

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2013**

---

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

Members Absent:            Curt Henningson

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

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Wallace.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**3. Presentation of minutes of the February 5, 2013 meeting.**

**A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the February 5, 2013 meeting.**

Chairman Wallace suggested that the order of the public hearing and meeting items would be changed so that the meeting item comes after each public hearing. The Commission members agreed.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**6. General Amendment (Jace Murray)**

Table 17.28-3, "Permitted signs for Office Research, Manufacturing and Public Land Districts", pertaining to Identification Signs in the Office Research District.

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

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

Roll Call Vote:

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, March 12, 2013**

**Page 2**

Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace  
Nays: None  
Absent: Henningson  
Motion carried.

**MEETING**

**11. General Amendment (Jace Murray)**

Table 17.28-3, “Permitted Signs for Office Research, Manufacturing and Public Land Districts”, pertaining to Identification Signs in the Office Research District.

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

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to approve the General Amendment as listed in the staff report.**

Mr. Schuetz seconded the motion.

**Mr. Doyle made a motion to amend the motion to establish two new categories for office park signs; the first category would apply to properties between 2.5 acres to 5 acres and would have a maximum height restriction of 12 feet, and the second category would apply to properties of 5 acres and have a maximum height restriction of 15 feet.** Mr. Pretz seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Wallace, Scheutz, Doyle, Wallace, Pretz, Amatangelo  
Nays: Kessler  
Absent: Henningson.  
Motion to amend carried.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Wallace, Scheutz, Doyle, Wallace, Pretz, Amatangelo, Kessler  
Nays: None  
Absent: Henningson.  
Amended motion to approve carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**4. General Amendment (Joseph Conti)**

Table 17.16-1 “Office/Research, Manufacturing, and Public Lands Permitted and Special Uses” to permit Permanent Motor Vehicle Storage in the M-1 Special Manufacturing Zoning District.

Section 17.20.030.P “Motor Vehicle Storage Temporary and Permanent” to include specific standards for properties in the M-1 Special Manufacturing District.

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, March 12, 2013**

**Page 3**

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

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

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace

Nays: None

Absent: Henningson

Motion carried.

**MEETING**

**9. General Amendment (Joseph Conti)**

Table 17.16-1 “Office/Research, Manufacturing, and Public Lands Permitted and Special Uses” to permit Permanent Motor Vehicle Storage in the M-1 Special Manufacturing Zoning District.

Section 17.20.030.P “Motor Vehicle Storage Temporary and Permanent” to include specific standards for properties in the M-1 Special Manufacturing District.

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

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to approve the General Amendment.** Mr. Doyle seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace

Nays: None

Absent: Henningson

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**5. 2047 Lincoln Highway (Ryan Harnish)**

Application for a Special Use Amendment to Existing Tattoo Parlor

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

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

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace

Nays: None

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**

**Tuesday, March 12, 2013**

**Page 4**

Absent: Henningson  
Motion carried.

**MEETING**

- 10. 2047 Lincoln Highway (Ryan Harnish)**  
Application for a Special Use Amendment to Existing Tattoo Parlor

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

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to approve the Special Use Amendment.** Mr. Schuetz seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:  
Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace  
Nays: None  
Absent: Henningson  
Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 7. 1915 W. Main Street (McDonald's)**  
Application for Special Uses (Planned Unit Development, Restaurant, and Drive-Through Facility)  
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan  
Application for a Final Plat of Subdivision  
Supporting Documents:  
Parking Analysis Memo; V3 Companies; dated 1/25/2013  
Preliminary Engineering Plans; V3 Companies; dated 1/25/2013  
Architectural Elevations; M US Restaurant Development; dated 11/15/2012  
Final Plat of Subdivision; V3 Companies; dated 2/25/2013

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

**Mr. Pretz made a motion to continue the public hearing to March 19, 2013, at 7:00pm.** Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:  
Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace  
Nays: None  
Absent: Henningson  
Motion carried.

**MEETING**

**8. Boulder Heights Subdivision (Southampton Builders)**

Application for Final Plat of Subdivision

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

**Mr. Kessler made a motion to approve the Final Plat of Subdivision.** Ms. Amatangelo seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Amatangelo, Scheutz, Kessler, Doyle, Pretz, Wallace

Nays: None

Absent: Henningson

Motion carried.

**12. Meeting Announcements**

Tuesday, March 19, 2013 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, April 2, 2013 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, April 16, 2013 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

**13. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members, Staff, or Citizens.-None.**

**14. Adjournment at 8:16 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

S62457A

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
General Amendment pertaining )  
to identification signs in )  
the Office Research District.)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of  
the above-entitled matter before the Plan  
Commission of the City of St. Charles in the  
Council Chambers, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles,  
Illinois, on March 12, 2013, at the hour of  
7:00 p.m.

1           **PRESENT:**

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

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

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

5                   **MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;**

6                   **MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and**

7                   **MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.**

8           **ALSO PRESENT:**

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

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

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                   Are you ready?

5                   MEMBER KESSLER: I am ready.

6                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim, roll call.

7                   MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

8                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Here.

9                   MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

10                  MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

11                  MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

12                  MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

13                  MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

14                  MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

15                  MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

16                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

17                  MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler here.

18                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 3  
19                  on the agenda is presentation of the minutes of  
20                  the February 5, 2013, meeting.

21                  Is there a motion to approve?

22                  MEMBER KESSLER: I move.

23                  MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved

1 and seconded. All in favor.

2 (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Following Item 3,  
6 we have four public hearing items and followed by  
7 four action items. It was suggested that we take  
8 the public hearing and corresponding action items  
9 in tandem. Basically, that we hear the public  
10 hearing and then vote on the recommendation.

11 Does anyone have any objection to doing it  
12 that way? Just so we can make it through each  
13 item. Okay. All right. Good.

14 In that case --

15 MR. COLBY: Mr. Chairman, if I  
16 could --

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

18 MR. COLBY: We have one of the  
19 Applicants present, so I suggest that we do that  
20 item first.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And  
22 that's Item 6?

23 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Item 6 on

1 the agenda is General Amendment, Jace Murray,  
2 Table 17.28-3, Permitted Signs for Office  
3 Research, Manufacturing, and Public Land  
4 Districts, pertaining to identification signs in  
5 the Office Research District; and following that  
6 we'll take Item 11 which is the action item on  
7 that item.

8 The exhibits that we have for this item --  
9 we have Exhibit A which is General Amendment  
10 Application dated February 13, 2013; and Exhibit  
11 B is the staff report from Russell Colby,  
12 planning division manager, dated March 1, 2013.

13 I don't think that we fully have to explain  
14 what our procedure is. If you have any  
15 questions, you're free to ask.

16 But anyone who wishes to give any testimony  
17 or ask any questions, I would ask that you raise  
18 your right hand and be sworn in.

19 (The witnesses were thereupon  
20 duly sworn.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. You  
22 may be seated.

23 So I guess, Russ, do you just want to go  
24 ahead and do this.

1                   MR. COLBY: Sure. I'll get started  
2                   and introduce the application and then turn it  
3                   over to the Applicant to make some comments.

4                   This is a general amendment application to  
5                   increase the size of signs that are permitted in  
6                   the OR, Office Research District.

7                   Specifically, the application is related to  
8                   identification signs, and identification signs  
9                   are really what you would consider a freestanding  
10                  sign that's typically placed out near the street  
11                  advertising the business. It's not a sign that's  
12                  on the building, like an awning sign or a wall  
13                  sign. It's typically a freestanding sign.

14                  The existing requirements are shown here in  
15                  the table on the top row. It says  
16                  "Identification Signs." You're allowed one of  
17                  these signs per street frontage, 10 foot setback,  
18                  50 square feet maximum sign area, and 8 feet  
19                  maximum height.

20                  The proposal that is before you is to  
21                  increase that maximum area and maximum height  
22                  specifically for signs that advertise a larger  
23                  office park.

24                  The Applicant had submitted the application

1 asking that we increase the size for all  
2 properties, and staff suggested that it might be  
3 a more conservative approach to look at  
4 increasing the size only for office parks.

5 There is some analysis in the staff report  
6 that looks at where office-zoned properties are  
7 located in the city. Really, there's a few  
8 clusters of them where there is a significant  
9 amount of office development, such as along  
10 Foxfield Road on the east side, along Dean Street  
11 west of Randall Road, and then the Corporate  
12 Reserve property.

13 Then there's other properties that are  
14 really more standalone, single building-type  
15 properties that are on smaller lots, and I have  
16 them listed out here.

17 So what we thought was, given that there's  
18 sort of this two different types of properties in  
19 the Office Zoning District, that if we're going  
20 to increase the signage requirements, it makes  
21 sense to increase the requirements for the larger  
22 complexes versus the standalone buildings. With  
23 a standalone building, you're able to have your  
24 own sign advertising maybe the one or two

1 businesses that are in the building versus an  
2 office park, where you don't have as much  
3 visibility, and it's more in the nature to list  
4 the tenants in the office park.

5 I've listed here properties that would  
6 qualify as an office park. Basically, a  
7 collection of buildings that are all under some  
8 sort of unified ownership or control. They  
9 certainly share common advertising space, access  
10 space, parking lots, and are sort of considered  
11 part of one campus area.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Russ, let me ask  
13 you a question real quick.

14 MR. COLBY: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: On this list, you  
16 had said what we're talking about is for 3 acres  
17 or larger; correct?

18 MR. COLBY: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Unified ownership  
20 interests?

21 MR. COLBY: Yes. And the 3 acres is  
22 the proposal. These are really just the numbers  
23 of how these different parks measure in terms of  
24 area.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is this an  
2                   exhaustive list of the areas in St. Charles that  
3                   would fall under this definition?

4                   MR. COLBY: It is. There are other  
5                   office developments in town, but they are in  
6                   different zoning districts. So, for example,  
7                   there's office developments that are located  
8                   along Main Street, and those have commercial  
9                   zoning, so they're allowed to follow the sign  
10                  requirements for the commercial districts.

11                  So this is pretty exhaustive of the OR  
12                  District.

13                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm just curious.  
14                  I mean, basically we identify 10 areas and 8 of  
15                  the 10 are over 3 acres.

16                  Would it make sense to decrease that number  
17                  to 2 1/2 acres just to include all of those that  
18                  are similarly situated?

19                  MR. COLBY: That's something we can  
20                  do.

21                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's just a  
22                  suggestion.

23                  MEMBER SCHUETZ: Are we open for  
24                  discussion?

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, we can go  
2 ahead and listen to the rest of the presentation.

3                   MR. COLBY: Yeah. I just have a  
4 couple more quick comments.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6                   MR. COLBY: So we have the definition  
7 here of what we call an office park. As you  
8 said, unified ownership or control, over 3 acres  
9 is what's listed, but we could go with over 2 1/2  
10 acres and encompass all of this property.

11                   The sign that's been requested by the  
12 Applicant would be at a maximum area of  
13 100 square feet and a maximum height of 15 feet.  
14 The existing maximum height is 8 feet.

15                   When staff looked at this initially, we  
16 felt that a height lower than 15 feet, perhaps  
17 around 12 feet would be more desirable for the  
18 office district because it's more of a  
19 transitional zoning between the commercial  
20 district and the residential area.

21                   So I listed here in the staff report the  
22 sign height in the commercial areas and the  
23 manufacturing areas where you have the 15 feet,  
24 which is what the Applicant has requested, but we

1 do have smaller signs in the residential downtown  
2 zoning districts around 8 feet and up to 12 feet  
3 in the downtown district. So we thought perhaps  
4 12 feet was more appropriate.

5 However, you know, it's sort of a matter of  
6 preference and aesthetics as to what sort of sign  
7 you think is most appropriate for these types of  
8 developments.

9 I put together just a short slide show so  
10 you can see how these different sign heights  
11 compare to each other.

12 This is actually the sign in question  
13 that's being displayed. I've estimated the  
14 height here from some data we had. It's probably  
15 about 12 to 15 feet, so probably in the taller  
16 range.

17 This is another example of the taller  
18 range. This one is on Randall Road.

19 This is two signs along West Main Street,  
20 and again these are more commercial areas, but  
21 you can at least see what the potential size of  
22 the sign would be if it was 15 feet, a 100 square  
23 feet.

24 These are other examples that are slightly

1 smaller. This one is in the 10-to-12 foot range.  
2 This one as well.

3 And these are the 8-to-10 foot range.  
4 These two signs here.

5 So that's just really to give you a basis  
6 of comparison of what the different height of the  
7 signs looks like. As I said, staff's initial  
8 inclination was 12 feet, but the Applicant needed  
9 15 feet.

10 We don't have a strong objection to 15  
11 feet, but rather just to raise a point that in  
12 the zoning districts, there's sort of a hierarchy  
13 of different sign heights as it exists now. The  
14 12 feet would fit that hierarchy, but that isn't  
15 to say that a 15-foot sign would be inappropriate  
16 for the zoning district.

17 With that, I will turn it over to the  
18 Applicant, and I can also bring up information on  
19 the specific sign he is looking to have  
20 installed.

21 MR. MURRAY: Good evening. Jace  
22 Murray, Murray Commercial, representing the  
23 ownership of the Dunham Center Office campus. I  
24 appreciate everyone coming tonight. Sorry to

1 take you all away from the mayoral forum next  
2 door. I was just over there. Nobody is throwing  
3 anything yet, so it's all good.

4 So I wanted to maybe just start off with  
5 how we arrived at where we are today. I  
6 appreciate staff's support, Russ's support and so  
7 forth in getting us where we are.

8 The Dunham Center Office campus in total is  
9 about 70,000 square feet of office space,  
10 consisting of approximately five different  
11 buildings, and this is the main ID sign that's  
12 been on the property since its inception in 1979.

13 The original building, the 525 building,  
14 which is there on the side, was initially built  
15 primarily for St. Charles Kitchens in the  
16 St. Charles Kitchens' days. So that was their  
17 corporate headquarters. So when this site was  
18 developed in 1979, this was the main ID sign to  
19 again provide identification to the property, the  
20 tenants, and so forth.

21 Where we are today, the sign hasn't been  
22 touched too much since 1979. So it's a little  
23 dated, quite a bit. It has some challenges. I  
24 don't think it's in vogue with what is out there

1           today.

2                       Last year I approached our signage group to  
3           design a new sign that basically is the same  
4           footprint as the existing sign. So we brought  
5           that down to the City, and we respectfully  
6           presented it to Bob Vann and the building  
7           department to get the permit, thinking it would  
8           be no problem.

9                       Bob Vann came back, Jace, it's too big. We  
10          can only do 8 feet. So we had some challenges  
11          ahead of us.

12                      But in talking with staff and some others,  
13          I proposed that it would be a great idea if we  
14          looked at allowing the OR District, and this was  
15          through staff's advice -- to look at the OR  
16          District to give some flexibility for signage for  
17          property identification and also more tenant  
18          attention and retention for those campuses.

19                      We're all challenged these days. We're  
20          doing everything we can to not only keep the  
21          tenants we have, but obviously attract new  
22          tenants. So this is two-fold. We need to  
23          replace the old sign so we can get more in vogue  
24          with today's signage opportunities that are out

1           there, and again I can't stress enough the  
2           attention and retention of tenants.

3           As I look over here, the No. 1 city for  
4           families. Across the street everybody is  
5           promoting us being the No. 1 city for businesses,  
6           and we're all for that, but I think we need to  
7           allow some of these property owners some  
8           flexibility too because that's important.

9           So that's how we got here. What else? A  
10          quick clarification, 100 square feet that's per  
11          sign. Okay.

12          So why did I suggest 15 feet to staff?  
13          This is less than 15. It's only 13 feet. My  
14          only reasoning there -- when you look through the  
15          sign ordinance as it currently stands, there's a  
16          lot of 15-foot signs allowed on manufacturing  
17          sites, retail sites across the board.

18          I appreciate Russ's comments as well. I  
19          think with 15 feet it's just -- I don't think  
20          there's a big difference between 12 and 15 feet,  
21          but it gives some more flexibility to these  
22          office campuses to design proper signage that has  
23          architectural interest, you know, in concert with  
24          the properties.

1                   So with that, I'll step back and --

2                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

3                   MR. MURRAY: -- I'm available for  
4                   comments, questions.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions from  
6                   Plan Commissioners?

7                   Yes.

8                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: As far as the  
9                   current sign from the '70s, how high is that, and  
10                  what's the square footage?

11                  MR. MURRAY: I think it's  
12                  approximately 14 feet. Honestly, I haven't been  
13                  out there with a tape measure, but the concept of  
14                  this proposed sign was to be the same footprint  
15                  visually as the existing sign, so not increasing  
16                  the sign.

17                  MEMBER SCHUETZ: Same location?

18                  MR. MURRAY: Same location. Same  
19                  foundation. We're fortunate that we have some  
20                  existing infrastructure to support it.

21                  MEMBER SCHUETZ: You're showing it  
22                  looks like the same side here in the graphic.

23                  Is the other side designed the same way?

24                  MR. MURRAY: It would be a mirror

1 image. It would be internally lit signage, if  
2 that's your question.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, you show Prose  
4 Orthodontics at the top left on the sign.

5 On the other side would it be designed the  
6 same?

7 MR. MURRAY: Yes.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And this is not  
9 directed to directly -- I guess I'll ask Russ  
10 this question.

11 As far as the office complexes under C,  
12 paragraph C, it says, "Properties that contain  
13 multiple tenants."

14 I guess my question is what would you  
15 consider multiple tenants? Would you say more  
16 than three? More than five? More than 10?

17 My concern is if it doesn't address every  
18 one of the office complexes, are we going to get  
19 a lot of little signs all over the place?

20 MR. COLBY: Well, when we say  
21 "multiple," we usually just mean more than one.  
22 But the thinking here was that most of these  
23 complexes likely have more than one tenant, but  
24 it's possible that they could only have a single

1           tenant. But, you know, given that, the property  
2           that's occupied by a single tenant, you know,  
3           they could take advantage of the whole sign if  
4           they wanted to.

5                     The one thing we can't do, though, is be  
6           able to guarantee that every single tenant will  
7           have a panel on the sign because some of these  
8           complexes have a very high number of tenants with  
9           smaller spaces. It's certainly up to the  
10          property management to decide who gets how much  
11          signage because you do reach a point where you  
12          can't really read it anymore.

13                    MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

14                    MR. COLBY: So that's sort of  
15          something I think will be figured out by the  
16          property owners.

17                    MEMBER SCHUETZ: So will there be a  
18          limited number of signage as far as, say, two or  
19          three of these -- I don't mean Dunham, but I mean  
20          any others?

21                    MR. COLBY: Yes. Under the proposal,  
22          they would be allowed this one sign as the larger  
23          office complex sign, but then you're also  
24          entitled to individual signs for the building

1 based on the smaller size.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: On the building.

3 MR. COLBY: On the property. On the  
4 site. So they could have, for example, one of  
5 these smaller 50-square-foot signs with the  
6 8-foot height placed adjacent to this one that's  
7 just advertising the building that's there.

8 So they would only be allowed the one big  
9 sign.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Per site.

11 MR. COLBY: Correct.

12 It basically takes one of the signs they're  
13 entitled to and makes it larger. We do something  
14 similar with shopping centers.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Could you show the  
17 sign for the Kane County Chronicle which had the  
18 electric display?

19 Please refresh my memory. We looked at an  
20 ordinance recently or a recommendation regarding  
21 electronic signage, and we recommended that a  
22 certain ratio of the sign -- the electronics  
23 portion of the sign was limited to a certain  
24 ratio.

1                   Is this amendment that's in front of us  
2                   today -- does that apply to this amendment?

3                   MR. COLBY: The signs in the office  
4                   district would be allowed under the same general  
5                   requirements as the other signs. So those  
6                   restrictions that apply to the percentage that's  
7                   the electronic reader board would apply here.

8                   MEMBER DOYLE: They would apply.

9                   MR. COLBY: Yes. So if there is an  
10                  interest in restricting that or saying that that  
11                  type of sign should not be permitted in this  
12                  district, you can do that, but it does fall into  
13                  the general requirements.

14                  MEMBER DOYLE: I just wanted to make  
15                  certain that at least the restriction that we  
16                  recommended before applies in this case.

17                  MR. COLBY: I believe, it applies  
18                  generally.

19                  Matt, is that correct?

20                  MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah. It was just --  
21                  the way that amendment was structured, it was in  
22                  the general definitions of the signage. So it  
23                  applies to all freestanding signs and wall signs  
24                  across the board.

1                   It's the same 50 percent or 50-square-foot,  
2                   you know, maximum limit for the reader board  
3                   would apply.

4                   MEMBER DOYLE: And following up on  
5                   Todd's comment about the acreage, on the  
6                   bottom -- I'm sorry, the bottom of page 2 and the  
7                   top of page 3.

8                   I'll put this out there. I don't know  
9                   whether this is complicating things too much, but  
10                  I'm just wondering since we're talking about a  
11                  new amendment if it would make sense to consider  
12                  a 12-foot restriction on office parks between 2  
13                  and 5 acres and a 15-foot restriction on office  
14                  parks in excess of 5 acres.

15                  My thought is that the additional  
16                  flexibility made sense for the larger office  
17                  parks that have more tenants in order for those  
18                  tenants to be promoted. If it's a smaller office  
19                  park of 2 1/2 acres, a 15-foot sign seems like it  
20                  might be -- I wonder if it would be large or  
21                  excessive for an office park of that size.

22                  Would it be feasible, reasonable, desirable  
23                  to split it that way?

24                  MR. COLBY: Yes. I think that's a

1 very logical approach.

2 MEMBER KESSLER: I'm not so sure I  
3 agree with that only because you could have a  
4 smaller lot size, but you could have a building  
5 that houses as many tenants --

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

7 MEMBER KESSLER: -- in smaller spaces  
8 and to restrict it that way -- then we've also  
9 got the consideration of the orientation of the  
10 building on the lot. You have the consideration  
11 of the orientation of the lot and building as to  
12 the roadway that it's on.

13 I think I'd be a little concerned about  
14 doing that simply by the size of the lot.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Let me respond to  
16 Mr. Kessler, and then I'm interested in hearing  
17 your response as well.

18 I understand your point. I think the only  
19 thing I would say is that the horse is already  
20 out of the barn, so to speak, in that on some  
21 parcels, there already are too many tenants in  
22 the parcel to effectively market all the names on  
23 the sign even if it's 15 feet.

24 So it's still incumbent on the property

1 owner to decide how they're going to use the  
2 space, whether it's 12 feet or 15 feet.

3 I think it's not -- there's a certain  
4 relationship between the number of tenants that  
5 are feasible to have on a smaller or larger lot,  
6 but I do wonder whether it would make sense on a  
7 lot that's only 2 1/2 acres to allow a 15-foot  
8 sign.

9 So I guess that's the basic question.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: Then I'm not sure  
11 what the reasoning would be. I don't understand  
12 why the size of the lot is going to determine the  
13 size of the sign.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: We're already  
15 proposing that there is a size restriction on  
16 this -- that this amendment only apply to lots  
17 that are in excess of -- well, actually, it's  
18 not. We do have a restriction.

19 We could remove it and say any lot that is  
20 owned by a single property owner, any office  
21 park, but then we could potentially be coming all  
22 the way down to 1-acre lots.

23 To me it's not something that I feel  
24 extremely strongly about. I just wanted to float

1 the idea and see what the reaction was.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: My comment would be  
3 I just want to be sure that there's only one  
4 large sign allowed per -- I don't know if  
5 landlord is the right word, but per office  
6 complex.

7 If they're under a certain -- if they're  
8 under, what Brian I think is saying, if they're  
9 under a certain acreage, the sign would be almost  
10 too big for certain acreage because it wouldn't  
11 be as proportionate to the building as well as  
12 the acreage. It would be small.

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. That is how we  
14 structured the proposal. You'd only be allowed  
15 this larger sign in lieu of one of the signs that  
16 are permitted if the site is large enough to meet  
17 the qualifications based on that.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
19 other comments?

20 Yes, Sue.

21 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Could we go back  
22 to the --

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Turn on your mic.

24 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Is it on now?

1 Thank you.

2 Go back to the sign, the new version, would  
3 you please.

4 Is this actually the way that you're  
5 intending it to look, the black on white or white  
6 on black?

7 MR. MURRAY: Currently, yes.

8 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Currently. Okay.

9 MR. MURRAY: It would be internally  
10 lit.

11 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Could we go back  
12 to Slide No. 6 now?

13 MR. COLBY: These slides?

14 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Right there.

15 Okay. There are six tenants on that sign,  
16 and it looks like, what, eight on the other?

17 MR. MURRAY: I'd have to go back and  
18 count them.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: 10 on the other.

20 MEMBER AMATANGELO: 10 on the other  
21 one. All right.

22 Okay. Sometimes when you put together a  
23 sign, it almost doesn't matter how large or small  
24 it is. If it's aesthetically pleasing, it makes

1 a huge difference. This to me is extremely  
2 industrial looking. I think it takes away -- I  
3 actually thought the other sign looks better than  
4 this sign because this takes away from that  
5 entire building.

6 If there's some way you could just soften  
7 it, for lack of a better word. I just think that  
8 it stands out like a sore thumb, if I can say it  
9 that way.

10 MR. MURRAY: Can I comment?

11 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Go ahead.

12 MR. MURRAY: Have you been -- I'm  
13 sure you've probably been by that site, the  
14 campus.

15 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

16 MR. MURRAY: The 525 building does  
17 have a more contemporary box look and feel to it.  
18 So I think our sign designers, North Shore, was  
19 trying to keep it and do something in keeping  
20 with that building design.

21 MEMBER AMATANGELO: The sign itself,  
22 the way you have it there, if you take away all  
23 the letters off the board, shall we say, and you  
24 have it with the -- you know, the actual sign



1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
2                   questions from members of the audience?

3                                   (No response.)

4                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any  
5                   comments from Plan Commissioners? Yes.

6                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: I'd like to go  
7                   back to the sign again as far as the height. I  
8                   really do prefer we stay within the 12-foot size  
9                   that we have seen in previous signs, particularly  
10                  if this is the route we're going to take. A  
11                  12-foot sign might not look as bad.

12                  I do like the fact that, you know, we do  
13                  have an opportunity to either go with 15 feet or  
14                  12 feet here, and personally, I think that the  
15                  12-foot sign that we have seen here, the monument  
16                  sign of the 12-foot size are much more attractive  
17                  and much more pleasing to the community.

18                  MEMBER PRETZ: I think the 12 feet is  
19                  probably a better transition going towards the  
20                  residential, and that would be my preference.

21                  I guess, I have one question for you, and  
22                  that was if you had 12 feet only to work with,  
23                  how much pain do you see that being for yourself  
24                  in trying to get your graphics within that?

1 MR. MURRAY: Well, I guess --

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Let me just finish.

3 Because your other sign seems to me, you  
4 know, from a letter standpoint smaller, and I  
5 could be wrong on that. But it just seems like  
6 these signs are somewhat larger, the individual  
7 signs in comparison to your current sign with the  
8 lettering being smaller. I could be wrong. It  
9 could be just the pictures themselves.

10 MR. MURRAY: The size of this font,  
11 if you will?

12 MEMBER PRETZ: The font, yes.

13 MR. MURRAY: These are --

14 MEMBER PRETZ: I think that a smaller  
15 font would work obviously at a 12-foot height.

16 MR. MURRAY: Maybe to answer it in a  
17 couple veins and thought processes.

18 You know, when I was reading through the  
19 sign ordinances, there are a lot of different  
20 areas where 15 feet was allowed -- manufacturing,  
21 retail. I was just thumbing through it, and I  
22 saw a lot of 15s.

23 We're only doing 13 or 13.10. Part of it  
24 is it's sending a message to the community to

1 design -- to give some flexibility to those  
2 business owners and real estate owners here in  
3 our community with OR zoning, to give them that  
4 flexibility.

5 I'm not saying I'm the best sign design guy  
6 by any means, but it's sending a message to the  
7 community about giving them some flexibility and  
8 giving them the opportunity to do something that  
9 would be in concert with the project and the size  
10 of the campus verse being more restrictive.  
11 That's just, you know, my thought from a cultural  
12 philosophy.

13 To reduce the sign -- again, we're doing  
14 everything we can to retain tenants, attracting  
15 tenants. This is a \$15- to \$20,000 sign that we  
16 want to invest in. It should have been done a  
17 long time ago, frankly. We want to show our  
18 existing tenants of the project that we're  
19 investing. We're always reinvesting in the site.  
20 There's a lot of capital in these projects to  
21 maintain them and keep them attractive to the  
22 tenants.

23 Can we do it at 12 feet? I think we can.  
24 I think it won't look as to scale with the

1 project at 12 feet. Maybe I'll use an analogy.  
2 West Chicago had a property on 38, a multi-tenant  
3 industrial property. So we had a sign up there,  
4 again just an ID sign, not too many tenants, so  
5 an ID sign.

6 I think it was going to be 15 or 16 feet, I  
7 forget, but the city changed their ordinance to  
8 only 8 feet. Well, that would look silly to only  
9 have an 8-foot sign on that project.

10 So I'm just using that as an analogy. I  
11 think this is to scale of the project. You know,  
12 it's over a 5-acre site. We have over  
13 70,000 square feet of space on the project. So  
14 instead of being limiting and restrictive, be in  
15 concert with other ordinances in the sign -- or  
16 height conditions in the sign ordinance.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: You took the words  
20 right out of my mouth. I was going to say if you  
21 look at the sign and if you look at the size of  
22 the building there, I think it's really, really  
23 important when you look at this signage, this one  
24 or any other signage, that it's in scale, like

1           you say, to the building, and that it complements  
2           the building and the building complements it and  
3           vice versa.

4                    I think it looks great myself.  Actually if  
5           you look at this and you look back at the current  
6           sign, to me, that current sign -- maybe it's the  
7           way that the photograph is taken, I'm not sure --  
8           it appears as though it's larger and it doesn't  
9           go with the building at all, and it looks more  
10          offensive to me.  So I'm fine with it.

11                   MEMBER DOYLE:  Mr. Chairman.

12                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  Yes.

13                   MEMBER DOYLE:  If we are agreed that  
14          we're going to go into the discussion phase right  
15          now and we feel that we've collected enough  
16          information to proceed to the deliberation, then  
17          I would move to close the public hearing.

18                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  Okay.

19                   MEMBER KESSLER:  Second.

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

22                   Any discussion on that motion?

23                                   (No response.)

24                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:  Tim, roll call.

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

2 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

7 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

9 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

11 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The  
13 public hearing is now closed.

14 That concludes Item 6 on the agenda, and  
15 next is Item 11, which is also General Amendment,  
16 Jace Murray, Table 17.28-3, Permitted Signs for  
17 Office Research, Manufacturing, and Public Land  
18 Districts, pertaining to identification signs in  
19 the Office Research District.

20 Is there a motion from the Plan Commission?

21 MEMBER KESSLER: I'd make a motion to  
22 recommend approval of a general amendment to  
23 Table 17.28-3, Permitted Signs for Office  
24 Research, Manufacturing, and Public Land

1           Districts, pertaining to identification signs in  
2           the Office Research District.

3                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As proposed in the  
4           staff report.

5                   MEMBER KESSLER: As proposed in the  
6           staff report.

7                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

8                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

9                   MR. COLBY: Just a slight  
10          clarification, as it's proposed in the staff  
11          report, it's a 3-acre site area.

12                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved  
13          and seconded.

14                   MEMBER PRETZ: I didn't hear that.

15                   MR. COLBY: The minimum site area for  
16          the larger sign is 3 acres in the staff report.  
17          I know there was a comment during the hearing  
18          that if it was lowered to 2 1/2, that it would  
19          encompass all the properties.

20                   MEMBER PRETZ: There were the two  
21          properties that are on it. Can we take it down  
22          to 2 1/2 acres?

23                   MEMBER DOYLE: We can make the motion  
24          to amend. I'm prepared to make a motion to amend

1 as soon as we have a second on the primary  
2 motion.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. There was a  
4 second.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Then I'd like  
6 to move to amend as follows: That we establish  
7 two new categories for office park signs. The  
8 first category would apply to properties between  
9 2.5 acres to 5 acres and would have a maximum  
10 height restriction of 12 feet, and category 2  
11 would apply to properties of 5 acres and have a  
12 maximum height restriction of 15 feet.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second that.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. There's a  
15 motion to amend the primary motion as stated by  
16 Mr. Doyle.

17 Any discussion on that motion to amend  
18 only?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. This  
21 is just on the motion to amend. Tim.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

23 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

1 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

4 MEMBER KESSLER: No.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The  
6 main motion is amended, and that's the motion  
7 that's on the table.

8 Any discussion on that motion?

9 (No response.)

10 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Could you just  
11 one more time walk through exactly what it was  
12 you just said? I just want to make sure that I  
13 have the sizes correct.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion is to  
15 recommend approval to the City Council as it's  
16 set forth in the staff report; however, there  
17 would be two categories of office research. One  
18 would be with acreage from 2 1/2 to 5 acres, and  
19 on that area, the maximum sign height would be  
20 changed from the proposal of 15 feet to 12 feet.

21 For the second area, which is 5 acres or  
22 more, it would remain as stated in the staff  
23 report.

24 Correct, Brian?

1 MEMBER DOYLE: That's correct.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
3 further discussion on the motion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Seeing  
6 none, Tim.

7 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

8 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

9 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

11 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

13 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

17 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
19 motion passes my a vote of six to nothing, and  
20 that concludes Item No. 11 on the agenda.

21 MR. MURRAY: Thank you for your time.  
22 Appreciate it.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

24 (Which were all the proceedings

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

had in the above-entitled matter  
ending at the hour of 7:38 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

S62457B

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
General Amendment to Permit )  
Permanent Vehicle Storage )  
in the M-1 District. )

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of  
the above-entitled matter before the Plan  
Commission of the City of St. Charles in the  
Council Chambers, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles,  
Illinois, on March 12, 2013, at the hour of  
7:38 p.m.

1           **PRESENT:**

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

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

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

5                   **MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;**

6                   **MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and**

7                   **MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.**

8           **ALSO PRESENT:**

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

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think next we'll  
2                   take -- since we're kind of taking things out of  
3                   order -- I'm sorry. Which one do you want to do  
4                   next?

5                   MR. O'ROURKE: I have the next two.

6                   MEMBER KESSLER: Do we have an  
7                   Applicant?

8                   MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. Everybody is  
9                   here now.

10                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. In that  
11                  case, we'll take Item No. 4 on the agenda, which  
12                  is General Amendment, Joseph Conti, Table  
13                  17.16-1, Office/Research, Manufacturing, and  
14                  Public Lands Permitted and Special Uses to permit  
15                  permanent motor vehicle storage in the M-1  
16                  Special Manufacturing Zoning District.

17                  Section 17.20.030.P, Motor Vehicle Storage  
18                  Temporary and Permanent to include specific  
19                  standards for property in the M-1 Special  
20                  Manufacturing District.

21                  Is this the exhibit list for that one?  
22                  General amendment personal service --

23                  MR. COLBY: I can't see it from  
24                  there.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Hold on a second.  
2                   What am I missing here?

3                   MR. O'ROURKE: It should be permanent  
4                   motor vehicle storage. You might have the wrong  
5                   one.

6                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Got it. I  
7                   see that now. All right. Sorry.

8                   We have two exhibits on this application.  
9                   Exhibit A is General Amendment Application,  
10                  Permanent Motor Vehicle Storage received  
11                  1/25/2013. Exhibit B is the staff report from  
12                  Matthew O'Rourke, planner, dated 2/22/2013.

13                  This is a public hearing, and just as a  
14                  matter of explanation, what the Plan Commission  
15                  will do here today is what we just did on the  
16                  other application, which is to accept testimony  
17                  both for and against the application.

18                  Once the Plan Commission has determined  
19                  that it has received adequate information to make  
20                  a recommendation to the City Council for either  
21                  approval or denial of the application, then we'll  
22                  close the public hearing.

23                  At the beginning of this meeting, we had  
24                  decided that we would break apart the public

1           hearings and meeting so that we can get through  
2           each one instead of having to go through all five  
3           public hearings and then all five meeting items.  
4           So that's what we'll do with this case as well.

5                       We'll have a presentation from the  
6           Applicant, and following that we'll have  
7           questions from Plan Commission members, followed  
8           by questions from the audience, followed by if  
9           anyone has any other testimony which they wish to  
10          give, they can do that at that time. Then we  
11          will close the public hearing and move on to  
12          action on this item.

13                      Anyone who wishes to give testimony or ask  
14          any questions please raise your right hand.

15                                       (The witnesses were thereupon  
16                                       duly sworn.)

17                      CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And if  
18          you could, when you do speak, make sure that you  
19          state your name and spell your last name for the  
20          record.

21                      Are you ready, Matt?

22                                       MR. O'ROURKE: I'm ready.

23                                       CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

24                                       THE WITNESS: Staff has been working

1 with the Applicant, Mr. Joseph Conti, on this  
2 particular matter. He represents the St. Charles  
3 Chrysler -- is it Dodge and Jeep or Jeep and  
4 Dodge?

5 MR. CONTI: Dodge and Jeep.

6 MR. O'ROURKE: -- Dodge and Jeep  
7 dealership. They're looking to utilize the  
8 property at the southwest -- southeast corner --  
9 excuse me -- of Tyler and Production Drive which  
10 is the former Ready-Mix site.

11 What they'd like to do is park excess  
12 vehicles that are for sale on that lot, you know,  
13 just strictly storage, and then when a customer  
14 would like to see it, you know, they'd go to that  
15 lot to get it, and they'd bring it to the main  
16 dealership site. This would be just motor  
17 vehicle storage.

18 This is a use that is allowed in the M-2  
19 Manufacturing District, but currently it's not  
20 permitted in the M-1 Manufacturing District. So  
21 the application in front of you is for a general  
22 amendment to amend the zoning ordinance to allow  
23 them in the M-1 District.

24 What staff has done is just analyze how

1           this could affect the M-1 District. When we  
2           looked at the purpose statement for that  
3           district, it really was intended to look at older  
4           industrial properties here in St. Charles and  
5           basically figure out ways to kind of reuse them,  
6           repurpose them for transitional types of uses,  
7           which when we read the definition for the storage  
8           use, we really felt that staff had met that  
9           criteria.

10           The only real concern when we did the  
11           analysis was where the M-1 District properties  
12           are located. In our proposal here -- I'll just  
13           scroll through it.

14           Really what we discovered when we analyzed  
15           every property in the M-1 District was that there  
16           is a lot of larger properties sort of located on  
17           the west side of town, in particular the railroad  
18           right-of-way near Dean Street on the west side.  
19           There's another cluster here on the east side of  
20           town. The property in question is over here, a  
21           few that front Main Street, and then some closer  
22           to downtown.

23           Really there is this dichotomy with sort of  
24           larger properties that are further out from the

1 core of downtown, and then there is a grouping of  
2 smaller ones sort of closer in. When it came to  
3 the relation of this use, we were concerned with  
4 any sort of mitigation or hazards that a  
5 permitted use such as this could be on a smaller  
6 property with an overflow of cars, not enough  
7 sight lines, you know, large lights beaming into  
8 the surrounding neighborhoods.

9 So what staff has put together working with  
10 the Applicant is an amendment basically to allow  
11 this as a permitted use in the M-1 District with  
12 certain use standards. Those use standards being  
13 it can't be within so many feet of a residential  
14 property, and it has to be at a site 2 --

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 2 acres.

16 MR. O'ROURKE: Okay. That kind of  
17 concludes staff's formal remarks on this one.

18 Do you have anything you want to add?

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So how many  
20 properties does that include?

21 MR. O'ROURKE: There's a total of 81  
22 different parcels counted on this. That would  
23 probably be lower, closer 60 because 20 of those  
24 properties are under that threshold.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Now, is it parcel  
2                   by parcel or -- is that how it would be  
3                   determined? I mean, if there was a piece of  
4                   property that is two parcels, let's say -- for  
5                   example, let's go to 62 and 63 here on Main  
6                   Street which are together --

7                   MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah.

8                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- but evidently  
9                   they're two different parcels.

10                  MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah. The zoning  
11                  ordinance does have provisions in there that  
12                  allow you to call two parcels one development  
13                  zoning lot. So we could use those criteria if  
14                  need be if it was one unified development. I  
15                  think in this case, this goes over the minimum  
16                  threshold, so you can do this independently.

17                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Or if you  
18                  look at the other side of town, you know, parcels  
19                  1 through 8, for example.

20                  MR. O'ROURKE: Right. That was the  
21                  rationale for the other restriction of you can't  
22                  do it in so many feet of a residential district.  
23                  That way you couldn't kind of consolidate a bunch  
24                  of these lots. You'd still be in the middle of a

1 residential neighborhood.

2 That's the same -- two of these lots would  
3 be well over an acre and a half, but this is a  
4 residential subdivision here. So that's why we  
5 came up with both these use standards to make  
6 sure we kind of mitigate against that sort of  
7 impact.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: I just wanted to point  
10 out that the language as printed on page 5 of the  
11 staff report actually reads not to be located on  
12 a lot that is less than 2 acres in area.

13 MR. O'ROURKE: I'm sorry. There was  
14 a couple of different versions --

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

16 MR. O'ROURKE: -- floating around,  
17 sorry, when I was going through this.

18 MEMBER KESSLER: My question is, you  
19 know, you have certain restrictions in place in  
20 proximity to residential.

21 What other restrictions are you proposing  
22 for this? Are there restrictions in the --

23 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. In the staff  
24 report, we highlighted all the current

1 restrictions in the use standards chapter, which  
2 is this section here 17.20.030. There's a whole  
3 list of restrictions. All these will apply.  
4 Everything from Item 1 through Item 8 applies to  
5 every permitted motor vehicle storage lot in the  
6 city.

7 No. 9 is the new provisions that will only  
8 apply to the M-1 District. So there's a whole  
9 list of restrictions there.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: In those  
11 restrictions, is there anything that -- how do  
12 you prevent it becoming a junkyard, if someone  
13 dumps too many cars there?

14 MR. O'ROURKE: The intent of the  
15 district or this use is really for it to be for  
16 new car sales. A junkyard would be a different  
17 use.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I understand. I'm  
19 saying what would prevent this from looking like  
20 one? I know they get shiny new cars and they'd  
21 park them.

22 MR. O'ROURKE: At the end of the day,  
23 that would be a code enforcement issue in keeping  
24 up with the property owners.

1                   MEMBER KESSLER: I have a great idea  
2                   for St. Charles Chrysler Dodge and Jeep, and that  
3                   would be go on the other side of town, rent space  
4                   on a major thoroughfare, and you have one and put  
5                   an outside storage lot there with a sign. You  
6                   could even do a sign. You could have another  
7                   dealership. You just couldn't conduct sales  
8                   there. So we could do that. That's a great  
9                   idea.

10                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Would it be  
11                   possible on a few parcels that are actually right  
12                   on Main Street that that would be restricted from  
13                   that, and that way they're not -- you know, as  
14                   you're going down a main thoroughfare, you're not  
15                   actually seeing it be a lot.

16                   MR. O'ROURKE: You know, that is  
17                   something that staff talked about.

18                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay. There's  
19                   only a few of them.

20                   MR. O'ROURKE: There are. I think  
21                   what staff's conclusion was that there were so  
22                   many dealerships on that portion of East Main  
23                   Street, that even though you're not selling them  
24                   on these lots, why differentiate the two since

1           that is sort of the look there. That was the  
2           conclusion staff came to.

3                       MEMBER DOYLE: I have two questions,  
4           one for the other Plan Commissioners and one for  
5           staff.

6                       I'm sensing that there is some hesitancy  
7           about whether the restrictions are adequate  
8           enough. I'm not certain if I'm reading that  
9           correctly. But the segue to my question for  
10          staff is you could put it as a special use rather  
11          than as a permitted use.

12                      MR. O'ROURKE: We talked about that.  
13          Really it was when you think about the findings  
14          of fact for a special use and how it relates to  
15          this use, we just didn't see that as being one of  
16          those things where you could literally stand up,  
17          and say, yes, this meets all those findings, and  
18          there was a great way to differentiate one motor  
19          vehicle storage lot from another based on that.

20                      MEMBER DOYLE: Yeah.

21                      MR. O'ROURKE: We felt the use  
22          restrictions were more of kind of a blanket over  
23          the things you try to limit through the special  
24          use and the impact anyway. So that's why staff

1           went the direction we did.

2                       MEMBER DOYLE: That there wouldn't be  
3 any reasonable objective way of assessing the  
4 findings of fact --

5                       MR. O'ROURKE: Right.

6                       MEMBER DOYLE: -- to recommend up or  
7 down for a special use application.

8                       MR. O'ROURKE: Provided that they  
9 meet all the use standards that are already  
10 contained in the ordinance --

11                      MEMBER DOYLE: Yeah.

12                      MR. O'ROURKE: -- and the proposed  
13 use standards. It just wouldn't be a good way to  
14 do it.

15                      MEMBER KESSLER: Well, if I gave the  
16 impression that I'm resistant, I'm not because I  
17 know of two cases in particular, I think three  
18 cases in the M-1 where there has been special  
19 exceptions to this, just on a much smaller scale;  
20 but any time somebody wanted to mitigate, let's  
21 say, a body stop and store vehicles -- for a  
22 place to store motor vehicles, they would need  
23 special permission to do it. I think there's two  
24 cases I know of on the west side of town where

1           that's occurring now. So this is just  
2           mitigating. So I don't object to it.

3                         CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other  
4           questions?

5                         MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm curious how many  
6           cars will be stored here.

7                         MR. CONTI: Hello, I'm Joe Conti.

8                         We have -- it would fluctuate. This is our  
9           busiest time of the year because part of our need  
10          for storage is we're either bringing fleet  
11          vehicles in, and they'll come in at, say, 25 at a  
12          time. Maybe a company like Coca-Cola or somebody  
13          would send people over to pick them up and give  
14          courtesy deliveries.

15                        I would say that we're in the neighborhood  
16          of maybe 100 to 170 cars, somewhere in that  
17          range.

18                        MEMBER SCHUETZ: You do have that  
19          many there.

20                        MR. CONTI: Yeah. We have been  
21          working with the building department. Actually  
22          it's not a display lot where we're trying to show  
23          it off from the road. It's just a storage, and  
24          we would actually just create like large squares

1           where we would park either two or three deep in  
2           pods with aisles in between.

3                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:   Where did you  
4           intend on storing the fleet vehicles?

5                   MR. CONTI:   There are -- if you've  
6           been by this lot, we currently have vehicles  
7           parked on there with a temporary permission to do  
8           such, and they're there right now.

9                   MEMBER KESSLER:   That's for now.

10                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:   Well, because  
11           according to the zoning ordinance, commercial  
12           vehicles shall only be stored in the M-2  
13           District.

14                   MR. CONTI:   Well, no, no, no.  When I  
15           say "fleet," they're not -- there's nothing more  
16           than our range of vehicles in that they're cars,  
17           pickup trucks.  Fleets are just companies that  
18           buy a large quantity.

19                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE:   Okay.

20                   MR. O'ROURKE:   Enterprise.

21                   MR. CONTI:   We have no big trucks, no  
22           semis, nothing larger than what would be a Dodge  
23           Ram or a --

24                   MEMBER SCHUETZ:   They usually turn

1           around in about 24 hours, maybe 48 hours because  
2           I have one.

3                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, you do.

4                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah. I just go  
5           pick it up.

6                   MEMBER KESSLER: You have a fleet of  
7           vehicles.

8                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: No. I have a fleet  
9           vehicle.

10                   MR. CONTI: Part of our -- we have an  
11           agreement with the City where, you know, economic  
12           development to try to bring more -- I agreed to  
13           bring fleet vehicles from other businesses to  
14           drive the sales tax revenue. So that's part  
15           of -- this is allowing us to bring more business  
16           to St. Charles.

17                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other  
18           questions?

19                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have one more  
20           question.

21                   MR. CONTI: Sure.

22                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: So if you don't  
23           store them here, what will you do?

24                   MR. CONTI: Good point. I don't have

1 option B on the table right now. We purchased  
2 this property with that intention. We have a  
3 full set of drawings to proceed with building the  
4 lot.

5 I don't know if you're familiar at all.  
6 The cement factory would go down, and then it  
7 would come to the drain -- we helped fix some of  
8 the drainage in that area. We would, I guess, be  
9 out searching for another lot somewhere.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I know of a really  
11 big empty parking lot on the east side.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: The mall.

13 MR. O'ROURKE: Wrong zoning.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Darn it.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: Well, why don't we  
16 change that.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

18 MR. CONTI: By the way, I live behind  
19 the mall.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it would be  
21 really convenient for you.

22 MR. CONTI: Yeah.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: One last question --  
24 as far as landscaping is there anything

1 considered there?

2 MR. O'ROURKE: There will be some  
3 required landscaping along the public street  
4 frontage, but if you read those provisions  
5 regarding that use, it does waive some of the  
6 interior landscaping just simply because it's for  
7 a parking lot.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: No. I understand  
9 that. I'm more concerned about the visual from  
10 the street.

11 MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah. We require in  
12 the zoning ordinance so many trees for every 40  
13 feet and those things, and the Applicant is aware  
14 of that.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So you'll be putting  
16 those in.

17 MR. CONTI: Actually, yes, there is a  
18 road -- along Production, there's a whole road  
19 with nice mature trees that stay, and there's  
20 proposed, you know, some smaller --

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And they're all ash.

22 MR. CONTI: Is what they're cutting  
23 down right now? Yeah. I just had three on my  
24 street taken down.

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

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions from  
5 members of the public?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

8 MEMBER KESSLER: I would make a  
9 motion to close the public hearing.

10 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Seconded by Sue.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: That's all right.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved  
14 and seconded to close the public hearing.

15 Any discussion on that motion?

16 (No response.)

17 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

18 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

19 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

21 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

23 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The  
5 public hearing is now closed.

6 We will move on to Item 9 on the agenda  
7 which is General Amendment, Joseph Conti, Table  
8 17.16-1 Office/Research, Manufacturing, and  
9 Public Lands Permitted and Special Uses to permit  
10 permanent motor vehicle storage in the M-1  
11 Special Manufacturing Zoning District, and  
12 Section 17.20.030.P Motor Vehicle Storage  
13 Temporary and Permanent to include specific  
14 standards for properties in the M-1 Special  
15 Manufacturing District.

16 Is there a motion?

17 MEMBER KESSLER: I make a motion to  
18 recommend approval of Item 9 as described on the  
19 agenda.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

21 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
23 discussion on the motion?

24 (No response.)

1                   MEMBER KESSLER: I'll call the vote.

2                   Amatangelo.

3                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

4                   MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

5                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

6                   MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

7                   MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

8                   MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

9                   MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

10                  MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

11                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

12                  MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

13                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
14 concludes Item 9 on the agenda.

15                  Thank you very much.

16                               (Which were all the proceedings  
17                               had in the above-entitled matter  
18                               ending at the hour of 7:56 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

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

I, JOANNE E. ELY, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter and that the foregoing is a true, correct, and complete transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this 18th day of March, 2013.



*Joanne E. Ely*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

My commission expires  
May 16, 2016.

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

S62457C

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
Application for a Special )  
Use Amendment to Existing )  
Tattoo Parlor. )

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of  
the above-entitled matter before the Plan  
Commission of the City of St. Charles in the  
Council Chambers, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles,  
Illinois, on March 12, 2013, at the hour of  
7:56 p.m.

1           **PRESENT:**

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

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

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

5                   **MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;**

6                   **MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and**

7                   **MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.**

8           **ALSO PRESENT:**

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

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moving on then to  
2                   Item 5 on the agenda, which is 2047 Lincoln  
3                   Highway, Ryan Harnish, application for a special  
4                   use amendment to existing tattoo parlor.

5                   For the record, we have two exhibits.  
6                   Exhibit A is Special Use Application, 2047  
7                   Lincoln Highway, received 2/11/2013.

8                   Exhibit B, staff report from Matthew  
9                   O'Rourke, planner, dated 3/1/2013.

10                  If you would raise your right hand.

11   (The witness was thereupon duly  
12   sworn.)

13                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. When  
14                  you speak, if you could just be sure to speak in  
15                  the microphone and spell your last name for the  
16                  record.

17                  Matt.

18                  MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. I'll help with  
19                  some of the more technical details.

20                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

21                  MR. O'ROURKE: Other than, we'll  
22                  keep -- they know their business but not  
23                  technically the zoning.

24                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Got it.

1                   MR. O'ROURKE: The application before  
2                   you is for an amendment to an existing special  
3                   use for a tattoo parlor out of a business that's  
4                   currently at 2045 Lincoln Highway. They're  
5                   looking to move into the larger unit at 2047  
6                   Lincoln Highway.

7                   Essentially, when the first special use was  
8                   approved, they're always tied to the property.  
9                   In this case, we wrote it specifically tied to  
10                  that unit. So any sort of amendment,  
11                  enlargement, anything beyond that unit space  
12                  requires them to go back through the special use  
13                  amendment process, which is why the Applicant is  
14                  here today.

15                  It's simply just trying to grow their  
16                  business. It's on the same property, the same  
17                  parcel. It's just the formality of locking into  
18                  the unit.

19                  So that's why the Applicant is here in  
20                  front of you this evening. Included in the staff  
21                  report is the planning, and Ryan is here to talk  
22                  about his business a little.

23                                 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

24                                 MR. HARNISH: Yeah. We're actually

1 just moving directly next door. The only reason  
2 that I believe we're here is just for the reason  
3 that, you know, was mentioned, that we're  
4 enlarging the space.

5 The previous space when we were passed was  
6 that we had to -- and the same policies still  
7 hold in effect there -- at least we would have  
8 them hold in effect because we have to in the new  
9 space as far as the times of open and close and  
10 also as far as the biggest problem that  
11 happened -- in the old space we were dealing  
12 with, I believe, 1,065 square feet.

13 We're really only going to be enlarging  
14 just -- it's almost 600 square feet. The reason  
15 for that being is because there's a loitering  
16 policy on the old space and that we couldn't  
17 have -- we had to have a certain amount of people  
18 inside the shop, and we couldn't go beyond that.

19 So we actually had to hire someone else in  
20 order just to stop the flow of traffic and book  
21 them for previous or future appointments;  
22 otherwise, we were in violation of our own code.  
23 So in the larger space, we can actually  
24 accommodate them, and another part is giving

1           someone else a job and actually filling the  
2           demand for tattoos within that area and not  
3           having these people loitering inside the shop or  
4           what kind of looked that way. We can actually  
5           make more among ourselves and in turn help you  
6           guys.

7                       MEMBER KESSLER: So business has been  
8           good.

9                       MR. HARNISH: Business has actually  
10          been very well.

11                      MEMBER KESSLER: Great. How long ago  
12          was it that --

13                      MR. HARNISH: We opened up the old  
14          shop about two years ago, and within two years,  
15          when we were tracking it, we were doing --  
16          roughly for the first few months, we were only  
17          doing, which put us right on quota though, we  
18          were doing about 20 clients a month, and now, we  
19          are actually in excess of about nine tattoos a  
20          day.

21                      MEMBER KESSLER: Wow. That's  
22          fantastic.

23                      CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
24          questions?

1                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: I do. I read  
2                   through the information that the staff provided,  
3                   and it appears as though that no additional  
4                   parking spots will be needed or you'll be --  
5                   you'll have enough parking spaces.

6                   MR. O'ROURKE: Yes. It's in a PUD.

7                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

8                   MR. O'ROURKE: You know, it was  
9                   designed for a certain type of use. The parking  
10                  requirement for this use is the same as our  
11                  general retail uses with what you'd expect in  
12                  there.

13                  MEMBER SCHUETZ: So there's no  
14                  problem.

15                  MR. O'ROURKE: There is no problem.  
16                  I think you could probably go out there and  
17                  figure out most of the tenant spaces are empty.  
18                  That's usually how we go by what existing uses  
19                  are in the building, and since it's basically a  
20                  blank building, they should have enough parking.

21                  MEMBER SCHUETZ: So what you're  
22                  saying is you had people waiting for appointments  
23                  outside?

24                  MR. HARNISH: We have a lobby area

1           within the tattoo shop. The lobby area -- we  
2           never expected really for the tattoo shop to  
3           really expand so quickly and the demand for the  
4           tattoos. I'm happy that it has; however, the  
5           lobby area is swelled with people.

6                        So with the new tattoo shop -- the  
7           difference in the old shop, and I don't know if  
8           anyone would recall, but we actually had the  
9           front lobby actually for the most part blocked  
10          off with the frosted glass, which didn't let us  
11          in the back have a line of sight of what was  
12          going on in the front.

13                       We installed security cameras, where people  
14          with -- security cameras that had to be wired in  
15          the back with the new shop so we can have an open  
16          feel where we actually have a view up to the  
17          front and can accommodate those guests up front.

18                       MR. O'ROURKE: I think a point of  
19          clarity, the people that were in the front were  
20          clients waiting.

21                       MR. HARNISH: Right.

22                       MR. O'ROURKE: It wasn't just  
23          people --

24                       MEMBER SCHUETZ: No. I know that.

1 All right.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Matt, a question.

3 I was looking through the code. Was there  
4 something about proximity to eating, drinking  
5 establishments for tattoo parlors?

6 MR. O'ROURKE: Not that I'm aware of.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Was there a  
8 restriction? I thought that I remembered that.

9 MR. O'ROURKE: There are for other  
10 adult-oriented uses. There's sort of  
11 restrictions, but this does not fit into that  
12 category.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I knew that  
14 there's a new bar that just opened up next door.

15 MR. HARNISH: Yeah. I mean we're  
16 governed by the laws from the same health  
17 department, agencies, and everything.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

19 MR. HARNISH: So we have to abide by  
20 that.

21 As far as St. Charles, I believe that we  
22 are actually zoned in the BR section, which by  
23 the way I'd love to get out of in the future, but  
24 I'll stick with it for now. But the reason being

1 is because if we did get downtown, then we'd  
2 have, I don't know, drunken and disorderly people  
3 coming into the shop.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

5 MR. HARNISH: There was a bar that  
6 actually opened up next door to us after we were  
7 there. So I wouldn't think that it would be such  
8 a problem.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. I just want  
10 to make sure that there's not anything that we  
11 need to be concerned about as far as --

12 MR. O'ROURKE: That may have been  
13 discussed at the last --

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

15 MEMBER KESSLER: I think part of the  
16 discussion we had at the last one was -- I think  
17 it related to the hours.

18 MR. O'ROURKE: Yes.

19 MEMBER KESSLER: With people closing  
20 down bars at 2:00 a.m. in Elgin and coming down  
21 here for tattoos. I remember that discussion.

22 MR. O'ROURKE: And the staff report  
23 has kind of rehashed what those conditions are,  
24 and staff is recommending those carry over as

1 part of this new special use ordinance. I was  
2 going to mention that.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other  
4 questions, Plan Commissioners?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
7 questions from members of the audience?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

10 MEMBER KESSLER: I would entertain a  
11 motion to recommend approval.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Close the public  
13 hearing.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: I'd move to close the  
15 public hearing.

16 MEMBER KESSLER: I'll second that.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
18 discussion on the motion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

21 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

22 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

23 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

4 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

7 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The  
9 public hearing is closed. That concludes Item 5  
10 on the agenda.

11 Now moving on to Item 10 which is 2047  
12 Lincoln Highway, Ryan Harnish, application for  
13 special use amendment to existing tattoo parlor.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: I make a motion to  
15 recommend approval Of Item 10 as stated in the  
16 agenda.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's  
19 been moved and seconded.

20 Discussion on the motion? Sue.

21 Oh, you were ready to vote.

22 Okay. Any discussion on the motion?

23 (No response.)

24 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

1 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.  
2 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.  
3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.  
4 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.  
5 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.  
6 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.  
7 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.  
8 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.  
9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.  
10 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.  
11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That is Item 10 on  
12 the agenda.  
13 Thank you very much.  
14 (Which were all the proceedings  
15 had in the above-entitled matter  
16 ending at the hour of 8:05 p.m.)  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

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

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

I, JOANNE E. ELY, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter and that the foregoing is a true, correct, and complete transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this 18th day of March, 2013.



*Joanne E. Ely*

Certified Shorthand Reporter

My commission expires  
May 16, 2016.

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

S62457D

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

In the Matter of:                )  
  )  
Application for Special         )  
Uses, McDonald's.                )

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of  
the above-entitled matter before the Plan  
Commission of the City of St. Charles in the  
Council Chambers, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles,  
Illinois, on March 12, 2013, at the hour of  
8:05 p.m.

1           **PRESENT:**

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

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

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

5                   **MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;**

6                   **MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and**

7                   **MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.**

8           **ALSO PRESENT:**

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

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Exhibits.

2 MR. O'ROURKE: There shouldn't be any  
3 exhibits.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No exhibits.  
5 Okay.

6 MR. O'ROURKE: We're just asking that  
7 this item be opened and continued to the next  
8 meeting.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Got you.

10 Okay. Item 7 is 1915 West Main Street,  
11 McDonald's, Application for Special Uses, Planned  
12 Unit Development, Restaurant and Drive-Through  
13 Facility; Application for PUD Preliminary Plan;  
14 Application for a Final Plat of Subdivision; and  
15 supporting documents: Parking Analysis Memo, V3  
16 Companies, dated 1/25/2013; Preliminary  
17 Engineering Plans, V3 Companies, dated 1/25/2013;  
18 Architectural Elevations, M US Restaurant  
19 Development, dated 11/15/2012; and Final Plat of  
20 Subdivision, V3 Companies, dated 2/25/2013.

21 So we're not doing any testimony on this.  
22 We're just --

23 MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah. Essentially,  
24 this item was always planned to be on the 19th

1 for a recommendation, but with the cancellations,  
2 we just thought we'd keep that date across.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I need a  
4 motion.

5 MEMBER PRETZ: I will make a motion  
6 to move to continue the public hearing to March  
7 19th?

8 MR. O'ROURKE: March, yeah, 19th.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Is that right? Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Second?

11 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sue already  
14 seconded.

15 It's been moved and seconded. Any  
16 discussion on the motion?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

19 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

20 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

21 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

23 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

1 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

3 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

5 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That  
7 is continued to our next meeting.

8 (Whereupon, at 8:07 p.m., the  
9 hearing was continued to March  
10 19, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

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

I, JOANNE E. ELY, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter and that the foregoing is a true, correct, and complete transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this 18th day of March, 2013.



*Joanne E. Ely*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

My commission expires  
May 16, 2016.

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

S62457E

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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
General Meeting )

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of  
the above-entitled matter before the Plan  
Commission of the City of St. Charles in the  
Council Chambers, 2 East Main Street, St. Charles,  
Illinois, on March 12, 2013, at the hour of  
8:07 p.m.

1           **PRESENT:**

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

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

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

5                   **MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;**

6                   **MR. THOMAS PRETZ, Member; and**

7                   **MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.**

8           **ALSO PRESENT:**

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

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That concludes the  
2 public hearing portion of the meeting, and now we  
3 have Item 8 which is Boulder Heights Subdivision,  
4 Southampton Builders, Application for Final Plat  
5 of Subdivision.

6                   What do we have.

7                   MR. COLBY: This is a final plat for  
8 a minor subdivision, which you'll recall when we  
9 discussed the updates to the subdivision code.  
10 We were creating a process for small, simple  
11 subdivisions where there's a lot split or a split  
12 up to four lots, that there's going to be an  
13 abbreviated process whereby the final plat comes  
14 before the Plan Commission without any  
15 preliminary review or any preliminary plan or  
16 preliminary engineering plan. This is one of  
17 those situations.

18                   The property is located at 802 South 5th  
19 Avenue. Here is an aerial of the site. There  
20 was previously a house there. That has been  
21 demolished and is vacant. The proposal is to  
22 split the property into two lots which would  
23 measure 50-feet-by-100-feet equaling 5,000 square  
24 feet, which is the minimum lot area for that

1 zoning district.

2 Staff has reviewed the final plat of  
3 subdivision and had some minor comments and is  
4 recommending approval of the application subject  
5 to resolution of those comments prior to City  
6 Council action.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is  
8 there a motion?

9 MEMBER PRETZ: I had a question.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: The building  
12 footprint -- the new building, the new homes that  
13 are being built, the beginning of their  
14 footprint, how does that line up with the  
15 neighbor? Is the idea that with the change to  
16 5 foot for utilities and yards, front yard  
17 size -- will the new buildings be forward from  
18 that, equal to, or set behind?

19 MR. COLBY: Well, the zoning  
20 requirements set the minimum front yard of  
21 20 feet. So, you know, absent what's going on  
22 around the property, it starts at a minimum of  
23 20 feet.

24 We also allow for any averaging of

1 setbacks, if there's a shorter setback along that  
2 block. So if all the other houses along that  
3 block have a shorter front-yard setback, we  
4 usually do the averaging formula to reduce that  
5 somewhat so that the building could be closer to  
6 the street based on the average.

7 So we don't require that the new building  
8 be constructed to that setback. They'll be able  
9 to set back really as far as they want depending  
10 on how they want to use the property, but, you  
11 know, 20 feet is pretty limiting if you want to  
12 fit a vehicle in front of a building, for  
13 example, which is why it's set at what it is now.

14 I don't know if that answers the question.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: The reason that I was  
16 asking is that being somewhat familiar with a  
17 smaller size lot, and I took a tape measure to go  
18 out in the front, and there's a sidewalk, and I  
19 know -- and I'm just doing it from experience, 20  
20 feet is not very far from the street and that  
21 area is Route 25 right through there.

22 MR. COLBY: Yes.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: I went over there to  
24 take a look. My concern was that if it's just

1           20 feet back, it's awfully close to the road.

2                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: My son lives on that  
3 street, and he has a house there, and it's  
4 50 feet from the street.

5                   MEMBER PRETZ: It's how far?

6                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: 50 feet.

7                   MEMBER PRETZ: From 25.

8                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: If you look at lot  
9 808 on this, it's right by this sidewalk. When  
10 you look at 812, it's set back about 10 feet  
11 further. I think that's what --

12                   MR. COLBY: Yes. The setbacks are,  
13 you know, commonly much shorter than 20 feet --

14                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.

15                   MR. COLBY: -- in some of these older  
16 neighborhoods.

17                   MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. I was just  
18 trying to get a feel.

19                   MEMBER SCHUETZ: It's more of a  
20 pedestrian feel rather than a vehicular feel.  
21 That's how St. Charles was originally designed.  
22 So they're going to be varying a lot, which I  
23 think is cool.

24                   I have a question on the lot size on

1           No. 716. What is the square footage of that lot,  
2           the one adjacent to it?

3                       MR. COLBY: I don't know. The  
4           Applicant --

5                       MEMBER PRETZ: I would say 50-by-100.

6                       MR. COLBY: Yeah. It's most likely  
7           50-by-100. It was subdivided originally by  
8           200-feet-by-200-foot lots, and then it was sort  
9           of split over time.

10                      MEMBER SCHUETZ: I see.

11                      MR. COLBY: So I would assume it's  
12           50 feet along Fifth Avenue, and then it would be  
13           about 5,000 square feet.

14                      MEMBER DOYLE: One question I have is  
15           would the approval of this application introduce  
16           any provision for allowing curb cuts that are not  
17           already permitted?

18                      MR. COLBY: The plat in this case  
19           will require access approval from IDOT. IDOT is  
20           signatory to the plat because it's their street.  
21           The Applicant has discussed with IDOT allowing  
22           two individual driveways to these lots, and I  
23           believe they are agreeable to that based on the  
24           nature of the type of development around this

1 property.

2 You know, with a subdivision plat, we do  
3 look at access to these lots; but in this case,  
4 it's not a City street, so it's not something  
5 that the City would be considering. But in  
6 neighborhoods similar to this one, the 50-foot  
7 lots, they all do have a front access point.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Are there other houses  
9 on this block that do have --

10 MR. COLBY: Yes.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: -- do have an access.

12 All right.

13 The second question I have is in Section D  
14 on page 4, the final comment, "The final plat is  
15 under review by City departments, and there may  
16 be additional comments."

17 Would those additional comments be covered  
18 under the motion as proposed?

19 MR. COLBY: Yes. We believe those  
20 would be minor in nature, which is why we're  
21 comfortable with the recommendations.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any  
23 further discussion?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion?

2 MEMBER KESSLER: I make a motion to  
3 recommend approval of Item 8 as stated on the  
4 meeting agenda.

5 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Second.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: Do we need to close  
7 the public hearing?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. This is just  
9 for action.

10 All right. It's been moved and seconded.

11 Any discussion on the motion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

14 MEMBER KESSLER: Amatangelo.

15 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

16 MEMBER KESSLER: Schuetz.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

18 MEMBER KESSLER: Doyle.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

20 MEMBER KESSLER: Pretz.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

22 MEMBER KESSLER: Wallace.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

24 MEMBER KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

1                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank  
2                   you. That concludes Item 8 on the agenda.

3                   I have X'ed through everything, except for  
4                   12 which is meeting announcements.

5                   Russ, at the next meeting then we'll have a  
6                   public hearing for McDonald's. What else is  
7                   going on the agenda?

8                   MR. COLBY: Right. We also have the  
9                   comprehensive plan for the Commission. We're  
10                  anticipating at that meeting we will provide the  
11                  Commission with a recommendation on all of the  
12                  topics that have been discussed thus far that we  
13                  put into that table that I have been keeping.

14                  So we'll have recommendations on those  
15                  items. If the Commission concludes their  
16                  discussion of the other remaining chapters of the  
17                  plan that evening and is comfortable making a  
18                  recommendation, you will have an opportunity to  
19                  do that.

20                  Alternately, you could continue discussion.  
21                  We have a recommendation prepared for the  
22                  elements that have been discussed thus far.

23                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then the  
24                  April 2nd meeting, April 16th.

1                   Anyone know that they will not be able to  
2                   be present at any of those meetings?

3                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: I will not be  
4                   available on March 19th.

5                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6                   MEMBER AMATANGELO: And April 16th.

7                   CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Fine.

8                   Have we heard from Curt at all, whether he  
9                   is available to be present at the next meeting?

10                  MR. COLBY: I have not, but I assume  
11                  he will be.

12                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. We  
13                  just need to make sure that we don't have any  
14                  quorum issues.

15                  Any additional business for Plan Commission  
16                  members? Staff? Citizens?

17   (No response.)

18                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is  
19                  there a motion to adjourn?

20                  MEMBER KESSLER: So moved.

21                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

22   (The ayes were thereupon heard.)

23                  CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

24   (No response.)

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

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Please take note  
the St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at  
8:16 p.m.

(Which were all the proceedings  
had in the above-entitled matter  
ending at the hour of 8:16 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, JOANNE E. ELY, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 84-4169, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter and that the foregoing is a true, correct, and complete transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this 18th day of March, 2013.



*Joanne E. Ely*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

My commission expires  
May 16, 2016.