

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2014**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chair Tim Kessler
Steve Gaugel
James Holderfield
Tom Pretz
Tom Schuetz
Laura Macklin-Purdy

Members Absent: Brian Doyle
Sue Amatangelo

Also Present: Russell Colby-Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson-Planner
Rita Tungare-Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Chris Tiedt-Development Engineering Manager
Bob Vann-Building & Code Enforcement Division Manager
Joe Schelstreet-Fire Chief

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 November 18, 2014 meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Schuetz, seconded by Mr. Gaugel and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the November 18, 2014 meeting.

**4. First Street Redevelopment PUD- Phase 3 (First Street Development II, LLC)
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan**

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. Holderfield to recommend approval of the PUD Preliminary Plan for the First Street Redevelopment PUD- Phase 3, subject to the resolution of all staff comments prior to City Council action and subject to future PUD Preliminary Plan approval of architectural plans for Building 3, the streetscape, the East Plaza, and riverwalk.

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, December 16, 2014

Page 2

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Gaugel, Pretz, Schuetz, Wallace, Kessler, Holderfield, Macklin-Purdy

Nays: none

Absent: Amatangelo, Doyle

Motion carried: 7-0

6. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, January 6, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, January 20, 2015 at 7:00pm Century Station

Tuesday, February 3, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, January 12, 2015 at 7:00 pm Council Chambers

Monday, January 9, 2015 at 7:00 pm Council Chambers

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

8. Adjournment at 7:45 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

100272

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)
 COUNTY OF KANE)

BEFORE THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES
 PLAN COMMISSION

In Re the Matter of:)
)
 First Street Redevelopment PUD - Phase 3)
 (First Street Redevelopment II, LLC))
 Application for PUD Preliminary Plan.)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

City of St. Charles Municipal Building
 2 East Main Street
 St. Charles, Illinois
 December 16, 2014
 7:00 p.m. to 8:45 p.m.

Reported by: Jean S. Busse, CSR, RPR
 Notary Public, DuPage County, Illinois

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

PRESENT:

- MR. TODD WALLACE, Chairman;
- MR. TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman;
- MR. STEVE GAUGEL, Member;
- MR. JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member;
- MS. LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member;
- MR. TOM PRETZ, Member; and
- MR. TOM SCHUETZ, Member.

ALSO PRESENT:

- MR. RUSSELL COLBY, Planner.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This meeting of
2 the St. Charles Planning Commission will come to
3 order.

4 Holderfield.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Macklin-Purdy.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Gaugel.

13 MEMBER GAUGEL: Here.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

15 No. 3 on our agenda is presentation of
16 minutes of the November 18, 2014, meeting.

17 Is there a motion?

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I motion we approve
19 the minutes as written.

20 MEMBER GAUGEL: Second.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All In favor?

22 (The ayes were thereupon
23 heard.)

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No. 4 on our

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

4

1 agenda is the First Street Redevelopment PUD - Phase 3
2 (First Street Development II, LLC) Application for PUD
3 Preliminary Plan.

4 Russ, would you kind of introduce this? I
5 know this has been before the Plan Commission in the
6 past. There's some interesting information about it
7 that we should know before we begin to consider it.

8 MR. COLBY: Yes. I'll run through a
9 short presentation to provide the Commission with some
10 context for what you'll be hearing tonight.

11 The First Street PUD was based on a
12 long-term vision for mixed-use redevelopment in
13 downtown that identified First Street as an opportune
14 location for redevelopment. That dates back to the
15 2007 Downtown Strategy Plan that was adopted by the
16 city.

17 The PUD ordinance itself was approved in
18 1996. At that time there were plans that were
19 presented and approved for all of the phases of the
20 project. I'll walk through the phases of the project
21 in just a moment.

22 There were also zoning deviations approved
23 for the buildings for things such as square footage in
24 excess of the maximum allowed in the zoning district

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

5

1 and also building height in excess of the maximum
2 allowed in the zoning district.

3 Additionally, the First Street PUD is
4 different from other development projects in that it's
5 a public private partnership between the city and the
6 developer.

7 The city has great interest in the project
8 for a number of reasons, including that we are a
9 property owner for much of the project, and we also
10 have an interest in the installation of public
11 improvements that are being paid for and installed by
12 the city as the project is being constructed.

13 This slide shows an overall site plan of the
14 entire First Street Redevelopment Project, and it
15 highlights the individual buildings that were approved
16 back in 2006, first with Phases 1 and 2, which were
17 completed in 2009.

18 Those buildings are shown on this aerial
19 photo as being constructed already, and that includes
20 Building 4, the parking deck building, the Blue Goose
21 store, and Building 7A, which has the BMO Harris Bank
22 in it along with 16 affordable rental apartments.
23 Additionally, most of the utilities and infrastructure
24 were installed at the time Phases 1 and 2 were

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

6

1 completed.

2 The next phase of the project was to be
3 Phase 3, which is highlighted in this area here, which
4 is the riverfront property that's located at the
5 northeast corner of First Street and Illinois Street.

6 The plan that was approved back in 2006 was
7 amended in 2008, but that plan has since expired. So
8 there's no current approved plan for the site. There
9 are, however, zoning deviations that were approved for
10 buildings to be located on that site.

11 Phases 4 and 5 are the future phases. The
12 plans remain approved for these buildings that are
13 shown on here, Buildings 6, 7B, and 8, although the
14 time for the development of those buildings is not
15 known.

16 This aerial photo shows the general building
17 locations that were approved with the original PUD.
18 It also illustrates the location of the proposal
19 that's being reviewed tonight.

20 The buildings that will be presented for
21 approval are located in this large yellow box here,
22 which is essentially the original building footprint
23 of both the buildings and the parking deck that were
24 approved for the site.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

7

1 There is also labeled on here locations for
2 a riverwalk and a public plaza located adjacent to the
3 site, and those areas are not included in the plan
4 that's being presented tonight.

5 This plan, which was also included in the
6 Plan Commission's packet, shows the approved
7 streetscape plans that show all of the public spaces
8 that were planned, some of which have been
9 constructed.

10 That includes the streetscape along First
11 Street and Illinois Street. It also includes the
12 planned riverwalk and bi-level riverwalk section and
13 the East Plaza as well. The area that's highlighted
14 in red shows where the proposed building footprints
15 for tonight's proposal are to be located.

16 So in terms of process, this is a PUD
17 Preliminary Plan application. A review and
18 recommendation is required from the Plan Commission.
19 What you're reviewing for is conformance to the
20 approved PUD ordinances. Those are the numbers listed
21 here, which are included in the packet. Also, you're
22 reviewing for conformance to other zoning and
23 subdivision standards.

24 This plan shows with some labels what the

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

8

1 buildings are numbered and what is located in each
2 building in terms of upper-level uses. Building 1 is
3 located at the corner of First Street and Illinois
4 Street; Building 2 is located to the north; and
5 Building 3 is located along the river with the
6 two-level parking deck located in between.

7 So this is oriented north this direction.
8 You see some of the plans change orientation, which
9 can be a little bit confusing.

10 This also indicates the location of the
11 entrances into the parking deck. There is the ground
12 level entrance, which also permits access to the
13 under-building parking, and this is the entrance up
14 to the second floor of the deck, which is provided
15 from First Street. So those are the individual
16 buildings.

17 So what's up for approval tonight, for all
18 three of those buildings and the parking deck there is
19 a site engineering plan that shows the building
20 footprints for all of these structures.

21 There's also development data being
22 presented that shows the uses within the buildings,
23 the square footages of the buildings by floor, and
24 also the overall building height that is being

1 proposed.

2 Additionally, we have architectural plans
3 being presented for Building 1, Building 2, and the
4 parking deck but not Building 3 at this time.

5 So the future approvals for this section of
6 the project the Plan Commission would see would
7 include a final plat of subdivision with designated
8 building lots, a streetscape plan for each section,
9 the streetscape in front of the buildings, plans for
10 the East Plaza, plans for the riverwalk, and
11 architectural plans for Building 3 when that is
12 proposed.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just to be
14 clear, these future approvals are for that particular
15 site, Phase 3, that we're discussing tonight?

16 MR. COLBY: Correct, for Phase 3 in the
17 areas that are directly adjacent to the buildings
18 being proposed.

19 Staff has reviewed the plans in working with
20 the developer, and the Staff Report details that
21 information. I just wanted to highlighted a few
22 things.

23 The proposal complies with the PUD
24 standards. It meets the maximum building square

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

10

1 footage for structures on the property. It also is
2 within the maximum building height that was originally
3 approved. The plans for the buildings that have been
4 designed meet our design standards that apply to the
5 project.

6 The new building program that's being
7 presented in terms of the different sizes of buildings
8 with changes to the uses on each floor, those changes
9 constitute a plan change. It's not something that
10 requires an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, which is
11 why there is no public hearing required.

12 Additionally, there are no changes being proposed to
13 the uses that are permitted on the site.

14 The project, we believe, has the ability to
15 meet all codes for building life safety and
16 engineering. That will be subject to resolution of
17 all Staff comments prior to the City Council approving
18 the project.

19 I've also provided some suggested conditions
20 for the Plan Commission to consider. Those are with a
21 recommendation including a condition for resolution of
22 all Staff comments prior to City Council action and
23 having the approval subject to future PUD Preliminary
24 Plan approval for the architectural plans for

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

11

1 Building 3 and also the streetscape, East Plaza, and
2 riverwalk plans, which would be approved and installed
3 as each building is constructed.

4 That concludes my presentation. I'd be
5 happy to take any questions on that information. I
6 can turn it over to the developer to present their
7 plans.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I would just like
9 to ask this question: We have elevational views for
10 Buildings 1 and 2 -- correct? -- and nothing on 3, but
11 really what we're concerned with is the footprint and
12 square footage of that area?

13 MR. COLBY: Correct.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. I'll go
15 along with that. So tonight we're not worried about
16 the appearance of the elevation.

17 What about the parking deck? Maybe I missed
18 something there. Are there elevational views of that
19 at this point in time?

20 MR. COLBY: There are partial
21 elevational views. I think the developer can speak to
22 that in their presentation. There's a basic design
23 for the individual sections of the parking deck that
24 we can see on those elevations.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

12

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And that's going
2 to be located between those two buildings?

3 MR. COLBY: Yes.

4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Access from two
5 points, from the south and from the west?

6 MR. COLBY: Yes.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: But the developer
8 is going to give more information about the appearance
9 of that?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes. He can answer
11 questions on that.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: All right. That's
13 all I have.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you,
15 Russ. Then I guess we can go ahead. Sorry I was
16 late. Let's go ahead with the developer.

17 MR. RASMUSSEN: Good evening. I'm glad
18 to be back, and I'm excited to present what we're
19 moving forward with on First Street and get your
20 comments and feedback tonight.

21 I'm not great at this computer. I never
22 have been, but Russ will help me get through it here.

23 We basically came to you folks I think about
24 a year ago, maybe a little longer than a year ago -- I

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

13

1 think it was August/September of '13 -- with pretty
2 much this plan. At the time we weren't quite prepared
3 to move it forward. So we kind of went back and
4 retrenched and did some additional work on it and met
5 with the city for quite a bit more.

6 So this really is the plan that we kind of
7 ran through with everybody last late summer/early
8 fall, and we're looking at moving forward. The big
9 significant difference from this plan from the
10 previous plan is Buildings 1 and 2 were identical
11 buildings before. I'm going to try to scroll down and
12 find those buildings real quick for you.

13 You guys should all have the packet with the
14 renderings that Dan Marshall did. I'm almost there.
15 Okay. So we'll go to the facade here.

16 Building 2, which is a for-rent residential
17 building on three floors and retail floor on the first
18 floor, that building was presented to you folks as we
19 were going to build two of them. Building 1 and
20 Building 2 were going to be identical.

21 Since that time we have partnered with
22 ALE Solutions, as they want to expand their offices
23 and their home in St. Charles. They're one of the
24 larger employers in St. Charles. We decided to change

1 Building 1 to a different building and create three
2 floors of office space.

3 They are going to be occupied and owned by
4 ALE Solutions. Rob Zimmers is the owner of that here
5 with his wife, Rowena, and we worked in conjunction to
6 create a new building. One of the exciting things is
7 we have two different facades, which I think helps the
8 First Street elevation as you're walking down.

9 The three-dimensional renderings that Dan
10 has created, you can see the backside of it right
11 here. You were just asking about the parking garage.
12 We'll get a little closer view of that, but you see
13 how small that parking deck is.

14 The first level of that parking deck
15 actually is about 6 feet below grade by the time you
16 get down to it. So that allows us to have that
17 second level of parking deck only about 6 feet above
18 grade.

19 So what we're doing there is we're building
20 a very low profile two-story parking garage, if you
21 will, that we should be able to landscape the exterior
22 of it and blend it right in. So the view from
23 literally where we're sitting tonight across the
24 bridge is the view that you can see here.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

15

1 I believe there's one more picture. There's
2 the First Street facade. Now you can see the two
3 different buildings.

4 We've been to the Historical Commission with
5 this and pretty much received their positive praises
6 for what we're trying to create on these facades. It
7 was a significantly good move from the city's
8 standpoint for us to create two facades here on First
9 Street.

10 This particular building, when Dan started
11 drawing it, we pulled up the pictures of the Piano
12 Factory and were trying to create that whole warehouse
13 look where we took out the windows, put new windows
14 in, and created a new residential and retail-type
15 environment. So that is really how that began.

16 Back to that garage, though, there's your
17 garage looking from above. So it really sits beneath
18 the first floor of the space, tucked in there pretty
19 friendly where it's, you know, not something you're
20 going to see a whole lot of, not really a whole lot
21 different than having a ground-level parking lot, you
22 know, on the ground that you look down to.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Would you mind
24 going back to the one just before that?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

16

1 MR. RASMUSSEN: Sure.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So you see a
3 little bit of the ramp.

4 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah.

5 That's your -- Dan, as you mentioned, at
6 the western entrance to the second level of the
7 parking deck, that is the entrance between Buildings
8 1 and 2. That will have a sidewalk on it going up
9 there and a ramp and then a sidewalk down on the
10 ground level as well.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

12 MR. RASMUSSEN: Now you can kind of get
13 the overall picture.

14 Coming off Illinois, we had that entrance
15 planned and approved before for a very similar
16 situation going into a six-story parking garage at the
17 time. Now we're just taking that into a 55-stall
18 ground level -- almost below ground parking lot.

19 Then on the north end of this, which we're
20 excited about, if I can get there, this is the north
21 end of that parking garage. Now, you can see this is
22 all kind of true to scale. There's a couple of people
23 walking down the handicap ramp on the north side.

24 What we've done with the project is we've

1 decreased our overall square footage by about 25
2 percent from what is previously approved in the PUD.
3 So we've shrunk the project significantly from a
4 square footage standpoint. In doing so, we created
5 some pretty neat open areas for outdoor dining and
6 restaurant-type space on the riverfront.

7 The riverfront as it was proposed back in
8 '06 remains the same. We just now have additional
9 open space, which I think is a pretty significant
10 positive factor here.

11 But you can see this is the tallest wall of
12 the parking garage, just a little bit taller than any
13 of us standing next to it would be. So it's pretty
14 unobtrusive, pretty friendly. There's no landscape
15 there, and we will be landscaping it.

16 As Russ mentioned, landscaping will be
17 designed and implemented. That portion is done by
18 the city. It will be presented to you folks for
19 approval during the construction, I believe, of each
20 of the buildings. It will be all constructed
21 differently.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: If I can just go
23 back and get a little bit more information about the
24 change of the facade between Buildings 1 and 2.

1 Did you say originally that Buildings 1
2 and 2 were identical? And now you've changed
3 Building 2. I tend to go along with you. I think as
4 we head in the northern direction towards Hotel Baker,
5 it has a better look to it.

6 What was the purpose of changing that?

7 MR. RASMUSSEN: Well, when we came
8 forth a little over a year ago, we had some market
9 studies done that definitely made it crystal clear
10 that the best project to be built here would be
11 for-rent residential living.

12 So office space is a very, very difficult
13 thing to try and occupy in St. Charles right now. We
14 really were looking to go straight with all
15 residential in these two buildings.

16 In doing so, we needed to control our costs.
17 Therefore, we're going to try to keep the buildings
18 with a somewhat similar look. That was the intent.

19 Now, when the Zimmers came forth and said,
20 "Hey, we would like to say in St. Charles. We're
21 growing. We need more space. We'll work with you to
22 build a building together," that changed everything.
23 That gave us the ability to create this type of a
24 structure for office space. We don't need the

1 balconies on there. It's just a whole different type
2 of building.

3 So it gave us an opportunity to start over,
4 design something new, something different, and I think
5 it adds a whole lot of life to that whole First Street
6 from day one. It's better than the original plan from
7 a facade standpoint.

8 I should mention that originally we had
9 approved 78-foot tall buildings. The tallest part of
10 this building right now is 54 feet.

11 Building 3, which you're not seeing tonight
12 because we haven't designed it -- you'll see it before
13 it gets built -- that's going to be a little bit
14 taller. There's going to be a fifth floor, and that
15 one I'm estimating the top of the parapet will be
16 about 62 feet. So again, it's still about 16 feet
17 shorter than we previously had approved.

18 So the scale of the project has been
19 downsized in every aspect, which what we have heard
20 and seen from the public and the Council and everybody
21 is that that is the proper direction for St. Charles,
22 and that's really where we've headed with that.

23 If you step back from this corner -- we've
24 got a picture. Is it right above that? There you go.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

20

1 So we stood out here one day, and we were
2 looking at the corner building and the plaza, which
3 is the Wok 'n Fire Restaurant. I'm sure everybody is
4 familiar with that. We had that entrance to the
5 ALE building smack in the middle of the building on
6 First Street, kind of very typical and kind of normal.

7 Dan looked at all of us standing on the
8 corner and says, "No, it needs to be here. We need it
9 to look like the street corner like you would have
10 seen in Chicago, Boston, all those different older
11 communities when things were built."

12 So we did it. It cost us a little bit of
13 square footage and a little upgrade in the
14 architecture, but I think it's a pretty neat feature
15 that will be very inviting to folks to enter that
16 building and will make that whole corner look great.
17 So I think that was a neat addition to the facade,
18 kind of almost last-minute, really. A couple months
19 ago Dan came up with that idea.

20 So in a nutshell, that's really what we're
21 looking for, your comments and support, obviously.
22 We've got quite a few pictures here. So I don't want
23 to just ramble through it, but I'd like to ask for any
24 questions you may have so I can get those answered for

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

21

1 you tonight.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank
3 you.

4 MEMBER GAUGEL: Can you address the
5 parking? I know that parking is always an issue
6 downtown. The previous plan had 170 private, 110
7 public.

8 Is the private parking going to be specific
9 to ALE? Because I know that's been recently an issue
10 with their business. Why, I guess, the make-up of
11 that mix? And is that going to be sufficient?

12 MR. RASMUSSEN: Well, what we have
13 done -- I think if we do the math, we're going to see
14 that the 25 percent decrease in square footage is
15 somewhat proportionate to the change in parking as
16 well.

17 The private parking is specific to each
18 building. There will be underground parking in each
19 building. We can only get about 27 stalls under the
20 ALE building and 27 under the apartment, but that's
21 where those will be.

22 Obviously, the balance of the parking is in
23 the two-level parking garage or deck.

24 MEMBER PRETZ: So what you have is you

1 have the parking footprint itself, but then there's
2 parking underground of each of the buildings?

3 MR. RASMUSSEN: Correct.

4 So when you look at it, it's pretty much
5 proportional to what it was before. You know, when we
6 built the plaza parking deck, we thought that would be
7 significant enough to handle everything. We're not
8 even fully occupied, and on a Friday night it's full,
9 but, you know, that's good news from the city's
10 standpoint because we're filling it up.

11 We can always use more parking. We're
12 trying to park it the best we can with the square
13 footage we have. I think the combination of the less
14 in square footage and the parking we have under the
15 buildings now, which didn't exist before, makes this
16 project a little bit better than before.

17 Rob Zimmers from ALE has some comments on
18 the parking, I guess.

19 MR. ZIMMERS: In regard to the parking,
20 I would not suspect that any of our employees would
21 park in the two-level structure. I would suspect that
22 would probably be timed parking, and it would remain
23 where the bulk of our employees would park across the
24 street in the upper floors of the deck.

1 Now, mind you that most of those people park
2 in the normal business hours in the third, fourth, and
3 fifth floors. So I don't really see any impact on the
4 new parking garage from our employees.

5 MR. RASMUSSEN: And that's a good
6 point.

7 When Rob and Rowena and I first sat down,
8 when Dan pushed that entrance to the corner, it all
9 made sense because that's where you're coming out of
10 the elevator for the parking garage, too.

11 So we're assuming that the first and second
12 levels of that parking typically won't allow people to
13 park there all day. So employees will be parking
14 where they are right now, which is on the top-level
15 floors of the large parking garage.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Like you said,
17 Tom, I'm not sure I understood this. I guess I missed
18 it. There's parking beneath each building as well as
19 the parking deck?

20 MR. RASMUSSEN: That's correct.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: We are reducing
22 the number of residential there. So the parking,
23 that's going to go down anyway, isn't it?

24 MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. We actually went

1 from about 120,000 square foot of residential to about
2 74,000 now between Buildings 2 and 3. So it's a
3 pretty significant decline.

4 The retail space previously was 38,000 feet.
5 It's now 36,000 feet. The office space was previously
6 32,000, and it's now 36,000.

7 So I think we've benefited from a city
8 standpoint in growing our office space, keeping our
9 retail and office space consistent on the first
10 floors, and the only component that really shrunk
11 is the residential. So that's kind of the big
12 difference in the plan, which should help your parking
13 as well.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So the residential
15 parking I understand is under the building. It's a
16 lower level.

17 But will it be identified? Will each unit
18 or residential area -- will they have designated or
19 just ample parking is what you're saying?

20 MR. RASMUSSEN: We also in the
21 Milestone building down the road, that building
22 everybody has one stall inside. If they have more
23 than one car, they have to park it. We have a couple
24 extra stalls that people have purchased. They are all

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

25

1 designated to the unit. If they have additional cars,
2 they have to park in public spaces.

3 This will be the same. You can't really
4 have open parking in an apartment. You have to
5 designate it to the apartment. Otherwise, you'll have
6 all kinds of issues underground.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm curious how you're
8 going to handle the top of the parking deck, the
9 black. In the renderings it looks like black asphalt,
10 but what is the top of the garage going to be?

11 MR. RASMUSSEN: Concrete. It will be
12 like this garage.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

14 MR. RASMUSSEN: The rendering is not
15 perfect.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right.
17 Have you given any thought to softening that
18 up somehow? What's it going to look like looking
19 down?

20 MR. RASMUSSEN: You know, Tom, that
21 question has been asked a lot of times. I'd just go
22 back and say pretty much every building that we have
23 looks down on a parking lot. This one just happens to
24 be 6 feet above ground.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

26

1 So we've put a lot of thought into trying to
2 make sure it looks decent, but it really looks like a
3 parking lot.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Would there be any
5 merit -- I'm just throwing this out there. The open
6 space, you're showing those pedestrians coming down
7 the handicap area.

8 Would there be any merit long-term, years
9 from now, whatever, to make that a park? Will the
10 structure hold if there's a green space on top?

11 MR. RASMUSSEN: There's no roof on that
12 garage. So what you're seeing on top is truly a
13 parking lot.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Oh, I
15 misunderstood.

16 MR. RASMUSSEN: That would be a good
17 idea, but it would cost quite a bit.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah, I know.

19 MR. RASMUSSEN: I think you really need
20 to envision it as an elevated parking lot because
21 that's really what it is.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. I get that.

23 MR. RASMUSSEN: As you see, we'll put
24 lights and we'll bumped out some of the brick and some

1 detail like that. The entire exterior is brick. So
2 it looks real nice from the exterior. So visually it
3 will be attractive.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have another
5 question, if I might.

6 In the packet there was a mention of the
7 fire access -- the fire code access, and they
8 mentioned the aerial apparatus.

9 Could you explain that? I'm not sure I
10 understand that.

11 MR. RASMUSSEN: Sure. Let me get to a
12 picture of that parking deck.

13 We spent some time with -- here, if you can
14 follow my arrow a little bit. On the second level of
15 the parking deck, a fire truck will be able to ascend
16 the access point there, come out to here, and then
17 reach pretty much all points of this building.

18 This part of the parking deck, the first
19 level is wide open. They can also get their apparatus
20 right into here to ascend and handle these portions of
21 the building.

22 So we spent some time with them. We had to
23 beef up the parking deck. It has to handle a
24 70,000-pound load. It's a pretty significant

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

28

1 difference in the structure itself, but that's what
2 we're heading towards designing.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it's the structure
4 and the space?

5 MR. RASMUSSEN: Correct.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

7 MR. RASMUSSEN: The Fire Department has
8 very stringent specifications. They know what the
9 sizes of their trucks are and so forth, and we have to
10 meet those guidelines both in a turning radius and
11 putting out their outriggers so that they can get
12 prepared to get up.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

15 Would the Fire Department like to comment
16 on that?

17 MR. RASMUSSEN: Sure, absolutely.

18 CHIEF SCHELSTREET: Joe Schelstreet,
19 S-c-h-e-l-s-t-r-e-e-t, Fire Chief.

20 He explained it very well. We do have
21 standards. The apparatus can only climb certain
22 grades. We also do have -- the ladder truck is of
23 significant weight, 75,000 pounds. This structure
24 will be built so that it will support the weight.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

29

1 If you've seen an aerial apparatus, once the
2 ladder is raised, there are arms or outriggers that
3 come out that balance the load. There's also some
4 requirements for that.

5 They have been very cooperative, and I feel
6 very confident with what we've got here.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions
8 from the Planning Commission?

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have one more.

10 The other plan that we looked at -- I don't
11 know -- a month ago where the building wrapped around
12 the parking garage a little bit, we saw it at the
13 beginning of this. Russ mentioned it -- or showed
14 that to us.

15 MR. RASMUSSEN: The original 2006 plan?

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. I'm just
17 curious why that was changed. I like this. I'm just
18 saying.

19 MR. RASMUSSEN: Well, coming from one
20 of the, really, two individuals that designed it, our
21 architect at the time and my partner at the time, Mark
22 Knauer, we designed something pretty grandiose. The
23 economy was booming. Nothing could go wrong.

24 Truly, it was more of a downtown project.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

30

1 I'm not saying downtown St. Charles. I'm saying a
2 downtown Chicago type of a project, a little too much,
3 I think, for our suburban market out here.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I do like this better,
5 actually.

6 MR. RASMUSSEN: You know, I fought very
7 hard and very long to get that approved. I'll humble
8 myself in two seconds and say it was too much. We
9 made the best decision we could have made. We pulled
10 back.

11 The plaza is perfect, no second guesses, no
12 regrets. It cost a little more than we would have
13 hoped, but I think it's a great building. I think the
14 deck has done tremendous things for our city in
15 parking.

16 The buildings down the street that we built,
17 the Harris Bank and the affordable units right now,
18 the apartments, all tremendous decisions. This would
19 not have been a good decision.

20 Our open space now, the less height, we had
21 a lot of questions about the tunnel vision down that
22 street. I think we've answered that at this point. I
23 can talk forever about how I believe this is a much
24 better project for St. Charles as well as us, the

1 devel oper.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are there any other
3 questions?

4 Russ, I'm just wondering if I can go back
5 over with you -- at the end of your presentation, you
6 had suggested a couple conditions.

7 First of all, can you go over -- you had
8 said conditional upon a preliminary plan for
9 Building 3.

10 But from a logical standpoint, how is that
11 going to work? Because for Building 3 they're going
12 to come back again. Will it be with an amendment to
13 this application for preliminary plan or with a new
14 application since it's on the same partial?

15 MR. COLBY: It could be an amendment if
16 the data that's being proposed changes, but we're
17 anticipating that the size of the building will not
18 change and what will be presented are architectural
19 plans.

20 What we'll require is a PUD preliminary plan
21 application specifically for the approval of those
22 architectural plans for the building.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. So if the
24 Planning Commission were to decide to recommend

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

32

1 approval of this preliminary plan, we really are
2 focused on Buildings 1, 2, the parking deck, and more
3 or less the bulk of Building 3 without the
4 architectural plans?

5 MR. COLBY: Correct. So the uses in
6 the buildings, the square footage, and the building
7 height.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Did you say
9 "building height"?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: But even the
12 building height that they are suggesting for
13 Building 3 is much less than what previously was
14 approved for the now expired preliminary plan?

15 MR. COLBY: Correct.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 16 feet less.

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a
18 question.

19 So in terms of uses, is ALE going to take up
20 all three floors of the retail -- not the retail, the
21 office space, all three floors?

22 You're growing exponentially, I know. So
23 are you ever going to grow out of that space?

24 MR. ZIMMERS: Are we going to -- I'm

1 sorry?

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: With the way
3 that your company is growing right now, which I know
4 is exponentially, are you going to grow out of that
5 space?

6 What is your plan in terms of the future?

7 MR. ZIMMERS: By the time we occupy the
8 space, we think we'll already be in another space but
9 maybe just have a second location. We may stay
10 partially where we're at. We may do something else.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I mean, are you
12 signing a certain year lease to occupy that?

13 MR. ZIMMERS: No. We would be an owner
14 of those floors.

15 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. All
16 right.

17 MR. ZIMMERS: We're also designing it
18 in a way that it could be used for other things if we
19 didn't occupy those floors. So it would have some
20 flexibility to it.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Do we
22 have other questions?

23 Russ, would you mind putting back up the
24 last slide that you had? There you go. All right.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

34

1 Then as far as the streetscape for the East
2 Plaza and Riverwalk go, that is something that really
3 is going to be up to the city to bring before the Plan
4 Commission for approval; correct?

5 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank
7 you.

8 Plan Commissioners, any thoughts?

9 This isn't a public hearing. Because it's
10 not a public hearing but also because there's public
11 here, if anyone wishes to ask any questions or make
12 any comments, you're welcome to do that. I would just
13 ask that you raise your hand and, you know, come up so
14 everybody can hear you.

15 Does anyone wish to speak before the Plan
16 Commission goes forward?

17 Okay. So this is on our agenda for action
18 tonight.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Can I make a comment?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: The Preservation
22 Commission did in fact see this information; and as
23 the applicant has stated, it was received in a very
24 positive way. Any type of question was answered

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

35

1 appropriately by the applicant. He's very flexible,
2 wants to make it right.

3 So from that standpoint, I just wanted
4 everybody to know that in fact that was true. There
5 were no objections to what he had brought forth.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other comments
7 or questions?

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just want to
9 reiterate, Tom, I was mentioning before that the looks
10 of the new streetscape I think is much more down home,
11 if you will, or St. Charles-ish or whatever.

12 It's not so grandiose, and I really like it.
13 It's very pedestrian friendly.

14 You don't like my "St. Charles-ish," huh?

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'm just imagining a
16 couple of hay bales.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I don't consider that
18 St. Charles.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you have
20 something, Jim?

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Well, I have a
22 sheet here, one side negative, one side positive. I
23 have nothing negative to say. I'm impressed with the
24 reduced size and height, a good transition from the

1 river as we move west.

2 I was a little concerned about the garage,
3 but that's been answered to my satisfaction with the
4 illustrations that you showed that would limit 6 feet
5 above grade. I think that's great.

6 I know we're not looking at facades
7 necessarily, but I'm impressed with the transition
8 that you put forth going from two different textures
9 of brick as we move north towards Hotel Baker, and I
10 like that entrance to the southwest corner of that
11 building.

12 I think it's all very positive. That's all
13 I have to say.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If I can just ask a
15 question of Mr. Marshall. If I could just ask you a
16 question.

17 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: On the architectural
19 renderings, one of the first impressions that I had --
20 I know that we see these renderings and then when the
21 building gets built, we go, "Oh, my gosh, why didn't
22 we ask for more articulation in the architecture?"
23 that sort of thing.

24 Could you perhaps address that?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

37

1 I know that we have some very long buildings
2 here, but do you want to address that for us?

3 MR. MARSHALL: Sure.

4 We've tried to give it some articulation.
5 There's always a balance between affordability and
6 articulations and square footage that you're trying to
7 max out. If you look at the renderings, there's some
8 pilasters just going up the vertical and then expander
9 panels. That's all come from a lot of photographs of
10 the Piano Factory, and then Rowena went downtown
11 Chicago and took a lot of pictures and walked those
12 in. We tried to get those details and proportions
13 right.

14 The corner, what we call "the Tower," was
15 really also influenced a lot by Rob and Rowena. They
16 really like the Cafe Brauer downtown in Lincoln Park.
17 So we transformed that into this look for this
18 building, similar with brackets and to bring some
19 detail down at that level.

20 On the first floor we were proposing to jog
21 the doorways in on that storefront so that you get a
22 little bit of the vintage storefronts with the
23 doorways set in instead of just being flat.

24 I noticed from just walking down along

1 Building 4, you don't really see the building that
2 much. Right now we see a lot from coming across
3 Illinois; but after these buildings are built, you
4 won't see it that way anymore. You see it from
5 looking up on an angle.

6 It's going to help those buildings read
7 better as well because right now we've got such a
8 long-shot view of those. It looks like a Meijer store
9 because of that. I hear that a lot. I think once
10 these buildings are built, it's going to bring that
11 context and that scale. So that's going to make the
12 whole thing look better.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Not to put the cart
14 before the horse, but since we are at least discussing
15 the bulk of Building 3, do you foresee any issues with
16 the positioning of that building, the way that we're
17 putting 1 and 2 in the parking garage?

18 I mean, 3 is really -- it's almost like a
19 no-man's land where you have the river on one side and
20 the parking garage on the other.

21 How do you foresee that panning out?

22 MR. MARSHALL: I don't think it will
23 really read that way because from the pedestrian or
24 the car level, you're just going to read that as a

1 block with the parking lot in the middle. We have
2 those all over town, really, even right across the
3 street. It doesn't read when you see it down from
4 below like it's all by itself. I really like the way
5 it creates that.

6 The cool thing, as you can see in the slide
7 from the bridge, is that this corridor -- you go all
8 the way, and you can see the end of the Milestone.
9 Then all those windows looking at the end of the
10 Milestone will continue to have this view down this
11 corridor. That really went back to Bob and Bob's
12 original site plan. That just worked out. We
13 happened to design that, and Bob built that as well.

14 But that spacing and the arrangement and the
15 way we have a little pergola on the fourth floor on
16 the corner of their office space, that looks rights up
17 the river. So that slot gives that you river view up
18 there as well.

19 So it works out really very well for all the
20 views, and these building will have great views all
21 around on the north end. It will look fantastic.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Other
23 questions or comments?

24 All right. Is there a motion?

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

40

1 MEMBER GAUGEL: Yes. Motion to
2 approve. I recommend the motion to approve the First
3 Street Redevelopment PUD, Phase 3, the application for
4 PUD Preliminary Plan subject to the resolution of all
5 Staff comments prior to Council action and subject to
6 future PUD Preliminary Plan approval of architectural
7 plans for Building 3, the streetscape, the East Plaza,
8 and riverwalk to be approved and installed as each
9 building is constructed.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there
11 a second?

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jim. All right.

14 It's been moved and seconded. Discussion on
15 the motion?

16 Seeing none, Tim?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

22 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Macklin-Purdy.

24 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

41

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Gaugel .

2 MEMBER GAUGEL: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That
7 passes unanimously. Thank you very much for your
8 time.

9 MR. ZIMMERS: Great. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That concludes
11 Item 4 on our agenda.

12 Item 5 is meeting announcements. Our next
13 Plan Commission meeting is not until next year. We
14 have January 6th here. We have January 20th at
15 Century Station.

16 Is that going to be in the training room in
17 the basement?

18 MR. COLBY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: February 3rd here.
20 Then the Planning and Development Committee, the next
21 PD meeting is January 12th and then February 9th.

22 Will this be on the January 12th agenda?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. We anticipate it will
24 be. We'll certainly let the Plan Commission know as

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014

42

1 it comes closer to confirm that.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And do
3 you anticipate that we'll have agenda items for our
4 coming meetings?

5 MR. COLBY: We do not have anything
6 scheduled for January 6th. We anticipate that will be
7 canceled, but I just want to confirm that. We'll
8 advise the Planning Commission shortly.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
10 additional business from Plan Commission members?

11 All right. Staff?

12 MR. COLBY: No.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Citizens or other
14 officials? All right.

15 Is there a motion to adjourn?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded.

19 All in favor?

20 (The ayes were thereupon
21 heard.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed? Motion
23 passes unanimously.

24 This meeting of the St. Charles Planning

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS - 12/16/2014



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

Commission is adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
(Which were all of the
proceedings had in the
above-entitled matter,
concluding at 7:45 p.m.)

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
2 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)
3

4 I, Jean S. Busse, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter No. 84-1860, Registered Professional
6 Reporter, a Notary Public in and for the County
7 of DuPage, State of Illinois, do hereby certify
8 that I reported in shorthand the proceedings
9 had in the above-entitled matter and that the
10 foregoing is a true, correct and complete
11 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as
12 aforesaid.

13 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set
14 my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd
15 day of December, 2014.

16
17
18
19  

20 Notary Public

21
22 My Commission Expires
23 July 25, 2017.