent changed because I think it's  
7 really easy for that -- a -- for a developer or a  
8 contractor to come to you and say, "I have a  
9 15 percent remediation cost," and there's nothing  
10 that they can prove or disprove to you.

11 MR. O'ROURKE: I would just state  
12 that, I mean, part of it is they have to prove  
13 it. They have to give us their pro formas and  
14 they have to -- they have to show us their  
15 numbers ahead of time and they have to justify  
16 that number to us. I mean, that's part of what's  
17 being proposed.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But, I  
19 guess -- I guess I'm not making myself -- I'm not  
20 making myself clear.

21 When -- when a developer puts together a  
22 pro forma, it's based on estimates, and there are  
23 no hard costs until the project has been completed,  
24 and so to rely on a pro forma that says

1 "10 percent of my cost is being eaten up by  
2 remediation," or something else, that's easy to do.

3 It's a lot less easy to come up with a pro  
4 forma that says, "20 percent of my costs are  
5 being eaten up by one of these criteria" that you  
6 laid out, and, I mean, I just -- I know how this  
7 business works and that's how it works.

8 MR. O'ROURKE: I do know that the  
9 Housing Commission shares that concern. There  
10 was a lot of deliberation back and forth on that  
11 number, and, I mean, I will say the development  
12 community was represented at the Housing  
13 Commission. The representative was actually  
14 there, and I think that they thought that this  
15 number was pretty accurate where it was.

16 I mean, they really -- it was originally  
17 proposed by staff at 15 percent, and the Housing  
18 Commission said that they felt that was a little  
19 too high. I mean, they collectively, as a group,  
20 that it came out that way. I would just offer  
21 that.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, would you  
24 like to make a motion?

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah. I  
2                   would -- I would make a motion to recommend, with  
3                   the exception of increasing the percentage of  
4                   identified additional cost from 10 to 15 percent.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the -- I just  
6                   want to make sure I'm clear.

7                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. Clear  
8                   it up for me.

9                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion that's  
10                  on the table would be a recommendation for  
11                  approval of the application conditioned upon  
12                  modification of the proposed wording from  
13                  "10 percent" to "15 percent" in the section  
14                  relating to -- tell me.

15                  MR. O'ROURKE: Financial hardship.

16                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- financial  
17                  hardship.

18                  Is that clear? Is that clear?

19                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. I'm  
20                  clear.

21                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And is that  
22                  accurate?

23                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's  
24                  accurate.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second  
2                   to that motion?

3                                   (No response.)

4                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'll second the  
5                   motion.

6                   All right. So the motion has been moved  
7                   and seconded.

8                   Is there discussion on the motion?

9                   MEMBER HENNINGSON: You know, I sat  
10                   in on the Housing Commission meetings regarding  
11                   this, and they were pretty set on 10 percent, and  
12                   there is plenty of experience on that Commission,  
13                   and I think we should follow -- follow their lead.

14                   Matt's already described it, but, I mean,  
15                   10 percent was the number, and I can tell you  
16                   there were some long discussions.

17                   John Hall is a member of the Housing  
18                   Commission. Tom Hanson is a member of the  
19                   Housing Commission. Cindy Holler, who is a  
20                   developer, is a member of the Commission, so I  
21                   would like to go with their numbers.

22                   Cindy, do you have any comments about this?

23                   THE COURT REPORTER: Your name,  
24                   please? Could you give me your name? Could you --

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  If you wouldn't  
2                   mind just stating your name and spelling your  
3                   last name.

4                   MS. HOLLER:  Cindy Holler, H-o-l-l-e-r.  
5                   Just let me clarify.

6                   So the comment is that we want to create  
7                   the hardship -- make it a little higher,  
8                   15 percent?  You have to prove there's a  
9                   15 percent hardship before we start to make --

10                  MR. O'ROURKE:  Before they can apply,  
11                  show they have no alternative to --

12                  MS. HOLLER:  We're at 10 percent now.

13                  Well, you know, I -- I don't -- I don't  
14                  really know.  I'm trying to -- I don't know that  
15                  I was in the meeting when the 10 percent, but I  
16                  will tell you that, you know, the whole  
17                  Commission was there.

18                  I would agree with Kurt that the folks are  
19                  really experienced people on that Commission.

20                  Typically a builder's profit on a  
21                  development is around 15 percent, if I'm  
22                  recalling now the conversation right, and that's  
23                  kind of where we came in.

24                  If they went up to 15 percent, they would



1 be basically at a point where there would be no  
2 profit at all; right?

3 MR. O'ROURKE: That's right.

4 MS. HOLLER: At 10 percent they're  
5 going to make a little bit of money but still  
6 it's going to hurt, so I guess that would be my  
7 comments in terms of responding to it.

8 I'm not sure you would even get a developer  
9 to do the work of coming before the Commission or  
10 applying if they were at 15 percent hardship.  
11 They would probably walk away all together and  
12 just say, "Why would I even go through a public  
13 process?"

14 So I think that sounds right, Curt.

15 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes, it does.

16 MS. HOLLER: And among the Commission  
17 members, I think that was where the number is.

18 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Right. That's  
19 how I remember it, and it was discussed on a  
20 couple of different -- during a couple of  
21 different meetings so --

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I hear  
24 that whole discussion went through the City

1 Council and the Housing Commission before it came  
2 here, so I guess I -- I --

3 MEMBER HENNINGSON: We met with the  
4 Housing Commission and the Planning and  
5 Development Committee.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which is the  
7 City Council.

8 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Right.

10 MEMBER HENNINGSON: We met once for  
11 probably 50 minutes, and this kind of thing was  
12 not -- this was not discussed.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh.

14 MR. O'ROURKE: But this was presented  
15 at a Planning and Development Committee meeting  
16 by staff in this form to them just for comments.

17 MEMBER HENNINGSON: I'm sorry.

18 MR. O'ROURKE: That's where the  
19 sliding scale -- actually, what the genesis of  
20 that idea was at that meeting, so they have seen  
21 these facts, but they didn't discuss it at great  
22 length.

23 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

24 The major thing that was discussed was

1           this sliding scale, but the 10 percent issue I  
2           don't believe was.

3                       MR. O'ROURKE: That was something  
4           from staff they saw.

5                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.  
6           Further discussion?

7                               (No response.)

8                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

9                       MEMBER HENNINGSON: I would -- you  
10          know, I'd like to support it as is, as proposed.

11                       VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you want  
12          to amend the motion?

13                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There's a motion  
14          on the table.

15                       MEMBER HENNINGSON: Do you want to  
16          change the motion?

17                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I would prefer to  
18          vote on the motion.

19                       MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. Let's vote.

20                       VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

21                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So, Tim.

22                       VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

23          Amatangelo?

24                       MEMBER AMATANGELO: No.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

2 MEMBER HENNINGSON: No, because of  
3 the fact that it is 15 percent.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.  
5 Wallace?

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion does  
9 not pass.

10 So would you like to propose a new motion?  
11 Or anyone?

12 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes, to recommend  
13 approval as is.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So the  
15 motion is to recommend the City Council approve  
16 the application for general amendment as -- as  
17 presented in the application?

18 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

19 MEMBER HENNINGSON: Thank you, Todd,  
20 far much better than I did.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It wasn't what I  
22 was thinking about but way to go.

23 And, Sue, did you second that?

24 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes, I did.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's  
2                   been moved and seconded.

3                   Discussion?

4                   (No response.)

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Amatangelo?

7                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

8                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Henningson?

9                   MEMBER HENNINGSON: Yes.

10                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace?

11                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12                  VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, no.

13                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
14                  motion passes three-to-one, and that concludes  
15                  Item No. 6 on our agendas. Thank you.

16                  Thank you, ladies.

17                  MS. HOLLER: You're welcome.

18                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 7 on the  
19                  agenda is an update on the Comprehensive Plan  
20                  Project.

21                  It this just on here just to say that  
22                  there's an open house?

23                  MR. COLBY: Yes.

24                  And, also, just to inform the Commission

1           that the Comprehensive Plan draft will likely be  
2           before you for review and recommendation in  
3           January.

4                           CHAIRMAN WALLACE:   Okay.

5                           MR. COLBY:   So if you are available  
6           next Wednesday to attend the open house, it would  
7           be a good opportunity to see where things are at  
8           at this point.

9                           We expect that there will be an updated  
10          draft posted right before that open house at the  
11          Web site, but you can also read it there.

12                          If the Plan Commission wants any kind of  
13          background information on the project and the  
14          process we have gone through or in terms of, you  
15          know, the Comprehensive Plan, what its function  
16          is, what the Plan Commission does, we are  
17          available, as staff, to provide you with any kind  
18          of information, just have an informal discussion  
19          about it before we formally consider the  
20          document.

21                          We can do that so we can sort of get some  
22          of those discussions out of the way since there's  
23          a lot of information to be presented in the  
24          actual plan document, so we can certainly have

1           some preliminary discussion before that. I think  
2           that would be beneficial.

3                   Or if there's any individual members that  
4           want to meet and just sort of go through some of  
5           the basics of, you know, what's up for  
6           consideration, we are available for that, as well.

7                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What is the  
8           location of the open house?

9                   MR. COLBY: It will be right here.

10                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

11                  MR. COLBY: From 6:00 to 7:30.

12                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

13                  MR. COLBY: But I think what I'll do  
14           is, our next meeting, which is December the 4th,  
15           I'll just have an item on there for us to discuss  
16           the project, and if Commission members have  
17           topics they want to bring up, let me know  
18           beforehand and we can discuss it then.

19                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

20           Thank you.

21                   Next upcoming meetings, December 4th,  
22           January 8th, January 22nd.

23                   I'm assuming that the December 4th -- are  
24           there items other than that?

1 MR. COLBY: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

3 January 8th, do we have any idea of how --

4 MR. COLBY: January 8th is likely the  
5 first meeting to consider the plan.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Got it. Okay.

7 MR. COLBY: We did -- one thing on  
8 that.

9 There was an application for development  
10 that came in just today that, of course, we would  
11 like to get on the agenda.

12 Typically the Plan Commission cancels that  
13 second meeting which this year would be the 18th.  
14 We just -- I don't think there's enough review  
15 time to get them here by the 4th.

16 We are wondering if you anticipated being  
17 able to have that meeting or if you even want to  
18 reschedule that meeting.

19 If everybody's out of town --

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Which one?

21 MR. O'ROURKE: December 18th.

22 MR. COLBY: It's typically during the  
23 week of Christmas anyway. This year, it's not.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's a week



1 early.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: It's a week early.

3 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I'm gone.

4 MR. O'ROURKE: You're gone.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I mean, I'm  
6 available kind of.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I am, too. I  
8 have no problem with it.

9 MR. COLBY: Okay. We'll make sure we  
10 have a quorum before we schedule anything.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. You're  
12 going to be somewhere warm?

13 MEMBER AMATANGELO: It wasn't on the  
14 schedule so I planned accordingly.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's on my  
16 calendar. It was scheduled, I think, at the  
17 beginning of the year.

18 MR. COLBY: I don't think it was  
19 because we never had the --

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's on my  
21 calendar so it had to be on some schedule. I  
22 don't know.

23 MR. COLBY: I don't believe it's on  
24 the official schedule.

1                   MEMBER HENNINGSON: Sue, maybe you  
2                   can take your computer along and use Skype.

3                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: I'd be glad to.  
4                   It would be very cool.

5                   MR. COLBY: You cannot do that,  
6                   actually. When we looked into that --

7                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, whatever.

8                   MR. COLBY: -- the Comprehensive Plan  
9                   Task Force has to have an established policy to  
10                  have people --

11                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jim Martin did it  
12                  in the hospital.

13                  MR. COLBY: That was before the  
14                  current version of the Open Meetings Act.

15                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What if she  
16                  doesn't constitute a quorum?

17                  MR. COLBY: She's not supposed to  
18                  participate.

19                  MEMBER HENNINGSON: I couldn't even  
20                  call in?

21                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You can watch.

22                  MR. COLBY: You could listen.

23                  MEMBER AMATANGELO: Phone a friend.

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

1                   Anyway, any additional business for Plan  
2                   Commission members?

3   (No response.)

4                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Staff?

5   (No response.)

6                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Citizenry?

7   (No response.)

8                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I make a  
9                   motion. Oh, I'm sorry.

10                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: I wish you all a  
11                   happy Thanksgiving.

12                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh.

13                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thanks to you.

14                   All right. Item 10, adjournment.

15                   VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

16                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Second?

17                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

18                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?

19   (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

20                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

21   (No response.)

22                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of  
23                   the St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at  
24                   9:13 p.m.

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

(Which were all the proceedings  
had in the above-entitled matter  
at 9:13 p.m.)

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

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand on this 30th day of November, 2012.



*Glenn L. Sonntag*

Certified Shorthand Reporter  
Registered Diplomate Reporter  
Certified Legal Video Specialist