

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2014**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Brian Doyle
Steve Gaugel
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tom Pretz
Tom Schuetz
Sue Amatangelo

Members Absent: Vice Chair Tim Kessler
James Holderfield

Also Present: Russell Colby-Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson-Planner
Rita Tungare-Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Chris Tiedt-Development Engineering Manager

Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

Chairman Wallace called the roll. A quorum was present.

3. Presentation of minutes of the October 7, 2014 meeting.

Motion was made by Ms. Amatangelo, seconded by Mr. Schuetz and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the October 7, 2014 meeting.

Chairman Wallace moved item 6 on the Agenda to be discussed first. There were no objections.

MEETING

6. The Quad St. Charles, 3800 E. Main St. (Charlestowne Mall PUD)(SC 3800 Main LLC) Application for Final Plat of Subdivision

The attached transcript prepared by Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Ms. Amatangelo and seconded by Mr. Doyle to approve the application for Final Plat of Subdivision, subject to resolution of staff comments.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Gaugel, Pretz, Amatangelo, Purdy, Schuetz, Doyle, Wallace

Nays:

Absent: Kessler, Holderfield

Motion carried: 7-0

PUBLIC HEARING

4. 600-660 S. Randall Road, Randall Shoppes PUD (Dyne Rote, LLC)

Application for Special Use for Drive-Through Facility

The attached transcript prepared by Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Gaugel to close the public hearing. Seconded by Schuetz.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Gaugel, Pretz, Doyle, Amatangelo, Purdy, Schuetz, Wallace

Nays:

Absent: Kessler, Holderfield

Motion carried: 7-0

MEETING

5. 600-660 S. Randall Road, Randall Shoppes PUD (Dyne Rote, LLC)

Application for Special Use for Drive-Through Facility

The attached transcript prepared by Chicago Area Real Time Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Mr. Gaugel, seconded by Mr. Pretz to approve the application for a Special Use for a Drive-Through Facility for a Coffee or Tea Room, with condition that eight stacking spaces be provided.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Gaugel, Pretz, Amatangelo, Purdy, Schuetz

Nays: Wallace, Doyle

Absent: Kessler, Holderfield

Motion carried: 5-2

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, October 21, 2014

Page 3

7. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, November 4, 2014 – Meeting cancelled

Tuesday, November 18, 2014 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, December 2, 2014 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, November 10, 2014 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, December 8, 2014 at 7:00 pm Council Chambers

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

9. Adjournment at 8:30PM

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

PRESENT:

- MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;
- MS. SUE AMATANGELO, Member;
- MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;
- MR. STEVE GAUGEL, Member;
- MR. TOM PRETZ, Member;
- MS. LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY; Member; and
- MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.

ALSO PRESENT:

- MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager;
- MS. ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner;
- MR. CHRIS TIEDT, Development Engineering Manager; and
- MS. RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community and Economic Development.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

3

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. This
2 hearing of the St. Charles Plan Commission will come
3 to order. Tim is not here, so I guess I'll do the
4 roll call.

5 Amatangelo.

6 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Here.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Doyle.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Gaugel.

10 MEMBER GAUGEL: Here.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Holderfield.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin-Purdy.

14 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 3 is
20 the presentation of the minutes of the October 7th,
21 2014, meeting.

22 Is there a motion to approve?

23 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

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

3 (Ayes heard.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes
7 unani mousl y.

8 At this time before we move on to Item No. 4
9 on the agenda, let's go ahead and take Item 6 unless
10 there is an objection to that.

11 All right. Seeing none, Item 6, The Quad
12 St. Charles, 3800 East Main Street, Charlestowne PUD,
13 SC, 3800 Main, LLC, application for a final plat of
14 subdivi si on.

15 Go ahead, Russ.

16 MR. COLBY: This is a final plat
17 application to create the outlots for The Quad project.
18 These would be the lots running along Route 64.

19 The Commission last saw the PUD preliminary
20 plat, both the site and engineering plans in the
21 spring. Subsequent to that, there were some smaller
22 additions and minor changes to the site plan relating
23 to the outlots.

24 This plat is being submitted to create zoning

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

5

1 lots for future building locations. There will be
2 building pads and parking located on those lots.

3 Staff has reviewed the plat application and
4 reviewed the preliminary plan, and the PUD requirements
5 and has found it is in compliance. There's a few
6 comments related to the easements we'll be resolving
7 with the Applicant, but staff is recommending approval
8 subsequent to the resolution of staff comments.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Say that again about
10 the easements.

11 MR. COLBY: There were some comments
12 provided to the Applicant regarding the need for
13 utility easements around the lots. There have been
14 some utilities that have been relocated on the site as
15 part of the construction that's ongoing now.

16 So we need to have easements granted for
17 those utilities and also provided on some of the lot
18 lines that were necessary, and the Applicant has agreed
19 to work with staff in resolving those.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Very well.

21 Any discussion or a motion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The Chair will
24 entertain a motion for approval of application for

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

1 final plat of subdivision for The Quad St. Charles,
2 3800 East Main Street, subject to resolution of staff
3 comments.

4 MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. It's been
7 moved and seconded.

8 Any discussion on the motion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

11 Amatangelo.

12 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Doyle.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Gaugel.

16 MEMBER GAUGEL: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin-Purdy.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace, yes.

24 That motion passes unanimously, and that

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

1 concludes Item 6 on your agenda.

2 PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 7:07 P.M.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

PRESENT:

- MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;
- MS. SUE AMATANGELO, Member;
- MR. BRIAN DOYLE, Member;
- MR. STEVE GAUGEL, Member;
- MR. TOM PRETZ, Member;
- MS. LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY; Member; and
- MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.

ALSO PRESENT:

- MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager;
- MS. ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner;
- MR. CHRIS TIEDT, Development Engineering Manager; and
- MS. RITA TUNGARE, Director of Community and Economic Development.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Next we
2 will go to Item 4, which is a public hearing, 600-660
3 South Randall Road, Randall Shoppes PUD, Dyne Rote,
4 LLC, application for special use for a drive-through
5 facility.

6 Entering the public hearing portion of our
7 meeting, the purpose of a public hearing is for the
8 Plan Commission to consider evidence both for and
9 against any application that comes before the City, in
10 this particular instance, an application for a special
11 use for a drive-through facility.

12 In reviewing and considering this
13 application, the Plan Commission considers findings of
14 fact for a special use. The Plan Commission was given
15 the findings of fact for a special use. This is what
16 was submitted by the Applicant?

17 MR. COLBY: That is correct.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. In order for
19 the Plan Commission to decide that the special use
20 should be allowed or to decide to recommend those -- a
21 recommendation to the City Council should be made for
22 approval of the special use, we have to consider these
23 findings of fact and -- sorry, hold on one second.

24 Now, in this particular instance, Russ, maybe

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

4

1 you can help us out. Since we have just been through
2 Plan Commission training, we'll use this as our first
3 step, as our first example.

4 So for findings of fact for a special use,
5 the Plan Commission considers these factors and in the
6 end decides based on all of the factors as a whole
7 whether or not to recommend a special use be approved;
8 correct?

9 MR. COLBY: Correct. The Plan
10 Commission needs to find in the affirmative on each of
11 the individual factors to make a recommendation for
12 approval.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And in being
14 given the findings of fact -- this finding of fact
15 sheet that was submitted by the Applicant, these are
16 the findings of fact that the Applicant would like for
17 us to arrive at for these different findings of fact;
18 correct?

19 MR. COLBY: That is correct.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Just so
21 we're -- I know we still have some newer members. Just
22 to let you know, you know, this is what we do with
23 this. This is how we consider the application.

24 So tonight we're going to take evidence from

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

5

1 the Applicant, first of all. Then the Plan Commission
2 will ask questions of the Applicant, and then the Plan
3 Commission or anyone else who wishes to offer testimony
4 either for or against the application may do so after
5 that.

6 As soon as the Plan Commission determines
7 that it has enough evidence to make a recommendation to
8 the City Council, then it would be in order to close
9 the hearing.

10 Now tonight we also have this on our agenda
11 as Item 5 for action, if the public hearing is closed
12 and if the Plan Commission feels that they can make a
13 recommendation to the City Council.

14 Any questions regarding procedure? Any
15 questions from the audience?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. At this
18 time anyone who wishes to offer testimony or ask any
19 questions, I ask that you be sworn in.

20 Please raise your right hand.

21 (Witnesses duly sworn.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

23 When you offer testimony or ask any
24 questions, could you just approach the lectern and

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

6

1 state your name in full, spell your last name, and also
2 state your address for the record.

3 Anything before the Applicant, Russ?

4 MR. COLBY: No.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

6 MR. KEYS: Good evening. My name is
7 Marvin Keys, address is 6801 Spring Creek Road in
8 Rockford, Illinois. I'm here on behalf of the
9 Petitioner, Dyne Rote, LLC.

10 I'm glad to be back in front of you guys, not
11 that I expected to be back so soon, but being back
12 before you means something is happening on our site
13 which is a good thing.

14 So we are happy to be in front of you guys
15 with a petition for a special use permit for a
16 drive-through. I am here with Phil Golding, who is a
17 representative from Starbucks, who will be available to
18 answer any questions after I complete my presentation
19 to address any particular concerns that you guys might
20 have that he would have some more expertise on as
21 opposed to myself as the representative for the
22 developer and the owner of the property.

23 I hope that in the last few months since we
24 were in front of you guys you at least had a chance to

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

7

1 drive by the building and see the work that's going on.
2 I know it looks a little rough. If you have been by
3 recently, it has been gutted out completely, and we're
4 in the process of redoing that facade, but it's going
5 to be turned into something much better and hopefully
6 meets all of your expectations based on what we have
7 proposed previously.

8 As you know, it is located at the
9 intersection of Prairie and Randall Road, that
10 southeast corner. It's a multitenant commercial
11 building, and our special use permit request is for a
12 drive-through to permit a Starbucks to operate on the
13 site.

14 The proposal specifically includes the
15 reconfiguration of the northern portion of the parking
16 lot which accommodates the drive-through facility with
17 the eight stacking spaces in there.

18 It includes an 81-square-foot bump-out which
19 you can see on the site plan, just where the
20 drive-through goes out to meet the actual lane for the
21 drive-through. And then the modifications to the
22 landscape plan to accommodate the reworking of that
23 site. Those modifications don't ultimately reduce the
24 amount of landscaping. It just changes where and how

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

8

1 it's laid out on the site.

2 Now, we're requesting -- one of the things
3 that has been raised in the staff report -- and what
4 I'll try and do is just kind of go through the staff
5 report and address some of the comments and questions
6 that they had or wanted us to address in the process
7 and identify kind of why we -- and explain why we think
8 that we qualify for the particular things and how we
9 expect that we meet them.

10 We'll go specifically through the special use
11 permit standards. We have provided those in part of
12 our packet, you guys have those; but otherwise, I'll
13 just give you some of the facts that end up supporting
14 those things as you make your decision.

15 What we're requesting is that the property --
16 or this use be considered as a coffee or tea room,
17 which is a specific designation under your zoning
18 ordinance, which this use squarely falls under this
19 definition. Specifically that states that it is a
20 limited menu restaurant which is located in conjunction
21 with and on the same premises as a retail use.

22 In addition, that ordinance provides that
23 when a coffeehouse is a permitted use in the district,
24 which it is here, that the coffee or tea room portion

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

9

1 of the use can be the primary use and not an accessory
2 use.

3 So I assume most of you are familiar with the
4 Starbucks business model. Obviously, they have a
5 limited menu of food items along with their coffees and
6 teas that they sell by the drink.

7 In addition, they have a retail component.
8 They sell mugs and drink cups and CDs and various
9 things like that. I think at holidays, they sell
10 Christmas ornaments and at different times. So based
11 on the definition within your ordinance, this falls
12 squarely within that, and we think it's appropriate to
13 do that.

14 It makes a difference in this case because of
15 the parking ratios that are required for a coffeehouse
16 versus a straight flat restaurant, which is the
17 difference between 10 cars per thousand and five cars
18 per thousand, so essentially half of the parking
19 requirement.

20 Now, one of the things that staff had asked
21 was for us to provide you some background or some
22 information about other Starbucks uses and where they
23 have perhaps varied from or have these kind of
24 standards with regards to their parking.

1 I think it's important to note that with a
2 Starbucks that has a drive-through versus a Starbucks
3 that does not have a drive-through, that they're very
4 different businesses. Because with a drive-through,
5 70 percent of the business that's done at a Starbucks
6 is done through the drive-through as opposed to in the
7 store. So it's a very different model from parking
8 requirements for a Starbucks with a drive-through with
9 that 70 percent ratio.

10 In addition, there is a couple of locations
11 that you may be familiar with that have actually a
12 lower parking ratio than what is provided for on ours,
13 which is the one in Geneva at 1431 South Randall. It's
14 co-located with a Chipotle, and that use actually has
15 4.3 per thousand between the two uses. So both
16 Chipotle, which is a full restaurant or would be a
17 restaurant under your designation, and the Starbucks
18 sharing that location, and they have 4.3 per thousand
19 located across that site.

20 The second location is at 2480 Randall Road
21 in Elgin, which has an 1839-square-foot Starbucks which
22 is very similar to this one. It's 2,015 square feet.
23 That one shares its space with a 4,500-square-foot
24 Panera, and together they share 52 spaces.

1 If you take the Panera as a restaurant with
2 10 cars per thousand, that leaves four cars per
3 thousand for the Starbucks. And you can mix that in
4 different ways based on the compatibility of the uses,
5 which also is permitted under your ordinance, but those
6 are just a couple of examples.

7 We also have a Starbucks in one of our
8 properties in Rockford that has six cars per thousand.
9 So they vary in range. But there are some that have
10 less than what we're requesting and some that have
11 more depending on the community and the site that they
12 go in.

13 But it certainly is not an unusual thing for
14 the variation or the change in parking to view this as
15 a five cars per thousand as opposed to a true
16 restaurant where people are coming in, sitting down,
17 eating, and parking for that period.

18 With regard to the site itself and how it
19 will function, we had a traffic study that we
20 prepared -- or that Starbucks actually had prepared
21 that we have submitted, and it's been included in the
22 staff comments. It's been reviewed by the staff
23 consultant.

24 That analysis ultimately provides that the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

12

1 use and the assumptions that are in there doesn't
2 negatively impact the surrounding traffic or the
3 surrounding community, which is one of your standards,
4 that we've got to make sure that what we're doing is
5 not going to negatively impact.

6 In terms of the traffic study, it looks at
7 the Level of Service for the intersections nearby, how
8 many cars are going out, turning, and all those things.

9 There was one intersection that was raised --
10 or one traffic pattern that was raised at our last
11 meeting, that is the left-turn lanes out of our
12 shopping center onto Prairie Road when there's people
13 turning left onto Randall Road from Prairie, and that
14 current traffic pattern as it stands now with our
15 development having the situation -- well, just a comic
16 store located there.

17 As it currently operates, it's a Level of
18 Service "E." With this development fully developed
19 with this use, with everything operating and
20 100 percent occupied, that Level of Service is exactly
21 the same. There is no change in the Level of Service
22 of that one, and all of the rest of the traffic
23 patterns at that intersection and all the other
24 intersections around it all operate well above the

1 service levels required or generally deemed to be
2 appropriate for traffic.

3 So there's nothing within our use or this
4 specific special use permit that has any negative
5 impact on that Level of Service overall.

6 In addition, we had -- as part of that
7 traffic study, they went to three nearby Starbucks
8 locations and looked at the stacking at the
9 drive-throughs.

10 These are all with locations that have
11 either -- I think one of them has 400 less cars per
12 day, which are 31,500 versus 31,200 cars per day going
13 by, and two other locations have 41,000-plus cars per
14 day going by them; and so these are similarly situated,
15 similar traffic patterns around the location and found
16 that the average stacking between those three locations
17 was six cars was the average during the peak time.

18 Now, that's the average. That's taking all
19 three of them and averaging each of those time slots
20 together, and six was the highest average.

21 Now, individually, the highest number of any
22 individual location at any individual time was eight
23 cars, eight cars of stacking. And so what we have
24 provided for is eight cars of stacking in this

1 drive-through to accommodate what would be essentially
2 the worst-case scenario. Even under a traffic pattern
3 where there's an additional 6,000 cars per day going
4 by, this accommodates that.

5 Starbucks obviously has worked with us in
6 designing this site and approving this site and making
7 sure that it works with their business model, and
8 everything that we have provided to you is what they
9 find acceptable.

10 The only other thing that was raised at the
11 last meeting that I wanted to address because it was
12 something that was talked about and I wanted to bring
13 you some closure or conclusion to it was some
14 discussions with regard to a cross-access easement with
15 regards to what we had talked about is on the south
16 side of our property, and it's the bank site, if we
17 could tie together into that property and allow cross
18 access.

19 And then if we had their approval, we could
20 go to the developer, Shodeen, and talk to them about
21 getting cross access across their parcel.

22 We spoke with Randy Morrissey who is the
23 director of real estate for the Chicago region for
24 Fifth Third Bank. I provided him with a site plan and

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

15

1 showing how the traffic interaction would work at that
2 location. This was back -- July 8th was when we
3 finally got -- we had talked a number of times. I got
4 him the site plan.

5 He called me back and said that they weren't
6 interested in pursuing an easement across -- pursuing
7 it any further.

8 So I did try -- over the last couple of weeks
9 after having some conversations with staff, I did try
10 to get something from him in writing. I have called
11 him three times. I have e-mailed him a couple of more
12 times, three or more times. I have not gotten any
13 response to get something in writing from him saying
14 that.

15 We have had those conversations, and at this
16 point without that access, we haven't gone to Shodeen
17 or any of those guys because we don't have the
18 necessary link in between the two. That's where that
19 stands.

20 Otherwise, I'm happy to answer any questions.
21 I'm happy to provide you with any additional
22 information that you might need; but otherwise, I'll
23 just let you guys address any questions that you have.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There was a comment

1 that was made I believe in the staff report regarding
2 if Prairie Street was widened to add a turn lane, there
3 would likely be a raised median.

4 MR. KEYS: I think what it said was
5 there was some comments in the traffic report or the
6 traffic study that said that at some point they may
7 widen Randall Road; and as part of that widening
8 project, it would likely result in a raised median at
9 this location and a right-in and right-out.

10 And I believe staff went -- and it's in their
11 report that they went to the County and asked them if
12 there were any plans at all in their planning schedule
13 to do any of that, and they said no.

14 I recognize that that's a possibility, that
15 somewhere down the line if there's a widening of
16 Randall Road to three lanes on each side, that that may
17 result in this having some access challenges. At that
18 point, we would have to deal with that. But there's no
19 plans at least that I know of and that were referenced
20 in any of the reports that would indicate that that's
21 actually been planned or has any time line for any kind
22 of implementation of that.

23 Obviously, that impacts us, but at this point
24 there is no -- there's nothing that we can do at this

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

17

1 stage about that, but we do know that it exists as a
2 potential future problem.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tom.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have a couple
5 questions.

6 On the Starbucks down in Geneva that's down
7 by the Chipotle, what is the stacking capacity there?

8 MR. KEYS: I don't know off the top of
9 my head.

10 MR. GOLDING: Six is standard.

11 MR. KEYS: Six is standard is what Phil
12 is saying.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And this one is eight,
14 if I recall correctly.

15 MR. KEYS: Yes. Correct.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Then I have just one
17 other question.

18 On the traffic study on Table 1 where
19 westbound on Prairie at peak hours is the "E" rate or
20 LOS, how many minute wait -- is that documented as far
21 as how many minute wait that would be?

22 MR. KEYS: Yeah. The Level of Service
23 "E," if I remember correctly -- it's in the back of our
24 traffic report -- I believe it says 51 seconds to

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

18

1 80 seconds is what is considered -- or 55 to 80. It is
2 in the traffic report.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it's not a big deal.

4 MR. KEYS: Right. It's under
5 80 seconds. To be "E," it has to be under 80 seconds.
6 I just don't know what the lower threshold --

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's fine. I was
8 just curious if it was 5 or 10 minutes or something
9 like that.

10 MR. KEYS: No.

11 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: I'm looking at page 6 of
14 your traffic study. At the top of the page it says,
15 "Existing Operations," which states that Level of
16 Service A is the highest, Level of Service "E"
17 represents saturated or at-capacity conditions, and
18 Level of Service "F" is the lowest, oversaturated
19 conditions. Then the last sentence is: "The minimum
20 intersection LOS that is generally accepted by industry
21 standards is LOS "D. "

22 So turning to your proposed findings of fact,
23 Findings of Fact B, sufficient infrastructure,
24 according to your traffic study, I'm reading that

1 westbound traffic at peak hours is at capacity and is
2 below generally accepted industry standards.

3 Could you explain how the Commission could
4 find that there is sufficient infrastructure to support
5 the special use?

6 MR. KEYS: Well, again, as I said, the
7 special use permit itself is not impacting that in any
8 negative way. Granting this special use does not
9 change the way it operates currently, and it
10 operates -- while it is not -- it's not a desirable
11 Level of Service, I don't think anybody would say a
12 Level of Service "E" is something that anybody wants,
13 but it is at capacity, meaning that it is at the limits
14 of what it is designed for. It's not over the limits.
15 It's at the limit. If it was at "F," it would be
16 failing, and it would be over the capacity that it was
17 designed for.

18 So while it is not -- generally if you were
19 designing something and saying, Hey, we want this to be
20 a Level of Service whatever, nobody is going to say
21 they wanted a Level of Service "E," but Level of
22 Service "E" is still functional; whereas "F" is
23 essentially a nonfunctioning -- the way they break it
24 down is they view it as a nonfunctioning section;

1 whereas this, while it's not ideal, doesn't -- it still
2 meets the requirements from our perspective that the
3 infrastructure is in place that allows it.

4 In addition, there is some tweaking that
5 could be done, and it was referenced in our traffic
6 consultant's report, and it was just that there may be
7 some tweaking that can be done to the way in which the
8 turns are handled versus the residential -- or there's
9 a pedestrian crossing, and how that all interacts that
10 may make this work better that can be worked on.

11 It was just something that they said that
12 there may be some tweaks that are available. I don't
13 know whether that comes from their software designs
14 that they just plug in the information and they think
15 that there might be some other ways to tweak that.

16 But I understand what you're saying, and I
17 believe that while it's not the ideal and it's not
18 something that generally, as you were saying, what we
19 would want it to be, but it is still functioning at the
20 capacity which it was designed for. So I think from
21 that perspective it meets the standard.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: So what does it mean when
23 it says that the minimal intersection LOS that is
24 generally accepted by industry standards is "D"?

1 MR. KEY: Meaning if you were
2 designing -- actually, my understanding -- and this is
3 based on -- I've been doing this for almost 20 years --
4 is when you're going to plan something and you're
5 designing an intersection that -- they wouldn't say if
6 you were going in, yes. If you're designing this for a
7 Level of Service "E," they would say no. It's got to
8 be designed for "D," not "E," but that doesn't mean
9 that "E" isn't functioning. The industry standard is
10 "D" is the lowest you want to go.

11 It already operates at an "E." We're not
12 doing anything that makes it worse than what it is.
13 It's still going to operate as an "E." It's still
14 going to function. It's just not the industry standard
15 for the lowest quality of service. We acknowledge
16 that, but we think it still meets that standard for
17 what it is. And our use doesn't make it worse, I guess
18 is the best --

19 MR. GOLDING: How are you? Phillip
20 Golding with Starbucks, 564 West Randolph, Chicago,
21 Illinois 60661.

22 Thank you guys for having us. I just wanted
23 to add, if you continue reading that paragraph
24 actually, you'll see, the results -- LOS "D," or

1 better, with the exception of the Prairie Street
2 westbound approach as its intersection with Randall
3 Road. During the weekday evening and Saturday midday
4 peak hours, this operates at basically LOS "E." Right.
5 It's that midday peak and evening.

6 If you think about when you go to Starbucks,
7 right, 85 percent of our business is before 4:00 p.m.
8 So actually what that's saying is when Randall Road is
9 at its busiest is when we're basically doing inventory
10 inside because we have no customers. Right.

11 So in the morning when Randall Road is
12 operating with less cars, that's actually when we're
13 busier. So the way that those peaks work for the
14 daytime traffic actually supports our cause in that
15 matter. If that makes sense.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So if I can move
17 on to another question, another topic then.

18 Turning to the effect on the nearby property,
19 there is a portion of the staff report that I can't
20 find right now to tell you exactly what page it's on,
21 but it says that -- I think it was our own traffic
22 consultant commented that it's likely that many
23 customers rather than trying to make a left-hand turn
24 towards Randall will instead opt to turn right and go

1 through either the shopping mall to the north where --
2 you know, through the Kane County Clerk's Office and
3 the municipal building there or eastbound through the
4 Jewel parking lot and out to Route 38, you know,
5 through those roads.

6 Thank you. That's actually on page 17 of
7 your own report.

8 MR. KEYS: Yes.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: So that seems to me to
10 have an effect on nearby property because those aren't
11 public roads.

12 MR. KEYS: I think this is talking about
13 the special use and whether it in and of itself is
14 going to have that impact. Again, this Level of
15 Service "E" at that intersection is not a result of the
16 special use. It functions at that level currently, and
17 that traffic pattern isn't a result of this special use
18 granting, and it doesn't cause that problem. That
19 problem exists currently.

20 So that's why this particular special use and
21 that standard, again, is reflective of this particular
22 request and whether this request results in that
23 negative.

24 I would argue that it's not necessarily a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

24

1 negative impact because cars going into somebody else's
2 parking lot in many instances will result in them
3 stopping at a store that's there. Those traffic -- I'm
4 sure the developers of those shopping centers say we
5 don't want them, absolutely not. But at the same time,
6 the retailers who are in those shopping centers, I
7 think, are happy to see any cars that go by because
8 they catch their eye. I don't know that that's a
9 negative impact on the property or the community even
10 generally, even if it were specific to our special use,
11 which it is not.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: Let me comment -- so
13 we're in the question period. So actually I'll hold my
14 comments.

15 Those are my two main questions.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

17 MEMBER GAUGEL: In regards to the
18 Starbucks currently at 1990 West Main, will this
19 facility be just like that one? Because I'm very
20 familiar with that facility.

21 I mean is it similar in terms of, you know,
22 the same business model, in terms of the same things
23 that are offered inside the store?

24 MR. GOLDING: Yes.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

25

1 MEMBER GAUGEL: Okay. The reason why I
2 bring this up is the issue of the coffee or tea room as
3 opposed to restaurant and if it serves in that same
4 function.

5 Now, my understanding, and, Russ, you can
6 confirm if I'm off on this, is that building was
7 approved for a drive-through facility before the
8 Starbucks was in there, and it was approved at 15
9 stacking spaces for that specific location already
10 before Starbucks even moved in; is that correct?

11 MR. COLBY: That is correct. The
12 special use was approved for a restaurant with a
13 drive-through without knowing a user.

14 MEMBER GAUGEL: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Sue.

16 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I'm good.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I have a
18 couple of questions because I'm trying to make -- I'm
19 trying to decide on which definition fits the use here.
20 I'm reading our coffee and tea room definition:
21 "Limited menu restaurant, which is located in
22 conjunction with and on the same premises as a
23 retail use."

24 And I guess one of the questions that I would

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

26

1 have is what -- I mean do you have general numbers for
2 what percentage of your sales are attributable to
3 retail sales versus food and beverage sales?

4 MR. GOLDING: Typically, it's less than
5 4 percent, so a small number of retail. To go further
6 in terms of food, the food numbers are similar.
7 Right. So we're not flipping burgers. We are a
8 beverage-oriented operation.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So beverages are
10 90-plus percent.

11 MR. GOLDING: That's our bread and
12 butter, yeah. We have been doing that for a long time,
13 since 1971, so. . .

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And what time of day
15 do you serve -- I know that you do have food available.
16 What time of day is it? Is it only at certain times of
17 the day, or is it always available?

18 MR. GOLDING: No. The pastries, the
19 croissants, the ancillary items that go along with the
20 beverage are available all day.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

22 MR. GOLDING: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: On your plat, I
24 noticed -- or on the -- okay. On the drive-through

1 image here, I'm trying to figure out what the size of
2 these stacking spaces are. The only thing that I can
3 see that gives me any type of a scale, because we don't
4 have a scale on here, is there's a measurement on the
5 building where the proposed drive-through window is,
6 which is 15-foot long, and the car appears to be about
7 the same.

8 How big are the stacking spaces that you use?

9 MR. KEYS: Well, the stacking -- or the
10 route all the way through there is 160 feet which
11 provides the 8-by-20 stacking spaces. Where those cars
12 are in relation to that, they wouldn't back all the way
13 up to the end of that if you were to do the 20-foot --

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So each of the
15 stacking spaces are 9-by-20?

16 MR. KEYS: There is room for eight
17 stacking spaces at 9-by-20. I mean the 9-by-20 -- the
18 width of that is 13 feet all the way around except
19 where there is the parking spaces which is 24 feet, and
20 then there is 160 feet of -- from the drive-through,
21 the pickup window around to where it then intersects
22 with the ingress and egress on the site. So there
23 is -- the 20-foot stacking spaces are there, yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What would you say in

1 response to if there is an additional car beyond what
2 is shown here, to the effect that that will add to the
3 traffic movement through the site.

4 MR. KEYS: We widened that. The point
5 where you can see where the -- at the north end of the
6 site where that first curve is, that is actually a
7 28-foot instead of the 24-foot to accommodate if there
8 was a car that was sticking out. There is an
9 additional 4 feet of width in that drive aisle that's
10 beyond what the typical 24-foot width would be that
11 would accommodate essentially if somebody's back end is
12 sticking out if there were nine cars stacking.

13 Whether or not there's more than that --
14 there is sufficient room to get around somebody if
15 somebody were coming in, but, again, you have to -- I
16 think it's important to remember that with a Starbucks
17 use, their peak, their period in which they're going to
18 possibly have that number of cars is going to be from
19 6:30 to 9:00 in the morning. That's their peak window,
20 and after that it drops off dramatically to four cars,
21 three cars, and on below.

22 So I believe it accommodates even more what
23 we have provided for because of the width of that
24 section. We tried to make it wider to just make that

1 movement a little better, and then if somebody were
2 coming in -- chances are if they're coming in to that
3 drive-through, and even if it were sticking out, they
4 would be just in the queue to get in to the
5 drive-through. I think, what is it, 30 seconds from
6 order to pickup typically in the Starbucks? So you're
7 moving through at a pretty fast clip.

8 So I think that it fully addresses that given
9 the fact that even at the busiest location, which is
10 again 41,000 cars that we surveyed, the highest
11 individual time was eight cars at one period on each of
12 those, and that data is in the traffic study.

13 There was only like eight cars and one
14 15-minute period in one location, and eight cars at
15 another location in one 15-minute period. The rest of
16 the time it was six or seven, and the average was six
17 at the peak, the peak period.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: My first -- well,
19 I'll hold that for a second.

20 Was the other St. Charles, the one that was
21 referred to by Mr. Gaugel, that wasn't included in the
22 study, was it?

23 MR. GOLDING: In terms of the stacking
24 study or the parking?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

30

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

2 MR. GOLDING: In terms of stacking, we
3 actually wanted to provide some busier locations than
4 that.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.
6 Other questions?

7 Yeah. Brian.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a couple of
9 questions for staff.

10 First of all, is there a lot requirement that
11 applies to drive-through facilities? Is there a
12 minimum lot size?

13 MR. COLBY: There is. In this zoning
14 district, there is not a minimum lot size that
15 specifically applies to the drive-through use. The
16 minimum lot size in this zoning district is 1 acre, but
17 through the PUD, they have a lot area reduction, I
18 think it's .99 of an acre was approved as the minimum
19 lot size for this PUD.

20 There is no other requirements in the zoning
21 district that a larger lot is needed for a
22 drive-through use.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. And Chairman
24 Wallace asked a question about the designation as a

1 coffee or tea room or a restaurant.

2 The snippet from the zoning ordinance
3 specifies that if a coffee and tea room are a permitted
4 use, that the adjunct use associated with a retail use
5 is not a requirement.

6 Is a coffee and tea room a permitted use
7 under this PUD or the underlying zoning?

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. In this zoning
9 district, it is a permitted use.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you, Brian.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I just have a
12 question. On page 7 of the information that we have,
13 it shows an outline of the parking spaces; and then on
14 page 11 with the landscaping design, it shows a
15 completely different configuration of the parking
16 spaces. So I'm just wondering --

17 MR. KEYS: At staff's request, we had
18 flipped the parking because we had parking on both
19 sides pointing in towards the drive-through. We just
20 flipped that around. We do have an update of the
21 landscape plan to reflect that flip.

22 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay.

23 MR. KEYS: But there won't be any change
24 to the landscaping. It's just a reverse of the spots

1 facing in. They recommended that to avoid blocking
2 those spaces, we flip it.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Right. That was
4 my question.

5 MEMBER GAUGEL: Can you clarify that
6 further? Because the page that we're looking at here
7 shows three spaces there. If you go down to page 11,
8 it shows seven spaces there.

9 MR. KEYS: We did eliminate some spaces
10 and added more landscaping.

11 MEMBER GAUGEL: So this current page
12 that's up here on the screen is --

13 MR. KEYS: Is the updated one we had
14 provided to staff after they had given us the comments
15 about being concerned about the blocking of spaces and
16 all of that and to make sure we kept above the
17 13 percent landscaping that we had approved in the PUD
18 process, and so that was what that resulted in.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have one more
20 question.

21 Just because I used to manage the 1990 West
22 Main building, the whole building, I know that there
23 were a lot of problems with the stacking and the
24 quality of the concrete there, and maybe this isn't --

1 pardon me, but is that taken into consideration?

2 Because that was a huge mess.

3 MR. GOLDING: It is, yes. We have
4 required that our drive-through lane be entirely in
5 concrete. So yes, that will be planned as part of
6 this. Yes. Thank you for that.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, Sue.

8 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Just one quick
9 question about the drive-through.

10 Is that an actual curb that I'm seeing here
11 that separates the parking area from the actual
12 drive-through, or is it just slightly elevated? Help
13 me understand what you're trying to depict here.

14 MR. KEYS: At which location?

15 MEMBER AMATANGELO: I do have the
16 conceptual rendering right here. To the left of the
17 cars that are at the drive-through window, you have a
18 strip of grass, and on each side of the grass -- the
19 strip of grass, there is another strip. It looks like
20 it's slightly raised concrete.

21 MR. KEYS: It's a real curb.

22 MEMBER AMATANGELO: It's a real curb.

23 Very good.

24 MR. KEYS: It's not just a little bump.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

34

1 It's a full curb. It just is depicted --

2 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Okay.

3 MR. KEYS: -- by the rendering smaller,
4 but yeah, it's a full-size curb.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have a quick
6 question, a general question on the landscaping.

7 Was it taken into consideration that these be
8 salt tolerant because of our winters?

9 MR. KEYS: Yes. Actually that was --
10 when we went through the first time, some of the
11 comments that staff had were eliminating a couple of
12 the -- what we found have been pretty hardy, but that
13 didn't meet your ordinance standards. So we switched
14 those out with ones that were under your ordinance, the
15 specific permitted salt-tolerant plants, and we did
16 adjust that to reflect what staff's comments were.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Question for staff.

19 Was there any discussion that was had before
20 regarding, say, a right-out exit only on the west side
21 of this property that would go northbound onto Randall
22 Road?

23 MR. COLBY: I don't believe so.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Has there been

1 any consideration for creating an additional exit from
2 this property?

3 MR. KEYS: There hasn't. I think we
4 wouldn't necessarily have an issue with it. I think
5 the County -- I don't know how Kane County treats the
6 Randall Road corridor, but if it's anything like
7 what -- we have a similar corridor in Winnebago County,
8 and the County guards it with its life, and they don't
9 want to see cuts in and out of that property.

10 It's certainly something we're -- if that's
11 something that's available to us, we can certainly
12 entertain the discussion, but no, it hasn't been raised
13 or discussed.

14 MR. TIEDT: Randall Road is under Kane
15 County jurisdiction, and it's an SRA route. The
16 Kane -- given that it's a SRA Route, it's really in the
17 interest of KDOT to limit access onto Randall. The
18 City has entered into several IGAs, intergovernmental
19 agreements, with KDOT to limit access points up and
20 down Randall. So I really think it's highly unlikely
21 that KDOT would go for a right-out.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

23 All right. Any other questions?

24 MEMBER GAUGEL: Can I ask a question of

1 staff in terms of procedure.

2 The coffee and tea room and restaurant piece
3 of it just has me a little confused as to how we're
4 incorporating this. If we were to approve this
5 application as is, we need to specify specifically if
6 it's a coffee or tea room or a restaurant; is that
7 correct?

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. We would like the Plan
9 Commission to specify that because once the special use
10 is approved, it would remain on the property. So if
11 another type of business were to want to occupy the
12 space, we need to have some reference point to what the
13 requirements are.

14 Now, in terms of the parking, whether it's
15 categorized as one or the other, there's enough parking
16 on the site. It's just the difference of how much
17 parking remains for the other uses in the building.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Going back to the
19 other drive-through Starbucks that's already located on
20 Route 64, I believe that that predated my time; but
21 when that was considered, was it planned for it to be a
22 Starbucks in there?

23 MR. COLBY: No. It was simply shown as
24 a restaurant, potential restaurant use with a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

37

1 drive-through. So the drive-through was designed to
2 accommodate the 15 stacking spaces that are required
3 for a restaurant. So then when the Starbucks was
4 proposed, it wasn't analyzed and determined if it was a
5 restaurant or not. Since the restaurant requirements
6 are our highest requirements regarding the stacking,
7 they were able to occupy that space and utilize the
8 drive-through.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.
10 Yes.

11 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just had kind of a
12 question or comment.

13 On the PUD, though, if we approve this as a
14 coffee and tea, does that mean another restaurant could
15 not go in there? That's what I read; is that correct?

16 MR. COLBY: Correct. If the special use
17 was approved for a drive-through for a coffee and --

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: No. I should reword
19 that. I didn't mean that location meaning that
20 building where Starbucks might well be. I mean, like
21 the rest of the strip mall.

22 Because there is not enough parking to put a
23 restaurant, a small restaurant in there; is that
24 correct?

1 MR. KEYS: It's not necessarily that
2 there is not enough parking. It would depend on the
3 ultimate mix of uses within the center. If we had --
4 say, 90 percent of it was taken by a service use that
5 only required three parking spaces per thousand, we
6 might be able to have, say, a restaurant because it is
7 ultimately based on the final uses that's in there.

8 So it doesn't preclude it, but we would
9 have -- I think what he was saying is that we would
10 have a problem if this would be -- essentially if
11 Starbucks isn't there and another restaurant comes in,
12 they don't get to just come in as a use because they
13 don't meet the requirements.

14 We'd have to either come back in front of
15 you, redesign the site, and what have you. We're
16 comfortable with that, but no, it wouldn't completely
17 preclude the possibility. It's just depending on what
18 other uses are there.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Whatever the mix is.

20 MR. KEYS: Yes.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. Thanks.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a question for
23 Russ and staff.

24 Just for clarification, you said that the

1 number of parking places as proposed are adequate for
2 the entire property?

3 MR. COLBY: That's correct. Even if the
4 Starbucks were to be considered a restaurant, there is
5 enough parking on the site for the other uses. It's
6 just a matter of what those uses are because the
7 parking requirements vary.

8 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. KEYS: And to address that, if I
10 could, just quick real. Just so you know, if it were
11 treated as a restaurant, we'd essentially be left with
12 office space in the rest of the building -- office
13 space or service industry space.

14 There could be no more -- or very little
15 retail in the rest of the center just based on those
16 parking ratios, if that were considered at the 10 cars
17 per thousand ratio.

18 So that's why it makes a difference to us
19 because if it's 10 cars per thousand, Starbucks won't
20 happen. It won't because we can't have office in the
21 rest of the center. The cost or what they'll pay for
22 rent, the amount of money we're spending on it won't
23 work for us. So that's the reason why it is a big
24 issue, or it's something that makes a difference to us,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

40

1 and it is important.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

3 MEMBER GAUGEL: In addition to that, the
4 stacking space comes into play as well. Correct me if
5 I'm wrong, if it were designated as a restaurant, then
6 you would be required to have 15 stacking spaces which
7 the plan currently doesn't allow for. Would you have
8 to come back and ask for a variance for that?

9 MR. KEYS: Actually I think the way the
10 ordinance is written is if we provided evidence that
11 the stacking spaces were sufficient based on the actual
12 restaurant -- it's only 15 if you just come in and say,
13 Hey, we have a restaurant with no data. 15 is what's
14 required.

15 If you come in with data that shows eight is
16 sufficient or two is sufficient or five, and you can
17 show that, you can have a lesser amount of stacking in
18 that scenario.

19 MEMBER GAUGEL: But you still need to
20 apply for that variance.

21 MR. KEYS: Well, I think that this
22 process would grant that.

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. This PUD is a part of
24 the special use process. So they have presented data

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

41

1 to support that as part of this application.

2 MEMBER GAUGEL: Okay.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: Mr. Chairman --

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: -- I have one more
6 question for both the Applicant and for Mr. Golding.

7 If the Plan Commission were to contemplate a
8 conditional recommendation for approval, the condition
9 being that you need to install a right-only exit from
10 the parcel onto Prairie Street, would you be amenable
11 to that condition?

12 MR. KEYS: No.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Why not?

14 MR. KEYS: Because that affects the
15 marketability and the use of the site as a whole. We
16 would have a whole scale swath of tenants that would
17 simply not go to the site. I can let Starbucks address
18 it from their perspective, but there is no question
19 that that will eliminate a whole wealth of tenants that
20 simply won't go to the site if that's the case.

21 MR. GOLDING: Would you like me to --

22 MEMBER DOYLE: If you have anything
23 to add.

24 MR. GOLDING: I concur. We have spent a

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

42

1 lot of time on this. It meets, you know -- we didn't
2 talk about the radius requirements, but it meets the 20
3 inside turning radius, 25 outside. We bumped that out
4 further. We spent a lot of time and analysis going
5 into this.

6 One of the things we looked at, as I
7 mentioned, was our peak periods in the morning. Right.
8 So we also care how we impact the neighboring
9 community. We found in the morning that Prairie is
10 actually not as busy as it is like on Randall at 4:00
11 or 5:00 p.m. So that would impact our ability to move
12 forward with this, just that we didn't impact it at
13 our peaks.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Questions
18 from members of the audience?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
21 comments or other discussion?

22 Yeah. Go ahead.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a comment. I
24 have been to a lot of Starbucks, and I have been to

1 this design. All over the metropolitan Chicago area,
2 this is the exact design, and it works very well.
3 You're in and out of there very quickly. So I would
4 love to see this at this location.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Brian.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: A couple comments.

7 First of all, regarding the usage for a
8 coffee or tea room, I think that it qualifies for that
9 use without a doubt, and I don't have any major
10 concerns about parking on the site or about the
11 stacking.

12 I do have a significant concern about whether
13 or not there is sufficient infrastructure for that
14 intersection given that it's operating at a Level of
15 Service "E." I'm looking at Table 6 on the traffic
16 study which is on page 16 which shows that during peak
17 hours, Saturday and midday -- its peak p.m. and peak
18 midday Saturday hours, it goes from 66.5 trips to 77.3
19 trips and 60.9 trips to 73.6 trips. That 77 number
20 starts to get close to what I heard is a "F" Level of
21 Service.

22 But more importantly, I think the question
23 for us to consider is if the industry standard is that
24 Level of Service "D" is the lowest level that's

1 generally acceptable, and the Applicant made a comment
2 that it generally isn't designed for Level "D." You
3 don't plan for Level D. Granted they're already at
4 Level "D."

5 But if 70 percent of the business for
6 Starbucks is going to be drive-through business, then,
7 you know, it -- it doesn't render the intersection
8 completely failing. It maintains an unacceptable level
9 or a marginally acceptable level of performance, and I
10 think the question for any special use that we have to
11 consider is are the qualities of this parcel conducive
12 to the special use in question.

13 When I first heard about this application, I
14 thought how is it going to work with this intersection
15 because the amount of space when you -- the amount of
16 space that you have to turn left and then make another
17 left-hand turn is so small.

18 And I think even if in 2015 we're barely, you
19 know, sort of like marginally on the line there, in a
20 couple of years we're looking at this being a failing
21 performance level and I just -- I think what I would
22 need to see to be convinced that it's acceptable for it
23 to go from "D" to "E" would be a scenario with
24 Starbucks as a nondrive-through facility and an

1 analysis of the trips in and out to see that without
2 the -- you know, if the site were built out entirely as
3 it's been proposed but without a drive-through, that
4 there's not an appreciable difference between the
5 increase of traffic.

6 But, again, the other side to that is the
7 narrative says that it's anticipated that a lot of
8 motorists are going to turn right; and if they turn
9 right, they have to cut through neighboring commercial
10 parcels. And I just don't think that that's a traffic
11 pattern that we want to support, and if they don't go
12 through the neighboring commercial parcels, they have
13 to go all the way to 14, come all the way down to 38,
14 and loop back around. This was the reason for my
15 question as to whether or not a right-out -- a
16 right-only exit would be acceptable.

17 I understand that it wouldn't be acceptable,
18 and motorists don't want to do that. They don't want
19 to turn right. They want to turn left. They want to
20 turn left, and they want to get back onto Randall Road;
21 and if a right-out were acceptable to motorists, it
22 wouldn't serve the business needs; but because it's not
23 acceptable to the business needs, it's not acceptable
24 to motorists, and that means that the anticipated use

1 is going to hit upon that marginally performing
2 approach.

3 So I just haven't been convinced that that
4 would work.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Chris.

6 MR. TIEDT: I just want to make one
7 point of clarification for the record, that on Table 6
8 of page 16, the traffic study, those numbers like the
9 66 to 77 that Brian was referring to, those are seconds
10 of delay, not actual trips.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Oh, thank you.

12 MR. TIEDT: I just want to make that
13 clarification.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes, I see that now.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have to disagree with
17 Brian. The "E," if I remember right, Mr. Golding --
18 did I say that correct? -- the clarification that he
19 made that the conflict on the peak hour of the weekday
20 p.m. and Saturday midday was when Starbucks is the
21 least busy, and so that's not going to reflect a true
22 reality.

23 So I'm not sure I understand where that
24 confusion is because I thought it was clear that that

1 is not -- if you go to Starbucks, which I go pretty
2 much morning, afternoon, evening, I know when they're
3 busy, and they're not busy then, and I just don't see
4 the problem.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: So if I can direct you to
6 the first bullet of the conclusion on the traffic
7 analysis on page 19, the proposed coffee shop with
8 drive-through development is expected to generate
9 approximately 163 new bi-directional a.m. peaks -- peak
10 hour trips, that's a.m. peak hour; 68 new
11 bi-directional p.m. peak hour trips; and 136 new
12 bi-directional trips during Saturday midday peak hour.

13 On the peak p.m. hours, I agree. The
14 difference between 163 and 68 is certainly evident.
15 The difference between 163 and 136 new bi-directional
16 trips is not quite as significant. So I don't know
17 that I agree with the assessment that there are no
18 appreciable growth in Saturday midday peak hour trips
19 based on the first bullet.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Do you guys have any
21 comments on that?

22 MR. GOLDING: To be candid and speak
23 frankly from the experience of operating close to 300
24 stores that we have in the Chicagoland area, the

1 numbers don't lie. Right. So in the mornings, we're
2 busy. The afternoons die down and in the evening.

3 Right now there is no one there, and if you
4 look at the actual counts on Randall Road, they were
5 the busiest in the evening times and later in the day.
6 So in the morning, it's actually less, and notice we're
7 focused basically on that smaller amount of cars, and
8 we're comfortable with that number. We don't feel like
9 we're adding to any of the existing problems of the
10 higher counts in the afternoon or evening. That's my
11 reply.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: I just have a follow-up.
13 Are you saying that this bullet point in the
14 conclusion is not correct, that it doesn't match with
15 your personal experience?

16 MR. GOLDING: I didn't write it. So,
17 you know, it's a completely third-party-based report.
18 So what I'm saying to you now is that, yes, I
19 would say that we're busiest in the morning. The
20 afternoon and evening has died down. So regardless of
21 that point -- I thank the traffic study people for
22 doing their traffic study.

23 Based on our significant experience of
24 operating stores in this area and how much we like

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

49

1 operating stores and, you know, bringing jobs to the
2 area and, you know, make the people that are there
3 happy, morning is busy, and the afternoons die down.
4 That's it.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
7 comments?

8 MEMBER DOYLE: I'll just comment that
9 the findings of fact are predicated on the traffic
10 study. And so if we have reason to believe that the
11 traffic study is not accurate, then we don't have
12 information that we need to render findings of fact.

13 So we can't go with the anecdotal testimony.
14 We have to go with factual testimony based on the
15 third-party analysis. So if we're not willing to
16 accept the client's own -- the Applicant's own traffic
17 consultant, then I don't know what we render our
18 recommendation on.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Chris.

20 MR. TIEDT: I just would like to add too
21 with the traffic study, the trip generation manual
22 takes into account all traffic, all the uses across the
23 country and kind of categorizes them and lumps them
24 into one category.

1 So in this case, they used a proposed coffee
2 shop with drive-through. Now, that could be a Caribou,
3 it could be Tim Hortons, it could be whatever,
4 Papanicholas, whatever coffee shops there are across
5 the United States. It's not strictly Starbucks with a
6 drive-through.

7 So I just wanted to make that point of
8 clarification because, you know, maybe a Starbucks sees
9 one thing, and it may not agree with what the numbers
10 here show. The numbers here are based on a broad-based
11 data gathering across the United States. So I just
12 wanted to make that point.

13 MS. TUNGARE: If I may just add one
14 comment as well in reference to the traffic study and
15 the applicability of the traffic study and findings
16 of fact.

17 The Plan Commission may choose to consider
18 the findings of the traffic study or the conclusions
19 from the traffic study in developing your findings of
20 fact but alternatively may choose to take into account
21 testimony that is provided by the Applicant or the
22 Applicant's representative during the public hearing.
23 So you have that choice as well based on the fact of
24 their experience. The testimony they gave was based on

1 actual experience.

2 The traffic study consultant and the traffic
3 study, as Chris Tiedt has indicated, part of it is
4 based on the factor of experience and part of it is
5 based on -- which is academic information.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Yes.

7 MEMBER GAUGEL: Comments. This property
8 I think is a victim of poor planning when it was built
9 in the '80s. I mean it was poor planning to have one
10 entrance and exit so close to the intersection at
11 Randall and so close, you know, to Prairie and
12 everything else that's going on there.

13 The way I view this is whatever goes in there
14 is going to have an impact to a positive extent on the
15 traffic in that surrounding area. That has been a
16 strip mall. It's always been a strip mall. The fact
17 that nobody is in there right now doesn't preclude the
18 potential uses for that building and what's anticipated
19 to be in there and what that building is going to be
20 used for.

21 Whoever goes in there, we're going to be up
22 against this exact same scenario no matter what. The
23 way I view this is much -- they had indicated that
24 while the traffic pattern may go through the Jewel

1 parking lot, it may, and probably some -- there could
2 be an increase in the traffic, but no matter who goes
3 in there, I think that same scenario is going to take
4 place.

5 It's very difficult to -- I see this as a
6 very sound application as a coffee or tea room in that
7 if any business that were to occupy any of the space in
8 there, this is going to have an increased effect on all
9 of the traffic and everything in the surrounding area.

10 It's almost a problem that somehow the City
11 needs to address, you know. I guess if this
12 application weren't to go through, I don't know what
13 could go through on that facility. It would be very
14 difficult to allow anything to go through.

15 With that said, I definitely understand your
16 concerns, and I see the traffic as the biggest issue
17 and obstacle to this site. It was when the Applicant
18 came before us twice before, and it will always be that
19 way until there is some kind of, you know, alleviation
20 for the means to access the property.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah. Brian.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: So I really want to find
23 in the affirmative on these findings of fact for this
24 proposed special use. I would love to see Starbucks

1 five blocks away from my house.

2 I think there is reason why drive-throughs
3 are not simply a permitted use. Therefore, they're a
4 special use because drive-throughs bring a certain
5 dynamic to a parcel, and there are other
6 considerations.

7 So, you know, maybe I'm standing on ceremony,
8 but we have to find all of the findings of fact in the
9 affirmative to recommend for the special use, and my
10 gut tells me that there are traffic problems here.
11 It's not the fault of the property owner or of the
12 proposed tenant, but it is reality.

13 There are lots of other permitted uses, and
14 they may not be as desirable in terms of business
15 development, but I'm struggling to see how we can --
16 knowing that we have -- that we have a special use and,
17 therefore, there is always a responsibility that we
18 would find the parcel is not appropriate for a
19 drive-through. We have to essentially come down on
20 the -- we have to conclude that there is sufficient
21 traffic capacity to support the use, the special use.

22 We don't have to conclude that there is
23 sufficient traffic capacity to support all the other
24 permitted uses because they're permitted uses; and if

1 we were to have to make that finding, we would render
2 the entire parcel effectively undevelopable.

3 So I think according to the protocol that
4 we've been given, we have to somehow find that there is
5 sufficient capacity which includes traffic and -- it
6 states right in the traffic study that a generally
7 acceptable industry standard is Level "D."

8 If you follow where the facts go, it seems to
9 me that it leads us to one of the findings of fact not
10 being found in the affirmative. So at this point I'm
11 finding it difficult to do what I want to do which is
12 find all of them in the affirmative.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I think if we
14 take into account their testimony, I think that you can
15 deviate from fact, fact, fact.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have to agree. Rita
17 had a comment that we can take testimony verbally as
18 part of the findings of fact.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: You do have -- you can
20 decide that there are other considerations in the
21 testimony that's been given to us, but we can't find
22 that there is not sufficient capacity and then proceed
23 to recommend for approval. We can't do that. That's
24 against the protocols. We have to find, in fact,

1 that there is sufficient infrastructure for this
2 special use.

3 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a couple comments.

4 One is in reference to clarification -- some
5 of the clarifications that Chris made which gives
6 additional insight into that traffic, as well as I
7 agree that the testimony of the Applicant as well as
8 the representative from Starbucks, in my opinion, is
9 adequate for the findings of fact.

10 But I wanted to say two other things: Number
11 one was to thank you for bringing the opportunity
12 before the Commission. You know, it's somewhat
13 exciting to see development in that area of town, and
14 so I just want to say on behalf of the Commission or at
15 least for myself, thank you for doing that.

16 I do have one criticism of the Applicant
17 though, and it basically pertains to two words that you
18 used several times, and that was "I think." Now, I
19 don't believe that this is probably what you were
20 trying to convey, but usually when a person is saying
21 "I think," they either don't know or they're guessing
22 as it relates to facts.

23 I don't believe that that's what you were
24 trying to do, but it's just a little criticism from my

1 part because that's telling me that maybe you're not as
2 deep with the subject matter as you should be as you're
3 presenting to us. So just for the future.

4 MR. KEYS: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think -- my biggest
6 issue from my initial conception of this plan was the
7 traffic flow through the site, and still the biggest
8 issue that I have is around the corner that the cars
9 are going -- that any car going into the site is going
10 to have to come in, go around the corner, and I think
11 that there is a potential for conflict there. That's
12 really the biggest issue that I have, and I don't
13 believe that there is anything that could alleviate
14 that.

15 I'm trying to figure out -- personally, I'm
16 struggling between -- because I really do believe that
17 this is a restaurant use. I don't believe that it fits
18 within the definition of the coffee room or the coffee
19 or tea room. I just don't think that that's the way
20 that our zoning ordinance intended it.

21 But that being said, I'm trying to figure out
22 some type of equitable solution where -- it's been
23 testified that 70 percent of the trips here are
24 drive-through -- or drive-through as opposed to

1 going in.

2 So I'm wondering if there is a way to not
3 have to necessarily define it as one or the other. And
4 I guess this would be a question for staff, where if
5 we, the Plan Commission, recommended approval based on
6 a certain number of stacking spaces and another number
7 of parking spaces, how would that operate if there was
8 some other business that went in here?

9 So if we didn't define it as a restaurant,
10 where what we said it has to have no less than eight
11 stacking spaces, for example, but it can have five
12 parking spaces per thousand square feet, it wouldn't
13 fit into either of those categories.

14 MR. COLBY: Yes. It wouldn't be
15 appropriate to approve a deviation from the minimum
16 parking standards for a use. So it wouldn't be
17 appropriate to say that the business is a restaurant
18 and then say it only needs to provide a certain amount
19 of parking spaces.

20 The more appropriate way to deal with that
21 would be to say that it is a coffee or tea room, but
22 there is something unique about the use that requires
23 it to have slightly more spaces. Because we couldn't
24 grant a deviation just through the special use. The

1 deviation is an amendment to the zoning standards.

2 MS. TUNGARE: Correct.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So basically
4 then the approval would be that the use is a coffee or
5 tea -- recognized as a coffee or tea room, but due to
6 special circumstances, it's approved on the condition
7 that it have X number of stacking spaces.

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. If you tie that to the
9 fact that the unique aspect of it, that it's primarily
10 a drive-through use and it's being approved through a
11 special use, you could tie those together.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.
13 Any other --

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Can you just clarify in
15 your thinking, you're thinking coffee or tea room,
16 eight stacking spaces --

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Uh-huh.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: -- and adding five per
19 thousand parking spaces.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, yeah. If it
21 was coffee or tea room, staff -- Russ, sorry -- if it
22 were a coffee or tea room, how many stacking spaces
23 would be needed? Five?

24 MR. COLBY: Five.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

59

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And how many parking
2 spaces?

3 MR. COLBY: Five per thousand.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And if it's a
5 restaurant, 15 stacking spaces and 10 per thousand
6 parking spaces.

7 MR. COLBY: Correct.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And that's why
9 I said initially I'm trying to come up with something
10 that's equitable because I don't think that either of
11 those are fair. You know, neither of those fit with
12 what their use is. You know, obviously five stacking
13 spaces is way too few. So we can't call it a coffee or
14 tea room because that wouldn't give it enough stacking.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: But five would be the
16 minimum, and they're proposing eight.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct. I don't
18 want to just have an approval and say now, granted it
19 has to -- if we just approved it and said it's been
20 approved as a coffee or tea room and they changed their
21 plans with only five stacking spaces, I wouldn't want
22 to -- that's a problem.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Because I think that

1 this -- I know that you're speaking from experience,
2 and the only experience I have is being at a Starbucks
3 drive-through, which I was on Saturday morning and
4 counted 11 cars. You know, and so it can happen. I'm
5 not saying that it does. Maybe eight is the maximum
6 that should be anticipated. Certainly, I would defer
7 to you because I think that you're an expert on that,
8 but -- yes, Rita.

9 MS. TUNGARE: I believe the Plan
10 Commission could put the higher standard as a
11 condition. So you could say approve a special use for
12 a drive-through for a coffee shop with the condition
13 that they provide, let's say for purposes of this,
14 eight stacking spaces. So that qualifies.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's what I'm
16 saying. That's what I'm trying to say, is that that
17 would be -- in my mind, that would be an equitable
18 solution.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry, Brian, but I
21 largely disagree with the argument about the
22 infrastructure just because I don't really feel that --
23 I mean if it's already at a failing level, then
24 anything that goes in there that has to meet these

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

61

1 standards is going to fail no matter what it is.
2 Because there is already -- you know, the site itself
3 is already failing in regard to the use.

4 So I guess that's the issue that I have with
5 that. My issue is more with circulation than anything
6 else.

7 Any other comments? Questions?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does the Applicant
10 have any rebuttal testimony to offer?

11 MR. KEYS: No. We're fine. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. All right.

13 Staff, anything else?

14 MR. COLBY: No.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. If the Plan
16 Commission feels that it has gathered enough evidence
17 to make an informed decision on the recommendation to
18 City Council, then a motion to close the public hearing
19 would now be in order.

20 MEMBER GAUGEL: Motion to close the
21 public hearing.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
24 seconded. Any discussion on that motion?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

62

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Amatangelo.

3 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Doyle.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Gaugel.

7 MEMBER GAUGEL: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin-Purdy.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace, yes.

15 That motion passes unanimously, and the
16 public hearing is now closed, and that concludes Item 4
17 on the agenda.

18 Item 5, 600-660 South Randall Road, Randall
19 Shoppes, Dyne Rote, LLC, application for special use
20 for a drive-through facility.

21 Is there a motion on this application?

22 MEMBER GAUGEL: Yes. Motion to approve
23 the application for a special use as a coffee or tea
24 room with the exception that the stacking spaces be

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

63

1 eight cars for the property, the facility at 600-660
2 South Randall Road, the Randall Shoppes PUD.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Before we
4 have a second, staff, is that --

5 MR. COLBY: Yes. That's adequate.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there
7 a second?

8 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second that one.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any discussion
10 on the motion?

11 Yes, Brian.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: I'd like to just discuss
13 briefly the findings of fact and confirm that the
14 Commission is accepting them as their own.

15 Finding of Fact A, given Chairman Wallace's
16 comments, I think that the word "restaurants" should be
17 changed to "coffee or tea room." The proposed
18 development is not a new restaurant. It is a coffee or
19 tea room.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Uh-huh.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: Finding of Fact B, the
22 last sentence, "A traffic study has been provided
23 addressing the access to the property," I think that
24 the Commission should state something more affirmative

1 than we received a traffic study and that it says
2 something about access to the property. We should say
3 that there is sufficient infrastructure to accommodate
4 traffic.

5 And as I've already stated, Finding C, "The
6 special use will not be injurious to the use and
7 enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity,"
8 I think the fact that cut-through traffic is going to
9 go through both commercial parcels nearby and nearby
10 property owners were not accepting of an access
11 easement to their parcel, I think that there is a -- I
12 think that's problematic, and so I think that the
13 Commission should consider whether or not cut-through
14 traffic contradicts the proposed finding of fact.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Can I make a comment?

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. I would
18 have to respectfully disagree because I believe when
19 you bring a business such as Starbucks or something
20 else, that would stimulate the area. It happens all
21 the time. Myself when I go somewhere and I -- for
22 instance, let's just say Bed, Bath, and Beyond and
23 Party City. I go there a lot. And I go there because
24 they're right by each other, and cut-throughing,

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

65

1 cutting through the parking lot is fantastic, and I
2 think it stimulates the economy. So I would have to
3 respectfully disagree. I think cutting through is not
4 a problem.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Why do you think
6 motorists are going to cut through to begin with?

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Because they're
8 probably going to go shopping.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: At Jewel?

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Sure. Absolutely. I
11 do it all the time.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: We can't -- we can talk
13 about what a driver will do when they're cutting
14 through someplace; but since we're not that driver and
15 since we're not speaking with them, we don't know other
16 than guessing what a driver will do. We have no idea
17 what their destination is.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: What is your point?

19 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm agreeing with you.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Oh, okay. Good. Thank
21 you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: I'll just make one final
24 comment --

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

66

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: -- and then I'll shut up.

3 I think the reason why there's going to be
4 cut-through traffic is because there is not sufficient
5 infrastructure so support the traffic coming out of the
6 parcel.

7 Again, there are lots of permitted uses.
8 Permitted uses do not require the Commission to
9 specifically recommend an approval of the permitted
10 uses simply by right. So I think that -- I've already
11 made that argument, so I'll stop there.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

13 Now, staff, as a point of order, since we do
14 have a motion to recommend approval pending, if there
15 are certain aspects of the findings of fact that we
16 believe need to be changed, should those be
17 incorporated into our motion?

18 MR. COLBY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then I think
20 Steve, as the maker of the motion, there were two
21 things that I think were relevant to the findings of
22 fact that were submitted by the Applicant: To change
23 the word "restaurants" to "coffee or tea room," and to,
24 I would say, append B to say that the traffic study

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

67

1 testimony of the Applicant has demonstrated that there
2 is sufficient infrastructure to accommodate access to
3 the property.

4 MEMBER GAUGEL: I would agree.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

6 MEMBER GAUGEL: Would you like me to
7 restate?

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No. We can amend the
9 motion to add those things as long as the person who
10 seconded the motion agrees.

11 Is that okay with you?

12 MEMBER GAUGEL: That is okay with me.

13 MEMBER PRETZ: And I agree.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So the motion
15 as amended is now that the -- is now to recommend
16 approval to City Council of the application with those
17 modifications and also with the additional condition
18 that eight stacking spaces be provided as per the plan
19 anyway.

20 All right. Any further discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything? Staff,
23 anything else?

24 Okay. I'll do a roll call.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

68

1 Amatangelo.

2 MEMBER AMATANGELO: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Doyle.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: No.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Gaugel.

6 MEMBER GAUGEL: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Macklin-Purdy.

8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Pretz.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Schuetz.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wallace, no.

14 That passes by a vote of 5 to 2, and that
15 concludes Item 5 on your agenda.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. KEYS: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 7 on
19 the agenda is meeting announcements. The next Plan
20 Commission meeting is cancelled. That's on election
21 night. Everyone be sure to go out and vote.

22 On November 18th and December 2nd, we are
23 here both of those nights.

24 Does anyone know if they will not be at

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

69

1 either of those meetings?

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I do.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

4 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I won't be here
5 on the 18th.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: On the 18th. Okay.

7 All right. And we have Planning Development
8 Committee meetings coming up. This one in particular
9 is for Planning and Development on the 10th.

10 MR. COLBY: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Wait, on the
12 10th? There isn't another Planning and Development
13 meeting before that?

14 MR. COLBY: November 10th is the next
15 meeting.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Sorry.

17 Yeah. It's going by fast.

18 All right. Additional business from Plan
19 Commission members?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Staff? Citizens?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there
24 a motion to adjourn?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS -- 10/21/2014

70

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

MEMBER AMATANGELO: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

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

(Ayes heard.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The motion passes unanimously. The City of St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. KEYS: Thank you.

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 8:30 P.M.

