

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chair Tim Kessler
Jim Holderfield
Tom Schuetz
Dan Frio
Tom Pretz
Michelle Spruth
Brian Doyle

Members Absent: Laura Macklin-Purdy

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Dev.
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

3. Presentation of minutes of the September 22, 2015 meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Holderfield, seconded by Mr. Kessler and unanimously passed by voice vote to accept the minutes of the September 22, 2015 meeting.

Item #6 and #5 on the agenda were moved to be the next items for discussion.

MEETING

6. Heritage Green PUD, 309 S. 6th Ave. (Redemption Holdings, LLC)
Application for Final Plat of Subdivision

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Pretz and unanimously passed by voice vote to recommend approval of the application for Final Plat of Subdivision for Heritage Green PUD, 309 S. 6th Ave. (Redemption Holdings, LLC).

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Spruth, Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Frio, Pretz, Wallace, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Macklin-Purdy

Motion carried: 8-0

5. Pheasant Run Resort (St. Charles Resort, LLC)
Application for Concept Plan

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

PUBLIC HEARING

4. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)
Ch. 17.08 “Nonconformities”, Section 17.08.050 “Nonconforming Lots of Record” and Ch. 17.14 “Business and Mixed Use Districts”, Table 17.14-2 “Bulk Regulations” (RT-4 and CBD-2 nonconforming lots and CBD-2 lot area and lot width requirements)

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz and unanimously passed by voice vote to close the public.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Spruth, Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Frio, Pretz, Wallace, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Macklin-Purdy

Motion carried: 8-0

MEETING

7. General Amendment (City of St. Charles)
Ch. 17.08 “Nonconformities”, Section 17.08.050 “Nonconforming Lots of Record” and Ch. 17.14 “Business and Mixed Use Districts”, Table 17.14-2 “Bulk Regulations” (RT-4 and CBD-2 nonconforming lots and CBD-2 lot area and lot width requirements)

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, October 6, 2015
Page 3

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

Motion was made by Mr. Kessler, seconded by Mr. Doyle and unanimously passed by voice vote to recommend approval of the General Amendment (City of St. Charles) Ch. 17.08 “Nonconformities”, Section 17.08.050 “Nonconforming Lots of Record” and Ch. 17.14 “Business and Mixed Use Districts”, Table 17.14-2 “Bulk Regulations” (RT-4 and CBD-2 nonconforming lots and CBD-2 lot area and lot width requirements).

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Spruth, Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Frio, Pretz, Wallace, Kessler

Nays:

Absent: Macklin-Purdy

Motion carried: 8-0

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, October 20, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

Monday, November 9, 2015 at 5:30pm Century Station Training Room – Joint meeting of Plan Commission and P&D Committee

Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

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

Monday, November 9, 2015 at 5:30pm Century Station Training Room – Joint meeting of Plan Commission and P&D Committee

Monday, December 14, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

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

11. Adjournment at 9:09 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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

- - - - -x

In Re the Matter of: :
Heritage Green PUD - :
309 South 6th Avenue :
(Redemption Holdings, :
LLC) Application for :
Final Plat of :
Subdivision :

- - - - -x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, October 6, 2015
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 74374A
Pages: 1 - 8
Reported By: Paula Quetsch, CSR

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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

Proceedings held at the location of:

CITY OF ST. CHARLES COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
(630) 377-4400

Before Paula Quetsch, CSR, and Notary Public
in and for the State of Illinois.

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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:

- TODD WALLACE, Chairman
- TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman
- BRIAN DOYLE, Member
- DAN FRIO, Member
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member
- MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner
- RITA TUNGARE, Director

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

MEMBER SPRUTH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

MEMBER FRIO: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler. Here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Item 3 on the
agenda is presentation of minutes of the September 22nd,
2015, meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So moved.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Second.

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

5

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

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

5 (Ayes heard.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Unless there's objection,
9 I'd like to take Item 6 next, followed by Item 5, and
10 then we can consider 4 and 7. Any objection to that?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So Item 6 on the agenda
13 is Heritage Green PUD, 309 South 6th Avenue
14 (Redemption Holdings, LLC) Application for Final Plat
15 of Subdivision.

16 Russ?

17 MR. COLBY: Yes. This is an application to
18 approve final plat of subdivision for the Heritage
19 Green PUD which the Plan Commission reviewed earlier
20 this year and the City Council approved as a
21 development of the remaining property of what's called
22 the Foxwood Square development and also includes the
23 Raymond Judd house which is an historic landmark.

24 Staff's review of the final plat of

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

6

1 subdivision for conformance with the approved
2 preliminary plan has a number of relatively minor
3 comments of items that need to be addressed prior to
4 City Council approval, but staff is recommending
5 approval of the final plat of subdivision.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Is there a motion
7 from Plan Commission?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would make a
9 motion to recommend approval of the Heritage Green PUD
10 309 South 6th Street (Redemption Holdings, LLC)
11 application for final plat of subdivision.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: 6th Avenue, correct?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 6th Avenue, correct.

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

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

20 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

7

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.
2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.
4 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.
6 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That motion passes
11 unanimately and that concludes Item 6.

12 (Off the record at 7:03 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Transcript of Heritage Green PUD - 309 South 6th Avenue
Conducted on October 6, 2015

8

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 12th day of October, 2015.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of 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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

- - - - -x
In Re the Matter of: :
Pheasant Run Resort :
(St. Charles Resort, LLC) :
Application for Concept :
Plan :
- - - - -x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, October 6, 2015
7:04 p.m.

Job No.: 74374B
Pages: 1 - 48
Reported By: Paula Quetsch, CSR

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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

Proceedings held at the location of:

CITY OF ST. CHARLES COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
(630) 377-4400

Before Paula Quetsch, CSR, and Notary Public
in and for the State of Illinois.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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:

- TODD WALLACE, Chairman
- TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman
- BRIAN DOYLE, Member
- DAN FRIO, Member
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member
- MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner
- RITA TUNGARE, Director

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moving on to Item 5,
Pheasant Run Resort (St. Charles Resort, LLC)
Application for Concept Plan.

For those of you who haven't been before us
before, the St. Charles Plan Commission is tasked with
considering applications for certain developments that
come before the City. In addition, the Plan Commission
also will consider concept plans from potential
applicants for developments. That's what we're doing
here tonight.

This meeting is really informational both
for the Plan Commission and the public, as well as for
the applicant. The applicant will present what they
intend on doing. The Plan Commission will let the
applicant know what they think about it. The whole
idea here is to save cost and time for the applicant
before they go forward and draw more thorough plans
for the application.

So the way that we conduct it is after the
applicant makes a presentation, then we will ask for
questions from Plan Commissioners, as well as from any
members of the public who happen to be here tonight.
And at the end of this item the Plan Commission --

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

5

1 members of the Plan Commission will be polled to let
2 the applicant know both favorable and unfavorable
3 aspects of the application or of the -- I'm sorry --
4 concept plan.

5 Any questions regarding that?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is the applicant here?

8 MR. CONNOLLY: We are.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. How long do
10 you expect your presentation to take?

11 MR. CONNOLLY: Probably not more than two or
12 three hours -- no, if it's more than 15 minutes I'll
13 be shocked.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

15 MR. CONNOLLY: Good evening. My name is
16 Peter Connolly. I'm here on behalf of the owners of
17 the Pheasant Run Resort, a company called St. Charles
18 Hotel, LLC.

19 A brief little bit of history -- and I'm
20 joined here tonight by these guys over here.
21 Jerry Barnes in the second row with the red tie is the
22 general manager of the Pheasant Run hotel, Brad Wiser
23 is one of the partners in the ownership group Pheasant
24 Run -- excuse me, St. Charles Resort, LLC, and Jerry

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

6

1 Schain of the Schain Banks firm is our zoning counsel.

2 About 52 years ago Pheasant Run first opened
3 as a hotel and it was -- and at the time it was a very
4 unique hotel probably not just in the Midwest but in
5 the country. It was a resort built in a cornfield,
6 and it started really as one building that was built
7 adjacent to what had become a very successful family
8 restaurant and was intended to be a family hotel that
9 would complement that restaurant. Over the ensuing
10 25 years it was developed out in a series of phases,
11 and it's actually easier as you see them.

12 Whoops. What did I do, Russ? Bad mouse
13 work. There we go.

14 If you look at the top of your screen, the
15 original hotel was built in three two-story open
16 corridor buildings that were based off the old Holiday
17 Inn model, and there's about 180 rooms there that were
18 built in the '60s and early '70s. And the elongated
19 north and south buildings in purple were built in the
20 '70s, and then towards the end of the '70s a 16-story
21 tower was built which was kind of right in the middle
22 of the complex up in here.

23 Along the way the resort also added a large
24 amount of meeting space and other facilities and a

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

7

1 golf course and really for its time was quite a very
2 special place. It was very popular with the Arthur
3 Andersen folks when they owned and ran the Q Center
4 and had its own following, as well.

5 But over the last 25 years it's fallen on
6 hard times. The people who owned it were lovely
7 people, but they never really reinvested in the
8 product, and, frankly, it got to be too big for the
9 market that it's in. When Schaumburg opened its
10 560-room convention hotel with the adjacent
11 160,000-square-foot convention center, that was pretty
12 much the death knell for the kind of business that
13 Pheasant Run had been doing for years.

14 The current ownership group bought it out of
15 receivership in April of 2014, and Hostmark
16 Hospitality, a Schaumburg-based third-party hotel
17 management company has been running it since that
18 time. From the time that the hotel was acquired by
19 the new owners, we've been thinking about how do we
20 restore this hotel to what it was. Not make it new
21 again because you can never make it new again, but how
22 do we restore it to its position as a first-class
23 resort, the gateway, if you will, at the east end of
24 St. Charles and make it something that will make money

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

8

1 for its owners because that's what they're in business
2 to do, but also something that the community will be
3 proud of again.

4 And so we started down the path of looking
5 at whether the hotel was the right size, whether it
6 should be smaller, how could we fix a smaller hotel to
7 make it a better functioning hotel along the way. And
8 then if we wound up, because this is a 150-acre site
9 more or less, with a smaller physical facility that is
10 the hotel, then what would we do with the balance of
11 it. That's the process that led us to where we are
12 tonight.

13 The first job we recognized was to fix the
14 hotel, and that process has already begun. If you've
15 driven by there lately, you might have noticed a new
16 coat of paint on the tower. The rooms of the tower
17 are also undergoing room renovation as we're sitting
18 here. So we're heading down that path.

19 We realized that we needed to fix the hotel
20 first. Because if we were going to do something else
21 with the balance of the hotel or the balance of the
22 grounds that we would need a better hotel in order to
23 attract people who would say, "Gee, I'd like to have
24 my retail shop near a good hotel not Pheasant Run the

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

9

1 way it is currently. I'd like to have perhaps
2 residential in that area, not the way it is currently."

3 So we recognized that the key to unlocking
4 the redevelopment plan was simply that, to make this a
5 better hotel.

6 So, actually, since this is up there, I'll
7 give you kind of the broad strokes of what will go and
8 what remain.

9 We reached the conclusion that no one has
10 played tennis on these courts on the last 15 or
11 20 years. That predates our involvement with it, but
12 certainly they're not being used currently. The hotel
13 laundry building which was originally the golf pro
14 shop doesn't work anymore, and the laundry is done by
15 an outside vendor.

16 This office building here was built as a
17 purpose-built training center for Arthur Andersen in
18 the 1970s, and it's not used anymore.

19 And really the biggest problem facing the
20 hotel is it's simply too big. At 500 rooms it's too
21 big to compete effectively in the meetings market
22 because of the new products like Schaumburg. So we
23 came to the conclusion that these three buildings
24 here, which were the original three hotel buildings,

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

10

1 should come down and that the balance of the property,
2 the main hotel and the mega center would be renovated
3 and made into a first-class resort feeling hotel that
4 would be something that would be competitive again.

5 So this is kind of generally what we came up
6 with as the plan.

7 The first part of the plan I mentioned is to
8 fix the hotel and restore it to something that really
9 is functional as a first-class hotel. When we get rid
10 of the existing three hotel buildings, and that office
11 building that's pretty much not used, and the old
12 laundry building, that created what we thought was a
13 very good corner for retail development.

14 This is -- we're directly across from where
15 Charlestowne mall is being redeveloped now. There's
16 an automobile dealership across the street from that,
17 so this has a potential to be a successful retail
18 development that would generate we think maybe perhaps
19 a big-box store and some accompanying retail with it,
20 which would be, frankly, complementary to the hotel.

21 We also then looked at the area over here.
22 One of the things when we first came to the city at
23 the time we were in the process of buying the
24 property -- in fact, Brad and I came together and

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

11

1 visited with the manager, and, they said, gee, there's
2 this 50-year-old golf maintenance facility that's like
3 a couple of Quonset huts and wells and some really
4 nasty looking stuff, and we didn't used to be able to
5 see it because Route 64 was 100 feet away, but now
6 with the redevelopment of Route 64, it's pretty much
7 sitting right on the road, and could you think about
8 getting rid of that?" And we said, "Sure, we could
9 think about relocating it, or moving it, or doing
10 something."

11 So we're now looking at this section here
12 where the golf maintenance facility has been forever
13 right up in that corner as being another area that
14 because it's on Route 64, on North Avenue, on that
15 corridor would be a logical place for retail and/or
16 office development and the elimination of what
17 currently is an eyesore.

18 That left us with the biggest issue, what to
19 do with the golf course. Since the time that the golf
20 course was originally built, which I think was in the
21 late '60s or early '70s, there are within a mile or a
22 mile-and-a-half of it three much longer, much higher
23 rated tracks than this course.

24 Frankly, from the perspective of the hotel

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

12

1 it does nothing at this point to add to the hotel's
2 business. It was at one point a generator of a group
3 business people who would come in and meet at the
4 hotel and go out and play golf or vice versa, but
5 these days if they play golf, they either go south to
6 the Prairie Landing, or they go over to the place on
7 Route 59.

8 So the golf course has continued to shrink
9 as a viable part of the business, and so our thought
10 is that we do something else with it. We've taken a
11 lot of different approaches to examining what we might
12 do with the golf course, and the logical one seems to
13 be residential.

14 We commissioned a Tracy Cross marketing
15 study which I know staff has a copy of, and the Tracy
16 Cross people concluded that, yes, it was a viable
17 place for residential.

18 We don't have any fixed plans as to what to
19 do in there. We have been approached by a number of
20 residential developers, some single-family, some
21 multifamily, some who said, gee, maybe what we'd like
22 to do is have a really nice nine-hole executive golf
23 course and some residential inside it back there, all
24 of them first saying, "We'll be much happier to talk

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

13

1 to you about doing that, about developing this area
2 once we know that you're actually really renovating
3 the hotel."

4 So we've started now on the renovation
5 phase, but we're now far enough along that we thought
6 it was time to come and see you and get your opinions
7 on just simply this, the idea that this would be
8 retail in this corner up here, retail and office over
9 on the eastern side, and then residential and open
10 space. Because any residential we do will likely have
11 quite a bit of open space involved in it if for no
12 other reason than the airport is down here someplace,
13 and this area here would probably not be much fun to
14 develop.

15 And that is what I have to talk to you about.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

17 Plan Commissioners, questions?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I guess I just
19 want to clarify -- this may be for staff, but from
20 what I've read, everything is zoned except the
21 residential, but you haven't determined that it would
22 be necessary to create a PUD at this point?

23 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What is the -- what

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

14

1 are those -- I seem to remember some kind of
2 warehouses at the south end of that property.

3 MR. CONNOLLY: Down here?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What are those?

5 MR. CONNOLLY: That's the airport. Those
6 are office buildings and hangars down on the other
7 side of the airport.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I will say
9 that shrinking the hotel is probably not a bad idea,
10 making it a boutique-type hotel would be more of a
11 destination. I know that it's difficult to maintain
12 that facility, huge facility, the traffic that's in
13 there now.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Can I jump in now or no?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Go ahead.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I wrote a bunch of notes
17 that came to mind when you were speaking and thinking
18 about the property itself and thinking about some of
19 the things that are around the Chicagoland area as far
20 as entertainment. And I know Zanie's there, and I
21 hear about it all the time on the radio; I've been
22 there many times. Are you planning on keeping that
23 entertainment spot?

24 MR. CONNOLLY: We are planning on keeping

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

15

1 entertainment there. There's a long history of an
2 association between Pheasant Run and theater. It goes
3 back to the 1970s. And finding a way to make that
4 work financially is a challenge, but it's something
5 that we're planning on keeping.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's good. I was going
7 to mention destination. I'm sure you're aware of the
8 Rosemont, what they've done up there over the last
9 several years as far as the entertainment. Are you?

10 MR. CONNOLLY: Yes. Hostmark managed what
11 was the Intercontinental O'Hare that was across the
12 street from the entertainment district, so I know
13 it well.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm not suggesting that
15 because it's at Rosemont.

16 MR. CONNOLLY: And 27,000 hotel rooms.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'm just saying as an
18 example. You know, I'm sure this is nothing new, but
19 a destination, we need entertainment, retail. I'm not
20 sure about the whole big-box thing, honestly.
21 Obviously, the zoning has got to be addressed, but
22 what I don't think would be a great idea is -- as far
23 as residential, it's got to be something different.
24 It would be better ideas, destination, somewhere they

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

16

1 can actually -- are you familiar with Fox Mill?

2 MR. CONNOLLY: No.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. That's on the west
4 side of town, and there's a lot of shops over there --
5 west side of St. Charles. There's a lot of shops, a
6 lot of walking, pedestrian friendly. I just would
7 hate to see or wouldn't suggest a typical throw a
8 bunch of houses in and hope it works.

9 MR. CONNOLLY: I think we agree with you.
10 We actually have been playing around with this. We
11 hired VOA, which is a pretty good-sized Chicago
12 architectural firm, and the principal who is working
13 on this worked on this plan for the last ownership
14 group about 10 years ago, and it was always
15 contemplated that all of these phases would be
16 connected by open spaces, gardens, something that is --
17 what we'd like to do is thematically bring back
18 Pheasant Run to kind of a country-sheek, if you will,
19 not necessarily luxury but one step below luxury, but
20 country-sheek that really celebrates what the
21 community is about.

22 This is a community that is at the end
23 somewhat rural and with open spaces and large trees
24 and walkways and gardens, and that's always been

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

17

1 contemplated by us as being part of the plan.

2 Otherwise, we wind up with a resort that is really
3 just a big hotel with big meeting space.

4 So we know a part of this has to be the
5 entertainment component, it has to be self-contained.
6 Particularly, if we're going to turn the golf course
7 into something else, there needs to be some other draw
8 there. So we're focused on that as being kind of a
9 garden experience.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Or they could have
11 festivals, small festivals or whatever.

12 MR. CONNOLLY: Exactly. Pumpkin festivals.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a couple of
14 questions, Russ.

15 First of all, is all the property in
16 St. Charles?

17 MR. COLBY: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do the city limits run
19 along the edges of the property here?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 MR. CONNOLLY: I think this has the
22 distinction of being the one piece of property that's
23 in St. Charles and also in DuPage County.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There are a few offices,

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

18

1 also, some residential neighborhoods, as well.

2 The comprehensive plan conspicuously doesn't
3 contain reference to Pheasant Run in the east gateway
4 subarea portion. Or am I wrong?

5 MR. COLBY: It's referenced in the goals
6 section, but it wasn't identified as an opportunity
7 site or a catalyst site, if that's what you're thinking.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

9 MR. COLBY: That was not a site that was
10 discussed in detail that there were any specific
11 recommendations about how that site could develop.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Other questions,
13 Plan Commissioners?

14 MEMBER PRETZ: I have something. It's more
15 a comment than it is a question, and that would be I
16 support what you have there. The one caveat that I
17 have is that as it proceeds with residential, as Tom
18 pointed out, the Commissioner stated, with the
19 residential some thought needs to be -- other than a
20 cookie cutter or just a typical subdivision that
21 serious thought is put into that residential area to
22 tie it into your other retail and office space.

23 The hotel, obviously, they're close; they
24 may not necessarily use it, but the other factors of

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

19

1 being able to walk and with some real nice designing
2 and that be taken into consideration.

3 MR. CONNOLLY: We absolutely agree. And,
4 actually, what we're hoping for is to wind up with an
5 overall development where everything complements each
6 other.

7 It would be best for the hotel if the
8 residential folks said, "Gee, I want to walk up the
9 garden or the garden pathway to go have dinner at a
10 decent restaurant that is at the resort." It would be
11 best for the residential if the hotel is good enough
12 to say, "Gee, this is where I want my kids to stay
13 because I don't want them staying with me."

14 We've had a number of inquiries of
15 developers, and it's been all over the map from age
16 55-only, to single-family, to keeping the golf course
17 around it, but in each case it's been -- part of the
18 conversation has been whatever you do here has to be
19 consistent with what we're doing at the hotel.

20 And, frankly, the retail has to be
21 consistent with the residential, too. I don't think
22 we're looking to put in 12 dry cleaners in a little
23 retail strip mall here. That's not going to help
24 somebody sell residential. They all have to

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

20

1 complement each other or you won't wind up with the
2 end community that you want. So we agree.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question
4 for staff. So this would be developed in these phases
5 right now without the residential portion --

6 MR. COLBY: Correct.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- is that correct?

8 MR. COLBY: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So this whole
10 process could begin immediately with retail at the
11 west end and retail/office at the east end. Is there
12 anything -- there's nothing that's going to preclude
13 them from drawing those boundaries that are shown on
14 the slide we're looking at; correct?

15 MR. COLBY: Correct.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And that property
17 that -- the portion that we're showing there as
18 potential residential open space could just sit there
19 until somebody decided to zone it; is that correct?

20 MR. COLBY: Yes.

21 MR. CONNOLLY: Well, I think as a
22 theoretical zoning matter that is correct. As an
23 infrastructure matter, for purposes of building in a
24 community of this size, that all has to be tied

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

21

1 together.

2 There are streets, and sewers, and drainage,
3 and a lot of considerations that will go into that
4 that need to be engineered I think as part of the
5 whole. If you knew you were doing a certain type of
6 residential, you would engineer it in a different way
7 in conjunction with the other things that are there.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And is -- well, I
9 guess what I would have to say is I'm not opposed to
10 residential, but nothing that's been mentioned I
11 think -- I mean, you look around there and it's all
12 retail, airport, factory, car dealer. I mean, there
13 is no residential there; it has to be something
14 somewhat unique. It could be a destination club-
15 type -- I don't know what it is, but I think maybe
16 that has to be zeroed in on.

17 What would happen here if we say, gosh, that
18 would be a great idea and we rezone it to residential?
19 What is their process for building on that site?

20 MR. COLBY: Well, as you mentioned, any
21 residential land use, for that to be established that
22 portion of the property would have to be rezoned to a
23 residential zoning district.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: One of the --

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

22

1 MR. COLBY: Correct. If the request was
2 just to rezone the property, the property would be
3 developed with any residential use that's permitted in
4 that zoning district. In the event that there were a
5 PUD request, there would be a specific plan requested,
6 and there would be some limitations and restrictions
7 on the type of residential development that would
8 go there.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Because I'm
10 sensitive to what you say, if you develop any part of
11 the property, it's going to be dependent on the other
12 parts --

13 MR. CONNOLLY: Right.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- especially with
15 infrastructure.

16 MR. CONNOLLY: Right. Particularly because
17 the actor, if you will, in deriving a development is
18 going to be the hotel owner, and the hotel owner is
19 going to spend its money first because that has to get
20 fixed now. So that hotel owner's money is going to
21 say, okay, I need the right kind of residential; I need
22 the right kind of retail; otherwise, I'm hurting my
23 investment, which I think is a good thing from the
24 standpoint of the overall development.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

23

1 MEMBER SPRUTH: I just have a point. Just
2 in terms of your consultation during this process, I
3 was wondering if you started speaking to the airport
4 at all about your plans.

5 MR. CONNOLLY: We haven't yet. We know
6 we're going to. This area down here is or may be
7 within the noise contour of the airport. So that
8 probably winds up as open space no matter what.

9 MEMBER SPRUTH: Do you know the flood path?
10 I just can't picture it right now.

11 MR. CONNOLLY: Actually, it's kind of
12 interesting. There is a stream, natural stream that
13 runs from this corner all the way through here and
14 currently uses the water hazards of the golf course
15 for retention, and it actually winds up down here
16 someplace. But that will have to be -- we have a
17 proposal from an engineering firm to, among other
18 things, look at the flood situation.

19 MEMBER SPRUTH: I'm also thinking of, also,
20 the airplanes coming in and out of the airport. Do
21 you have an idea as to how that would affect design
22 and the layout?

23 MR. CONNOLLY: I think it affects location
24 of -- location of structures in the area that's really

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

24

1 close to the airport. I don't think it really affects
2 much over here. Frankly, I spent a lot of time in the
3 last year at the resort, and I don't think I ever
4 noticed hearing an airplane.

5 MEMBER SPRUTH: I guess I'm just mindful
6 that it's important to include the airport in your
7 discussions --

8 MR. CONNOLLY: Absolutely, I appreciate that.

9 MEMBER SPRUTH: -- and to be a good neighbor
10 as part of your plan, in addition to your neighbors
11 across the street, and, you know, just have -- include
12 them in your discussions and their input. Because
13 there is a possibility that if your designing of
14 residential is not mindful of the airport, you could
15 have residents now complaining about an existing
16 airport. And I've had applications before where you
17 have residents move in and complain about their
18 neighbor that they don't like. So it needs to be
19 mindful of that so that it's a good relationship.

20 MR. CONNOLLY: We agree.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: You mentioned you
22 commissioned the study by -- I don't remember the name
23 of the consultancy -- for viability of this parcel.
24 Did you receive a final report? I didn't see that in

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

25

1 the staff packet.

2 MR. CONNOLLY: We got issued a draft report
3 so far which we have not asked them to finalize, but
4 it's a typical residential marketing demographic and
5 density study, and it says, you know, rough justice up
6 to, plus or minus a couple, 250 units, something
7 like that.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: So is the analysis basically
9 a market analysis --

10 MR. CONNOLLY: Yes.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: -- in terms of the community
12 and saturation?

13 MR. CONNOLLY: For absorption, yes.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: So Mr. Kessler referenced
15 surrounding land uses, and it appears to me that this
16 would be sort of an island, a residential island
17 that's surrounded by retail, commercial, industrial
18 uses, transportation uses. Did your consultant's
19 report or any of your discussions talk about concerns
20 regarding how residential would fit within this parcel
21 and how you would -- aside from the adjacent retail
22 use and hotel use, what kind of residents would live
23 here and what amenities would be available to them?

24 MR. CONNOLLY: I think the theory was that

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

26

1 the bulk of the residential would happen in this area
2 here, leaving a buffer between the residential
3 development and the airport area.

4 One of the aspects of the property that's
5 kind of interesting is that the -- when the golf
6 course was originally built it was a cornfield. Now
7 there are 1200 50-year-old trees there, including I
8 think a bunch of viburnum. So there is some buffer
9 there that would probably be maintained.

10 We asked that question specifically, and
11 while these types of marketing studies basically do a
12 demographics and absorption, they weren't troubled by
13 it. They thought it was kind of a unique opportunity
14 for us.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: I don't know if you can
16 answer this or staff, but the park and school
17 districts, given that this is in DuPage County, what
18 park and school districts does this parcel belong to?

19 MR. COLBY: I believe it's in both the
20 St. Charles Park District and School District 303.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. And one more question.

22 So I noticed both in the staff report, as
23 well as your statement of development summary, you
24 referenced the fact that there is no -- that utilities

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

27

1 terminate at the edge of the property, and so
2 utilities would need to be extended into the
3 property, and you would require assistance from the
4 City for that.

5 Any -- could you just describe that a little
6 more in terms of your analysis in terms of the
7 utilities and what that means in terms of --

8 MR. CONNOLLY: What we've been told by --
9 actually, by the City -- is that -- and we know this
10 because we have the resort -- the water terminates up
11 here, but there is a line running across.

12 The electrical box for the entire site is
13 here. That's the St. Charles-owned electrical
14 utility, so that utility wants to expand. No matter
15 what happens, they want to have a larger -- or several
16 different places, not just one access point for
17 electric.

18 Currently there are no -- other than the
19 runoff stream that runs this way through the property,
20 there are no other sewers or land improvements down in
21 here in the golf course area. So all of that would
22 have to be redone.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything further?

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

28

1 MEMBER SPRUTH: I just wanted to say --
2 encourage you to go out and see Fox Mill, not
3 suggesting to duplicate that at all. However, they do
4 have everything interspersed in the community out
5 there, which is St. Charles, except your hotel, but
6 they do incorporate churches, as well as retail, and
7 parks, and different types of housing, low-density,
8 high-density, whatever. It might be interesting just
9 to look.

10 MR. CONNOLLY: Absolutely. We'll take a
11 look. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any questions
13 from members of the audience?

14 Yes.

15 MR. BIRD: Good evening. David Bird,
16 executive director of the DuPage Airport Authority.

17 First of all, I'd like to thank you for what
18 is a plan that we think is very good with the exception
19 of one component of that plan. That is the residential
20 component. We are adamantly opposed to that.

21 We have had a long and I think very
22 profitable relationship with Pheasant Run over the
23 years. We do a lot of business with Pheasant Run.
24 We're very supportive of the redevelopment plan.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

29

1 However, a plan that brings residential development
2 that close to an airport is a very, very bad idea.
3 You will be building noise complaints into the people
4 that buy into those homes or condos or whatever for
5 the lifetime -- for as long as those condos exist.
6 It's going to happen.

7 You've seen what's happened with the
8 reconfiguration of the runways at O'Hare. That's
9 created tremendous noise issues where previously there
10 was none, including in St. Charles. The noise
11 complaints that we get are from O'Hare aircraft. I
12 see them -- I'm a resident of St. Charles. I live a
13 few blocks away. I see them coming over my house all
14 the time now, where they didn't used to do that.

15 Building residential -- and, again,
16 unfortunately, this diagram does not represent how
17 close this is to the runway configuration. I do have
18 some diagrams. I'd be happy to disclose these to the
19 members of the board. We'll prepare those and get
20 them to you. It's very close.

21 He is right. It is outside of that critical
22 noise contour. The way noise contours are developed
23 is that is an average noise level, day/night noise
24 level, taking the operations, the aircraft operations

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

30

1 from landings and takeoffs at an airport day and night
2 and developing an average for the -- an average
3 decibel level.

4 Now, nighttime operations count 10 times
5 more than daytime operations because the ambient noise
6 level is much less, so people hear aircraft more. We
7 do have nighttime operations there.

8 We have -- and you see the hangar complex
9 just to the south of this proposed development. We
10 have maintenance operations that take place there.
11 Typically, when you have a maintenance operation, they
12 will do full-power run-ups. Those are very noisy
13 operations.

14 So you're going to have full-power run-ups,
15 and, again, if you've driven down Tower Road, Tower
16 Road is a dedicated nonairport roadway. It is not
17 intended -- although it is used for people to cut
18 through, it was never intended for that use. It's
19 really a narrow area. There is not a lot of distance
20 between the operations that take place and this
21 proposed development.

22 So the FAA has taken a position that
23 developments -- that it's really up to communities
24 now. They spent billions of dollars attenuating

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

31

1 houses, purchasing houses, purchasing property, and so
2 forth. The FAA's position is that it's up to
3 communities to do their part to not build in these
4 areas that are now noise impacted.

5 We completely agree. We think that the plan
6 that Pheasant Run has for the north part of the
7 property is great. We would like to see something
8 other than residential, something that is compatible
9 with the airport that, frankly, has been there for in
10 excess of 80 years.

11 We have a growth plan. We're planning for
12 additional aircraft operations. Aircraft are -- I
13 will not argue the aircraft are not getting quieter;
14 they are, in fact, getting quieter. But this area
15 would still continue to be noise impacted because it's
16 very close to the runway configuration that we've got
17 at DuPage.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is the airport
19 interested in the property?

20 MR. BIRD: It depends. I can't -- we have
21 not broached this. We just became aware of this,
22 unfortunately. The question was asked, "Have you
23 talked to the airport?" This is the first we were
24 made aware of this. We saw it on an agenda.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

32

1 So the authority board has not been apprised
2 of this. So I don't know exactly what their feeling is.

3 MEMBER SPRUTH: Is the -- it's unfortunate
4 that you couldn't have had more discussion now that
5 we're at this point. Is there -- I do -- I'm just
6 thinking maybe there needs to be some brainstorming
7 between the two. I'm very -- I appreciate your
8 concerns and thank you very much for coming tonight
9 because noise is a big issue in residential. And I've
10 developed -- I've had existing facilities where
11 residential is developed and there is a noise
12 complaint, so it is a very important issue.

13 Is there -- do you have a plan which shows
14 the -- your aircraft -- the flight --

15 MR. BIRD: We do. We have a master plan.
16 We do have that. It can show the ultimate
17 configuration of the air field and the forecasted
18 growth and so forth. So we would definitely share
19 that. We have shared that with developers who have
20 come to us in the past. Absolutely.

21 No, we are more than happy -- we are very,
22 very interested in what goes on around us. We want to
23 participate as a partner in that process. We take
24 those discussions very seriously and would welcome any

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

33

1 discussions.

2 We think it's a little unfortunate that you
3 got to this point without being included in the
4 process because clearly we're open to that, and we've
5 had a relationship within Pheasant Run for 52 years.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think that
7 it's still early in the process. So this opens up the
8 opportunity for everybody is sit down and talk, and
9 this is the time that it should occur. We're not too
10 far into the process.

11 Again, as Michelle pointed out, it would
12 make sense to talk to the most active neighbor you
13 have. When I look at the mall and the activity across
14 the street, to the north, and to the east, it's not as
15 active as the airport is going to be, but it's a good
16 thing that we discovered this right at the concept plan.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. BIRD: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I do. I would like if
21 the first speaker could come up.

22 This issue about noise is something I hadn't
23 really considered, and when you look at this total
24 plan, the hotel itself is not that far away; it abuts

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

34

1 to this proposed residential area.

2 So we do have a hotel that people sleep
3 there and so forth, hotels across the street. I just
4 wondered -- I don't know if this is a fair question --
5 what has been the history of complaints at Pheasant
6 Run about excessive noise from the airport? Has that
7 been a problem with management that they've had to
8 deal with over the past few years?

9 MR. CONNOLLY: Well, we've only been
10 managing the hotel for the past 18 months, but I'm not
11 aware of any. We get complaints about the noise, but
12 it's usually about other guests or the swimming pool.
13 But I'm unaware of anywhere people said the airport is
14 too loud.

15 I think from our perspective we're more than
16 happy to engage with the county -- the airport and try
17 to see if we can come to some accommodation that we
18 both think is appropriate.

19 I don't believe that saying no residential
20 is available there is necessarily a good solution, but
21 certainly we were already at the point of saying this
22 area is really close to the airport, you wouldn't put
23 anything in it.

24 So we'll see if we can work something out.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

35

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Well, there must be a
2 dialogue.

3 MR. CONNOLLY: Absolutely. And we're happy
4 to do that. We hadn't reached out to them prior to
5 this largely because we weren't sure exactly what we
6 were going to do, and we wanted to see what kind of
7 reception we'd get here to the overall concept plan,
8 but we're happy to reach out to the airport.

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any other
11 questions?

12 Yes.

13 MR. BIRD: Yes, sir. I would just say in
14 answer to your question that there is a significant
15 difference in people staying at a hotel and people
16 living in a house permanently. I've dealt with these
17 issues now in three different locations, three
18 different distinct parts of the country. Noise has
19 always been a significant issue with people that
20 own homes.

21 You can have -- I've worked at airports
22 where we had on-airport hotels, one right outside the
23 terminal building, and they never got noise
24 complaints. But we would get nose complaints from

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

36

1 homes 10, 15,000 feet from the threshold of a runway.

2 So there's just a significant mental or
3 intellectual difference between people that are
4 staying in a place one or two nights and people that
5 own a home permanently. There's a big difference in
6 how they view noise issues, and that's pretty much the
7 standard across the country.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Well, I was unaware of
9 that, but I was just making the point that this seems
10 something to be considered. If you have people
11 sleeping in hotels close to the airport, it might be
12 an issue.

13 MR. BIRD: I'd be very happy -- there's a
14 difference between one or two nights and 24/7/365.

15 MEMBER SPRUTH: Is there a recommended
16 buffer for housing?

17 MR. BIRD: We've got all the noise contours,
18 and that may be a subject for a separate presentation.

19 There are critical noise contours within
20 which you cannot build residential development. This
21 does not fall in those. However, the difference between
22 where that noise contour starts -- I mean, it could be
23 on this side, but the noise is going to be pretty much
24 the same on this side of the noise contour.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

37

1 I'm going to tell you that if you want to
2 come out and visit during a busy day that it's going
3 to be pretty noisy where that proposed residential
4 development is. And, unfortunately -- the unfortunate
5 thing is that airports, you know, generate noise. And
6 in that area, as I said, you've got maintenance.
7 You're close to a runway. When airplanes get to the
8 end of a runway, they're doing tests on the engines,
9 so they're running up the engines. So it's pretty
10 noisy in that area.

11 We just don't want the City or the people
12 that buy there to have to deal with these kinds of
13 issues if we can preclude them early in the process.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Maybe there'd be
15 consideration -- this just popped into my head -- of
16 those people that -- if it's an airplane community
17 that live there and they're used to the noise and
18 they're great with it because that's their toy. I
19 don't know. Just throwing it out there. It's
20 something to consider.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions from
22 the members of the audience?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Then I would ask -- staff

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

38

1 do you have anything?

2 MR. COLBY: No.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Then I would ask the
4 Plan Commissioners -- I know that we've already made
5 comments, but I would like to hear just quickly some
6 things that you do like about the plan, that you would
7 suggest improvement on kind of in a nutshell form.

8 Michelle, do you want to go first?

9 MEMBER SPRUTH: I think I'd talk with the
10 airport, taking their plans, current and future, need
11 to take into consideration the noise issue is very
12 significant. I don't know the existing studies that
13 have been done. So noise would be an issue, and I
14 don't want the people moving in there to -- I don't
15 want any bad relationships to develop.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm going to have to
17 say I support the concept plan as being presented
18 tonight. The noise level concerns with the
19 residential area is new for me, but overall I do
20 support the plan.

21 I just want to say when I came to
22 St. Charles a long while ago that's not too far off of
23 your 52 point and interviewed for a job at St. Charles
24 High School, the principal drove me around town, and

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

39

1 one of the places that was a showplace was Pheasant
2 Run, and that was a memorable thing in my mind. And
3 all I can say is that I'm encouraged that we're going
4 to start to improve the hotel in Phase 1 as we move
5 along. I think Pheasant Run is an icon of this city,
6 and I'd like to see it preserved.

7 So that's all I have to say.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Brian.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: When I first heard of this
10 and looked at it, I wasn't quite certain what I
11 thought. I guess the first things that ran through my
12 mind -- well, let me back up.

13 In terms of the redevelopment of the hotel
14 property, the development of retail fronting Route 64
15 both east and west, I think those proposals are
16 excellent.

17 Regarding residential behind the property,
18 the first thing that went through my mind was
19 affordable housing and questions that we talked
20 recently with the housing commission about, and I'll
21 come back to a comment about this being an island.

22 Now, there is residential development north
23 of 64 along Smith Road and Foxfield Drive, but,
24 otherwise, this entire area is an industrial area, and

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

40

1 I don't think that it's one that if we were asked, you
2 know, what would you think this should be developed as,
3 my mind would not go to residential, particularly being
4 close to the airport. It hadn't even occurred to me,
5 frankly, before tonight the noise concerns there.

6 Where my mind went was what kind of
7 amenities are going to be here for residents. There
8 are no parks within walking distance; can't walk to
9 the library very well; there are no public schools
10 within walking distance. You're really isolated from
11 the rest of the community, and that is not, in my
12 opinion, a great residential development pattern.

13 Our comprehensive plan also talks about in
14 different parts concern of protecting our industrial
15 areas from residential encroachment, and it's
16 precisely about noise and those industrial areas
17 remaining industrial for those land uses so that those
18 property owners and tenants don't feel that they're
19 being pushed out when suddenly there are all these
20 noise complaints.

21 So, in conclusion, I would say I would not
22 rule it out summarily, but I would say I'm not
23 persuaded yet that this is an appropriate location for
24 residential development, and I would encourage the

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

41

1 applicant if they are going to bring that forward in
2 the future to address not only traffic and noise but
3 the character of such a development in terms of access
4 to local amenities and what it is going to feel like
5 as a tenant here or as a homeowner in terms of
6 connectedness to the surrounding community.

7 Thank you.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Well, I personally used to
9 come out this way when I was a child. I grew up in
10 Chicago, and we'd go to Pheasant Run once a year, and
11 that was a big deal for us. So I'm glad to see that
12 you are improving it and it will be staying here. So
13 that's good.

14 As far as the retail and the offices,
15 et cetera, I'm glad to see you're considering that.
16 I'm sure you will be talking, and I would encourage
17 you to talk with the mall across the street to make
18 sure that there's not a lot of duplication and that
19 you're complementing each other, and maybe the facades
20 and different architecture might be similar in
21 some ways.

22 As far as the residential goes, I'm not
23 going to repeat everything everybody said, but the
24 consideration would have to be, since it is an island,

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

42

1 self-sufficient. If you do go that route, I would
2 guess there would have to be parks built into the
3 residential area. I mean, 104 acres is a pretty
4 decent size, and it might feel like island, but maybe
5 they might enjoy that to some degree if you make it
6 interesting enough for them to live there.

7 And that's really all I have.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I will echo some of the
9 same things, that I think that it's great that we're
10 going through this redevelopment phase, and I
11 certainly think the retail and office uses along
12 Route 64 are a good idea and appropriate.

13 As far as the residential portion goes, I
14 don't necessarily agree with the other Plan
15 Commissioners on that. I think that there is a middle
16 ground. I would hate to see the entire thing
17 developed into just, you know, a residential
18 neighborhood, but I think that there is something of a
19 hybrid that you could incorporate with an executive --
20 cutting down the golf course to something of an
21 executive golf course and then putting in maybe -- I
22 don't want to say like AMLI, but something like AMLI
23 where you have, you know, rental units.

24 I think that it would cater to certain

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

43

1 people, and I don't necessarily agree that they're an
2 island out there, either. I mean, there's a grocery
3 store across the street. As far as parks go, I think
4 that there would be parks incorporated into your plan,
5 and it certainly would be for a certain type of person
6 that wants that. I mean, I don't think that I would
7 plan on moving there with all of my kids; I don't
8 think it would be appropriate for that. But for
9 somebody who may want to have an area that's easy to
10 get in and out of and has a lot of buses and services
11 around, wants to golf every once in a while, have
12 their own clubhouse, something like that, I think that
13 that would be a good idea from my perspective.

14 I do also hear what the airport is saying,
15 and certainly we've had a lot of developments that
16 have come in and, you know, inevitably people move
17 into neighborhoods that are next to let's say
18 motorcycle dealerships or something like that and then
19 complain about the noise, you know, of things that
20 predated their moving there.

21 I think that that's inevitable, but I do
22 think that if it's something that's more of a rental
23 product or something where people are -- aren't out
24 mowing their yard and planting their tulips, that sort

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

44

1 of thing, that would be more conducive to this type
2 of area.

3 So those are my thoughts.

4 Tim.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I agree with Tom and
6 Brian and say I'm not diametrically opposed to
7 residential there, but it would have to be the right
8 kind of residential.

9 You know, one that strikes me -- when I
10 drive around in northwestern Illinois, I come across
11 these tiny airport communities where the pilots have
12 their homes with the hangar in the back yard. I mean,
13 can they dump right into DuPage Airport? I mean,
14 could be. It has to be some sort of club-type
15 residential, I'm certain of that, perhaps where they
16 have access to the hotel and that sort of thing.

17 But as I say, I'm not -- I'm not convinced
18 that we should just open this up to any kind of --
19 say, okay, it can be residential; it's going to be R4
20 so anything that conforms to R4 can go in there. I
21 don't think that's the case, and I'm not so certain
22 that this wouldn't lend itself to being a PUD for that
23 reason so we would be able to say this is the type of
24 residential we want to see in there.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

45

1 I'm very thrilled that you're going to do
2 something with the hotel. It has fallen into
3 disrepair; it is a St. Charles landmark. I mean,
4 everybody has stories about growing up here, the
5 indoor/outdoor pool. Heck, my wife worked there
6 40 years ago. To see that brought back to some kind
7 of usability for the community is a great idea. So
8 keep at it.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, the advantage of being
10 towards the end is I really don't have a whole heck
11 of k a lot to add differently from what you've
12 already heard.

13 I will say that I'm excited to see activity
14 on that property. It seems to be very positive, and
15 from my perspective I support your concept as it sits
16 today.

17 MEMBER FRIO: I'll kind of ditto what
18 everybody else said.

19 Just throwing out some ideas, the
20 residential, I feel if someone is going to buy a
21 property there, they kind of know what they're getting
22 into. One of my best friends lives a block over from
23 Midway. I mean, he's used to it; he doesn't hear
24 anything. I go down there and it drives me crazy. So

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

46

1 you know what you're getting into.

2 I'm sure you spent a lot of money buying the
3 resort. How now you can make a profit to -- you know,
4 you're putting money back into the resort. Thank you
5 for that because it's an awesome place to stay.
6 St. Charles is a great place for a lot of people
7 to come.

8 I take my family at Thanksgiving to Galena
9 to Eagle Ridge. This might be a way for people from
10 the city to come out to our area if you can make it
11 like, you know, cabins, or cottages, or single units
12 where people can stay, you know, for a short time.

13 But I think you're doing a great job. I
14 like the whole concept of the thing. And, again, my
15 feeling with somebody that's moving in there, you
16 would assume they know what they're getting into. And
17 you have to make a profit on your investment, so you
18 have to maximize that.

19 So I don't know if I really told you
20 anything, but those are some ideas. But, again, you
21 spent the money for the hotel, and now you have to
22 maximize your money out. How do you do that? God
23 bless you. I don't know how you take care of that
24 land, but I think you're on a good path.

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

47

1 That's all I have.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: One other caveat. I'm
3 sure that your time frames for each phase are fluid at
4 this point just based on the fact that you're going to
5 be using existing income stream from the hotel in
6 order to finance, I'm sure, quite a bit of this. But,
7 you know, one of the things that I would suggest is
8 before making concrete decisions about the residential
9 portion of this would be to see how the other phases,
10 you know -- how the other phases change the profile of
11 the property. So I think you can do all the drawings
12 in the world, but until it actually is there, you
13 won't really know what it's going to be like.

14 So that would be my other thought.

15 All right. Thank you.

16 MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Than concludes Item No. 5
18 on the agenda.

19 (Off the record at 8:03 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Pheasant Run Resort
Conducted on October 6, 2015

48

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 12th day of October, 2015.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017

 _____

Notary Public in and for the
State of 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

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

- - - - -x

In Re the Matter of: :
General Amendment (City :
of St. Charles) - :
Chapter 17.08, :
Chapter 17.14, and :
Table 17.14-2 : Item 4

- - - - -x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, October 6, 2015
8:04 p.m.

Job No.: 74374C
Pages: 1 - 43
Reported By: Paula Quetsch, CSR

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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

Proceedings held at the location of:

CITY OF ST. CHARLES COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
(630) 377-4400

Before Paula Quetsch, CSR, and Notary Public
in and for the State of Illinois.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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:

- TODD WALLACE, Chairman
- TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman
- BRIAN DOYLE, Member
- DAN FRIO, Member
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member
- MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner
- RITA TUNGARE, Director

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moving on to Item 4,
General Amendment (City of St. Charles) - Chapter 17.08,
Chapter 17.14, and Table 17.14-2.

MS. JOHNSON: So last month we discussed --
you probably remember we discussed a general amendment
to change the lot size requirements in the RT-4
district and CBD-1 and -2 districts. So based on the
discussion from that meeting the staff has modified
the proposed amendment.

So the current proposal is to amend the
nonconformities chapter of the zoning ordinance to
grandfather in nonconforming two-family dwellings in
the RT-4 district, doing that instead of changing the
lot size requirement for a two-family from 7500 to
5,000 square feet like we had talked about before, so
addressing the nonconformities chapter instead, also
amending the nonconformities chapter to grandfather
single- and two-family dwellings on nonconforming lots
on the CBD-2 district. Also changing the lot size
requirements in the CBD-2 district, we have a modified
proposal for doing that.

We're no longer proposing to change the lot
size requirements in the CBD-1 district based on lot

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

5

1 area analysis that we've done, and I'll touch on that
2 later.

3 We've included the parcel data that we had
4 referenced. It's included in the back of your meeting
5 packet. So the residential lots in the RT-4 and CBD
6 zoning districts are listed and branched by lot size
7 per unit, so you can see kind of the cutoffs there for
8 reference.

9 So just as a reminder on the zoning
10 districts we're talking about, CBD-2 district is kind
11 of the transitional mixed-use district between
12 downtown and the residential neighborhoods, and all
13 types of residential uses are allowed in the
14 CBD-2 district, and then the RT-4 district permits
15 single- and two-family.

16 So we discussed last time that there are
17 many nonconforming lots in the CBD-2 and RT-4 districts.
18 In the RT-4 district a total of 23 percent of parcels
19 don't meet the lot area requirement, and most of those
20 are the two-family parcels that are undersized, and in
21 the CBD-2 district 35 percent of lots are nonconforming.

22 So nonconformity is what we talked about
23 last time. They're problematic for a few reasons. If
24 a nonconforming building is destroyed, it can't be

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

6

1 reconstructed or reestablished. So because of that,
2 owners are unlikely to make substantial investments in
3 their property, and then potential buyers often have
4 trouble getting a mortgage or insurance. And because
5 of that, buyers are more likely to pay in cash, and
6 they're probably looking for a long-term rental
7 investment in the property.

8 So right now the nonconformities chapter of
9 the zoning district, it permits single-family
10 dwellings in residential districts to be constructed
11 or reconstructed on undersized lots if the lot existed
12 as of 1960. The provision doesn't extend to two-
13 family dwellings in any of the residential districts,
14 so we're proposing to include those two-family
15 dwellings in the RT-4 district only since two-family
16 dwelling is a permitted use in the RT-4 district. So
17 that means that an existing two-family dwelling that's
18 on a lot under 7500 square foot, if it's destroyed it
19 could be rebuilt even if it doesn't meet that
20 7500-square-foot-lot requirement.

21 One provision we're adding to that is the
22 lot would have to contain a two-family dwelling as of
23 the date the zoning ordinance was adopted, so October
24 of 2006. So it would have had to exist before

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

7

1 that date.

2 So this change as proposed would result in
3 all of the single- and two-family properties in the
4 RT-4 district either to conform to the lot area
5 requirements or to be grandfathered in as conforming.
6 We're also proposing to go to the same in the CBD-2
7 district but only for single- and two-family dwellings.
8 So this would result in -- if you look at -- sorry --
9 this the middle portion, result in all of the single-
10 and two-family lots in the CBD district to either be
11 conforming or be grandfathered in as conforming.

12 Are there any questions about this area?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You said something
14 about -- what happened in 1960 in the CBD?

15 MS. JOHNSON: The nonconforming chapter
16 right now grandfathers in single-family lots that are
17 undersized that were established as of 1960.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: In which zoning
19 district?

20 MS. JOHNSON: In all residential districts.

21 MEMBER FRIO: Is there a portion of the
22 house that can or cannot be destroyed?

23 MS. JOHNSON: Right now it's 50 percent of
24 the value. If it's over 50 percent of the value

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

8

1 destroyed, then it can't be rebuilt. If it's just
2 damaged partially, it could be renovated to its --

3 MEMBER FRIO: So when you grandfather it in,
4 if it burns down, they can rebuild?

5 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. If it burns down, you
6 can rebuild what was there.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What is the one
8 thing that could change that? Just rezoning or a text
9 amendment?

10 MS. JOHNSON: Right. So in perpetuity these
11 would be grandfathered in unless this chapter is
12 changed in the future.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: When you're counting and
15 labeling a two-unit or a single-family unit, is it by
16 the number of electric meters, or how exactly do you
17 determine two-family?

18 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, sometimes -- I started by
19 checking the electric meters and then verifying on the
20 assessor's page. The township assessor sometimes says
21 something we know is a two-family, they'll call it a
22 single-family for whatever reason. So I kind of used
23 aerial imagery. So I probably missed a couple, but I
24 did the best I could.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

9

1 MEMBER PRETZ: So the record that would --
2 so as of 2012 the record that you have at that time,
3 assuming -- let's assume you didn't miss any -- and a
4 fire destroys the building and they go -- if there's a
5 rebuild in process, then it is checked against that
6 actual record so that the rebuild would not be a two-
7 family? If it was a single-family and maybe they had
8 two families living in there, your records do not
9 indicate that. Therefore, that would have to be a
10 single-family residence?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Right. There would have to be
12 some record, or they would have to show that there
13 were two separate dwelling units as of 2006.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I couldn't be here last
15 time. So I apologize if I ask questions or make
16 comments that are inappropriate.

17 So the goal here is to change the lot size
18 so, as mentioned earlier, if a home burns, they can
19 rebuild on that --

20 MS. JOHNSON: That was our idea last time,
21 and now we're proposing not to change the lot size but
22 instead to just grandfather those properties that
23 already do not meet the lot size. So if a person
24 wanted to develop on a 5,000-square-foot lot, they

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

10

1 would only be able to build a single-family dwelling.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

3 MS. JOHNSON: But if the two-family existed
4 before and it was burned down, they could rebuild it.
5 But if they wanted to build a new two-family dwelling
6 on a lot that didn't have a two-family before, it
7 would have to still be at least 7500 square feet,
8 which is the current lot area requirement.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. I misread it all and
10 thought, oh, my goodness they're lowering everything.

11 MS. JOHNSON: No. We changed the --

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Exactly what you did
13 is what I was going to recommend. All right. Thank
14 you. I'm good.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: I'm looking at the table in
16 the back of the packet. To clarify, this only applies
17 to one- and two-family units in RT-4 and one- and
18 two-family units in CBD-2?

19 MS. JOHNSON: Well, technically, it only
20 applies to two-family in RT-4 because the single-family
21 are already grandfathered under the ordinance, and
22 then it applies to single- and two- family in CBD-2
23 because no types of units in CBD-2 are grandfathered
24 currently.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

11

1 MEMBER DOYLE: So I'm looking at your table
2 then. In RT-4 on page 21 -- I can't tell. There's
3 nonpermitted residential uses that list three- and
4 four-family units like at 314 South 4th Street that
5 has the 1400 square feet per unit. And then when we
6 go to CBD-2, we have multifamily units, including like
7 309 Walnut which have lot area per unit of 363 square
8 feet. So what, if anything, does this change
9 regarding multifamily units, three, four, and up?

10 MS. JOHNSON: Multifamily isn't permitted in
11 the RT-4 district. So under this amendment, if a
12 three-family were to burn down, they could reconstruct
13 it as a two-family.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So the three-families
15 in RT-4 then, so if the lowest one is 4200, that would
16 end up being a 2100 -- two 2100-square-foot
17 residences, which is in line with some of the other
18 square footage.

19 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: And what about CBD-2? Like
21 let's say 309 Walnut Street burns down, which is
22 roughly six units at roughly 4,000 square feet for the
23 parcel. They could develop a two-family unit there
24 with roughly 2000 square feet per unit?

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

12

1 MS. JOHNSON: That one is a PUD. But if it
2 was not a PUD, that kind of gets into the next
3 proposal of changing the lot size requirement per
4 unit. We're proposing 2200 square feet for a
5 multifamily per unit.

6 So they would -- let's see. Yes, they would
7 be able to rebuild as a two-family.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: By right?

9 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: And for the 414 Cedar, they
11 wouldn't be able to rebuild a six-unit multifamily,
12 but they could rebuild a two-unit multifamily with
13 2500 square foot per unit?

14 MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: So every building is
16 grandfathered in even if it's -- they don't have to
17 have a two-unit building on the parcel; they just have
18 to have at least two units on the parcel --

19 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: -- as of 2006.

21 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm a bit confused by
23 this. It's a big concept.

24 I just want to go back. I was looking on

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

13

1 what I received here about Homes for a Changing Region
2 study, and I left here last time with one idea in my
3 head, and we're going a different direction now.

4 I'm just wondering. It says, "The City
5 should explore options for reducing lot size
6 requirements for residential units in CBD-1 and CBD-2
7 in order to provide new opportunities for high-density
8 residential development."

9 Are we doing that with what you're proposing
10 tonight, or are we going in a different direction?

11 MS. JOHNSON: A little bit. We were before
12 proposing to reduce the lot size requirement in CBD-1,
13 and we're not proposing that anymore. Because what we
14 found is that there's really not a conformity problem
15 downtown. The residential uses meet the 1,000-square-
16 foot lot area requirement. So we're not proposing
17 that anymore, and in the CBD-2 we're just proposing a
18 slight reduction in lot size requirement, which I can
19 get into. It's not -- should I move onto that? Are
20 we done with the nonconformity issue?

21 MEMBER DOYLE: To grandfather in?

22 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I guess I'm
24 still hanging a little bit on what Jim was saying, and

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

14

1 that is what I'm hearing you say, Ellen, is that we're
2 trying to increase the density, but because we don't
3 have lot sizes that would allow it anyway because of
4 the inventory that's there, it's not necessary to
5 reduce the lot sizes. Is that correct? Did I say
6 that right?

7 MS. JOHNSON: The original intent of this
8 amendment was to deal with the nonconformities, and
9 based on our analysis there's not a nonconformity
10 problem in the CBD-1. So now it's more of a policy
11 question that we can address later on if we think we
12 want to provide opportunities for increasing density
13 downtown. But we kind of view that as a separate
14 issue from this, so that's why we aren't proposing
15 that at this time.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So this has been a
17 pathway to achieve what we were looking at to
18 begin with?

19 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Okay. That's all I
21 wondered.

22 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. So moving onto the
23 CBD-2 proposal, this area right here shows the
24 existing lot size requirements. So all types of

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

15

1 residential require different lot size requirements.

2 So we are proposing to reduce the
3 single-family lot size from 5,000 to 4400 and then
4 standardize the lot size for the other types of
5 residential uses to 2200 square feet. That's the
6 current requirement for the multifamily, for
7 upper-level dwellings, so we're proposing to
8 standardize that. So then on a 4400-square-foot lot,
9 you could have a two-family and up from there.

10 So that is our proposal here. So based on
11 both that -- the change in lot area as proposed and
12 also the proposed grandfathering, we'll get a total
13 conforming or grandfathered to conform percentage of
14 91 percent of lots.

15 We also have presented an alternative
16 proposal, kind of a more dramatic shift at 3,000
17 square foot for a single-family and then just
18 1500 square foot per unit for other residential uses
19 that you might want to consider, but that's more of a
20 dramatic change towards a little bit higher densities.

21 We feel that the 2200 square foot per unit
22 is precedent for that, and that's the current
23 requirement for multifamily, and it would be a little
24 bit easier to administer and to apply to individual

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

16

1 lots now that it's standardized as proposed.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And why -- sorry if I'm
3 asking a question I shouldn't, but why would we lower
4 it from 5 to 4400? What's the goal? Higher density?

5 MS. JOHNSON: Well, there's -- right now,
6 let's see, only 82 percent of single-family parcels
7 meet the -- basically, there's no real standard lot
8 size in the CBD-2 district. 5,000 square foot is
9 required, but there's such a variety of lot sizes in
10 that district, so we felt that it would make sense
11 for -- it just makes more sense based on what's
12 already existing.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And why do we have to do
14 100 percent, or 90 percent, or whatever?

15 MR. COLBY: Well, when the City rewrote its
16 zoning ordinance in 2006, one of the goals was to
17 write zoning districts that reflected the existing
18 development pattern in town, and for a lot of the
19 zoning districts it was a goal to write the
20 requirement so that roughly 90 percent of the lots in
21 a given district would be conforming based on the new
22 requirements.

23 And what we found was that with the CBD-2
24 district the requirements are really more written for

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

17

1 new development or redevelopment of sites, and it
2 rendered a lot of the existing lots into a
3 nonconforming status.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So they can't be built on?

5 MR. COLBY: Right. Or reinvestment in the
6 property is discouraged because of its nonconforming
7 status.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And that's why they pay
9 cash or not get a loan?

10 MR. COLBY: Right. What we're trying to do
11 is adjust the requirements to better match what exists
12 today so that we don't have this problem where we're
13 creating nonconformities because we think in the long
14 term it discourages investment in the property.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. I understand but
16 historically it seems like they've gotten lower from
17 what are they were or should have been. So if we
18 lower it again, will they again go lower 20 years
19 from now?

20 MR. COLBY: A lot of these lots we're
21 talking about have existed for many years.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Like 100 years?

23 MR. COLBY: Right. And they've been there
24 for that amount of time, and they haven't gone away.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

18

1 As long as the buildings remain and are continued to
2 be occupied.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So they haven't improved
4 them because of this.

5 MR. COLBY: Well, it's partially because of
6 that but also because once an area property is
7 divided -- say a city block is subdivided with
8 different ownerships. The only scenario where someone
9 can actually increase the size of a lot to combine
10 multiple small parcels. And that can be done but when
11 that happens, you have wholesale redevelopment of a
12 given area.

13 And the way our codes are written right now,
14 that's really the only way to accomplish new
15 development or redevelopment around the perimeter of
16 downtown. So what we're trying to do is get away from
17 that model because we've observed that there seems to
18 be continued interest in renovating older structures
19 and finding reuses for existing buildings versus
20 wholesale redevelopment.

21 We think the way the code is set up right
22 now is it's really making wholesale redevelopment the
23 only option to reinvest in property. So we think
24 that's sort of counterproductive long term in terms of

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

19

1 keeping a variety of rental units in town, historical
2 preservation practices, all of those things.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Thanks.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And those nine lots
5 that will not be conforming regardless if we use the
6 proposed change would just be if something occurred
7 they could --

8 MS. JOHNSON: Rebuild as two-family. And
9 some of those are PUDs, too.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, some of those
11 nine are?

12 MS. JOHNSON: Maybe two or three of them.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Some of those are what?

14 MS. JOHNSON: PUDs. So they're conforming
15 to whatever was approved in the PUD.

16 One other part of this is lot width in the
17 CBD-2. Staff is proposing to standardize the lot
18 width requirement to 50 feet. That's kind of the
19 standard lot width that exists. That's the current
20 requirement for all uses except townhomes and
21 multifamily/upper level.

22 Right now those uses require 100-foot lot
23 width, and that really limits the existing parcels
24 for redevelopment. It limits the potential to reuse

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

20

1 those properties having that added 100-foot width
2 requirement. So we're proposing to remove that
3 requirement and just require the standard 50 foot
4 of width.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, that brings
6 the question what -- do all of these in this
7 proposed -- this list of 100 parcels, are they all
8 50 foot?

9 MS. JOHNSON: No. No, but the nonconforming
10 proposal also includes -- it's nonconforming as of lot
11 size and lot width.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

13 MS. JOHNSON: So at least for the single-
14 and two-family.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: So I have a question
16 regarding the nine nonconforming multifamily/upper
17 level with the 2200 square foot per unit. If I'm
18 looking at the list of parcels and looking at the lot
19 area per unit, can you identify -- are the nine that
20 are nonconforming near the top of that list in terms
21 of number?

22 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: And which ones are they?

24 MS. JOHNSON: So it's the number on

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

21

1 CBD parcels spreadsheet. So numbers 1 through 13.

2 Yes, 1 through 13.

3 MEMBER FRIO: Are you on page 22?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: And so the --

6 MS. JOHNSON: Some of those are two-family.

7 So for the multifamily --

8 MEMBER DOYLE: 1 through 10 excluding No. 8?

9 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: And two of them are PUD?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Correct, two of them.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: I see. So these could be then
13 converted to two-family units but not multifamily units?

14 MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: So we now have three units --
16 the 10 unit one, that one, No. 9, that one would only
17 be -- I mean, could it be converted to a lower number
18 of units like an eight-unit building?

19 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. Uh-huh. Just so each
20 unit had 2200 feet of lot area.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: And what's the minimum square
22 foot per unit in CBD-1?

23 MS. JOHNSON: 1,000.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: For multifamily?

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

22

1 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: When staff -- could you
3 describe your pros and cons that you considered when
4 coming up with the alternate proposed lot area
5 requirement?

6 MS. JOHNSON: Well, one of the pros was that
7 we would get 100 percent conformance with the
8 two-family and almost 100 percent with the single-family.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: But they're all
10 grandfathered in?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Those are grandfathered in
12 anyway. We just wanted to give another option to
13 create -- I guess to be closer to the requirement of
14 the CBD-1, and that's more of a policy question if you
15 want to have densities closer to CBD-1 or to the RT
16 districts. That's more of a policy question. We just
17 wanted to throw the option out there. These aren't
18 the only two options. That's why we had the list of
19 parcels, too, if you see by the cutoff, but it was to
20 give the Commission options for discussion purposes.

21 MR. COLBY: The other item I would add is
22 that the 1500 square feet reflects a number that's
23 closer to what the City's approved in PUD developments
24 with that zoning district. So that's more representative

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

23

1 of the type of new development the City has actually
2 approved but, granted, those are within PUDs.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: I guess my thought is that
4 2200 square feet is a decent-sized apartment, you
5 know, and for that to be a minimum in our central
6 business district is -- I'm interested in considering
7 the alternate proposed lot area with 1500 square foot
8 per unit at least for multifamily.

9 With the others being grandfathered in, we
10 could keep two-home to townhome and two-family higher
11 if necessary, and that would address the redevelopment
12 issue. But I think that downtown is where we should
13 have our density, and that's only four units, but I
14 think a 1300-square-foot apartment is -- that they are
15 people who --

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think these are
17 lot sizes.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: 1500 square foot.

19 MS. JOHNSON: 1500 square foot of lot size
20 per unit.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You have to have
22 1500 square feet of lot per each dwelling unit.

23 MS. JOHNSON: It has nothing to do with the
24 size of the unit itself.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

24

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So for a two-family
2 you'd have to have -- if it was 40 feet, you have
3 3,000 --

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. So it's got to
5 be 3,000.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I understand that.
7 But how big would that lot be in dimension, width by
8 length?

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: 300, 500? I don't know.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 30 by 100. We're
11 talking about lot sizes here.

12 MS. JOHNSON: It doesn't address the size of
13 the units themselves.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's for a single-family.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Just to clarify, when I'm
16 looking at the table, let's say No. 6, 103 North
17 4th Avenue, multifamily, three units has a lot area of
18 5,000 square feet and a lot area per unit of
19 1667 square feet.

20 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: Is that -- so it's a
22 5,000-square-foot lot, and it is nonconforming
23 according to the proposed lot area requirement.
24 Correct?

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

25

1 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: So it's a 5,000-square-foot
3 lot but it's --

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: But there's three units.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Right. So it's the square
6 footage of the --

7 MS. JOHNSON: It's the square footage of the
8 lot for each unit.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: So it's not the square
10 footage of the unit. I see.

11 MS. JOHNSON: Right.

12 MEMBER FRIO: So under the alternative plan
13 that would fit as a three-unit; correct?

14 MS. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. I understand. Sorry.
16 But, Russ, to your point, recent PUDs are
17 averaging about 1500 square foot per unit lot size?

18 MR. COLBY: Yes.

19 MS. JOHNSON: It's on that list here. So
20 here are the CBD-2 multifamily PUDs, so you can see
21 the square foot per unit in this column here.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Those are lots?

23 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

24 MR. COLBY: So it does vary quite a bit.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

26

1 One thing I'll point out is the Heritage Square units,
2 for example, have commercial uses, also. So they're
3 not solely residential developments.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: I don't have any other
5 questions.

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

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I do. I actually
9 have a question for Brian.

10 So I mean, I understand you're heading that
11 direction to the smaller because it is dense, and I do
12 think that even on a 1500 square foot per unit on a
13 two-family there's a significant amount of space in
14 that dwelling. When I think of apartments, if you had
15 a 20 by -- I mean, you could have easily anywhere from
16 700 to 1,000 square feet in that unit. That's not an
17 unusual size apartment unit. I think when you start
18 getting up to 2200 and you're talking 1200 to 1800
19 square foot for an apartment or, you know, a multiunit,
20 that's a big unit. That's a real big unit when you
21 consider many of the houses in RT-4 are anywhere from
22 1200 to 1800 square feet for an entire single-family
23 house.

24 I guess where I'm going, I mean, is that

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

27

1 your thinking, as well?

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I think Brian thought it
4 was square footage inside versus the lot.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Forgetting that,
6 even so, his thinking about the dwelling size is in
7 line with what a multifamily dwelling size is and
8 probably should be in the CBD-2 district even with
9 that lot size. I mean, you can get a pretty big unit
10 in a 2200-square-foot -- I mean, if you have
11 4400 square feet for a two-family, that's a good size
12 apartment.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, if it's 1,000 square
14 feet in CBD-1 --

15 MR. COLBY: One thing to keep in mind is
16 that in the CBD-2 district there are other zoning
17 requirements that limit the size of the building. For
18 example, the building coverage, the percentage of the
19 lot that can be covered by buildings is capped at
20 40 percent for a nonsingle-family development. So you
21 don't have full use of the lot.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So if you had
23 4400 square feet, and you can only use 40 percent of
24 that, that's 2200 -- that's 2,000 approximately,

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

28

1 2,000 square feet that you could build on, that could
2 be the footprint of your unit, 2,000 square feet.
3 That's pretty big. Bigger than my house.

4 MR. COLBY: I just wanted to point out there
5 is a difference between the CBD-2 district which has
6 those limitations versus the CBD-1 district which is
7 the downtown district which allows the 1,000 square
8 feet. There's no limitations on building coverage
9 there. So you do have to also factor in the setback
10 requirements limitations that are more meant to
11 reflect that it's a transitional district from a
12 downtown to a single-family neighborhood.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So if I'm looking at
14 this alternate plan, in this alternate plan I have
15 3,000 -- anyway, 3,000 square feet times 40 percent.
16 I mean, that's 1200 square foot. That's a
17 1200-square-foot dwelling unit on the smaller.

18 Do you see what I'm saying? If you have
19 3,000 square feet per unit -- say you have 1500 square
20 feet per unit, that means you have to have a
21 3,000-square-foot lot, you can put two units on it,
22 you can only use 40 percent. That's 1200 square feet.
23 So you're going to have two 600-square-foot
24 apartments, which is not a small apartment. I mean,

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

29

1 apartments are 600 to 1,000 square feet is what big
2 apartments are unless you're paying 250,000 for a
3 condo, Tom.

4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Once again, we're going
5 high density here. That would get it.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That would get it.

7 MS. JOHNSON: Also, that 1200 square feet is
8 the footprint. So you could always have a two-story.
9 That doubles that percentage.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That gives you two units.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm not opposed to
12 this alternate is the where I'm headed.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: But that gives us high
14 limitations.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What do you mean?

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: The 1500 per unit you're
17 limited. If you do 2200 you have flexibility of your
18 building. It's still high density, as far as I'm
19 concerned, 2200. You don't think that's high density?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: The reason why I brought it
23 up is it is -- I'm going to assume that staff is
24 proposing it as an alternate proposal because you

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

30

1 think that it's viable, and that it is within the
2 realm of best practice, and that you wouldn't be
3 proposing it if you thought that it was inadvisable.

4 MR. COLBY: Well, I think, as Ellen stated,
5 it does in a way represent a policy change to what
6 kind of development the City is encouraging in that
7 zoning district, which is why our proposal we think is
8 more consistent with what we think the way the zoning
9 district is currently structured and would maintain
10 the same maximum density. But the alternate proposal
11 would allow an increased density, which is a change to
12 how the district is structured now.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And that's what you want to
14 do? Is that what you're saying?

15 MR. COLBY: Well, there's some policy
16 direction and documents the City has adopted to
17 support that, but it is a change because once that
18 ordinance change is made, you could see different
19 types of development in that district. So it's
20 something to consider the impact of that.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: And in the case of
22 four parcels, it would facilitate redevelopment?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. But it would also allow
24 that type of development on a lot of other parcels

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

31

1 right now that are more or less capped because of the
2 existing square footage limitations. I think that's
3 more the impact we're trying to be sensitive to in not
4 putting that forward as our proposal.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So you're encouraging that
6 for that reason?

7 MEMBER DOYLE: That's not what I heard him
8 say. Their proposal is the middle proposal,
9 2200 square feet, and if we were to entertain the
10 alternate proposal, we would be in effect making a
11 recommendation to City Council for something that to
12 some degree is a policy change from what current
13 prevailing development patterns are now downtown.

14 MR. COLBY: Correct.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But they do conform
16 to some policies and some recent PUD approvals?

17 MR. COLBY: Yes.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: And the multifamily is not
19 allowed in RT-4; correct?

20 MR. COLBY: Correct.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: So the requirement in lot
22 area for a two-family in RT-4 is 3750?

23 MS. JOHNSON: 7500 square foot total.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: And it will remain that?

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

32

1 MS. JOHNSON: Correct.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: So bringing it down to
3 2200 still provides a transition? It steps it up
4 from RT-4?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes. And one of the other
6 things we're trying to accomplish, it was confusing to
7 apply those existing standards because of the
8 different square footage requirements for two-family,
9 versus townhome, versus multifamily. Given the types
10 of development that exists in the downtown area, you
11 don't often have buildings that fit neatly into those
12 building types, so having it standardized would be
13 much easier for us to apply and also for property
14 owners to understand what they can and can't do with
15 their property.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: So I guess I'm in favor of
17 either proposed amendment. I'm sensitive to the fact
18 that staff is advising that we would be in effect
19 recommending a policy change and it would introduce
20 potentially a new kind of development downtown, more
21 intense development. I personally think that there
22 are benefits of that, and it's within our purview to
23 make that policy recommendation, but I'd be curious to
24 know what other commission members -- it's not

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

33

1 something I feel like I have to push. It's something
2 that I would want to know that there's some consensus
3 that this is something that we wish to push.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I'll tell you
5 what I would like to do. Because I think we're
6 discussing the pros and cons of voting for or against
7 the recommendation, I'd like to make a motion to close
8 the public hearing. Because unless somebody has some
9 other information that they want staff to get for us,
10 my motion is to close the public hearing.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Before I entertain that
12 motion, are there any questions or comments?

13 MR. DERRICO: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And since it's a public
15 hearing, if you raise your right hand.

16 (Witness sworn.)

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. If you could
18 state your name and spell your last name for the
19 record.

20 MR. DERRICO: Sure. My name is Greg Derrico,
21 D-e-r-r-i-c-o. I own a property -- two properties on
22 Walnut Avenue in the CBD-2 district, and I've owned
23 one of the two for 30 years now, and the second I've
24 owned for about 10 to 12 years, and everything you're

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

34

1 discussing tonight directly impacts some of my
2 struggles I've endured for many of those years in
3 terms of redeveloping my property.

4 So as I listen to all the considerations
5 here tonight, I hear a lot about the destruction of
6 property and the replacement of something that burns
7 down. My focus is mainly on redevelopment and trying
8 to improve the neighborhood.

9 One of the properties I have -- the one that
10 I've had for 30 years -- and I did build a new
11 structure on it approximately 10 years ago. The
12 structure is approximately 3,000 square feet in floor
13 space and would be ideal for a mixed-use application
14 under the current existing zoning requirements.

15 However, this particular property is not
16 100 feet in width across the street, the dimension
17 where it meets the street; it's only 50 feet. So
18 that's my number one restriction that I've been
19 dealing with with multiple submissions to the City
20 over the past couple years.

21 I'm looking to take a property, as I said,
22 that's 3,000 square feet right now, I no longer need
23 3,000 square feet for my own use -- I'm sorry -- I
24 didn't indicate that that building has been my primary

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

35

1 office for all of the 30 years, and again most
2 recently in its current form 3,000 square feet for the
3 past 10 years.

4 So I have an interest in redeveloping that
5 property in probably a multiuse function, but I'm not
6 able to because it does not meet the 100-foot
7 requirement. So I have probably 2,000 of the
8 3,000 square feet sitting idly by right now that I
9 would like to develop into two residential apartments
10 and maintain 1,000 feet for an office that I would
11 still occupy.

12 Now, under the current regulations I cannot
13 do that for a couple of reasons. The first I named.
14 The second is the fact that as it stands now, I'm only
15 allowed 3700 square feet or I'm required -- excuse
16 me -- required to have 3700 square feet of lot size
17 for each dwelling unit, and that would only net me out
18 one apartment. I could have one apartment and one
19 commercial space. If the 100-foot requirement was
20 waived and we went as staff proposes to a zero there,
21 I would still fall short of developing the property
22 and using it to its full potential. That's property
23 No. 1.

24 So I'm very much in favor of eliminating the

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

36

1 100-foot requirement, and I think in keeping with
2 what's neighboring me and what's been approved as far
3 as PUDs, very close and nearby my property within
4 probably 100 yards or less we have multiple PUDs that
5 have a much smaller lot size requirement and,
6 therefore, higher density.

7 So I would like to see the alternate
8 approved at 1500 square feet of lot size. If that was
9 approved and I acted on that, my property would
10 exactly match what exists on Illinois and 5th and
11 Illinois and 4th Street, that property in that area.
12 So it would be an exact match for mine, and I'm not
13 looking for or asking for any more than what already
14 exists. That's Property No. 1, 311 Walnut.

15 I own the property adjacent to that,
16 309 Walnut which is 3700 square feet of lot size.
17 There's currently an older two-unit apartment on it
18 that's grandfathered in, and the City and I are stuck
19 with this old building that would do everybody a favor
20 if it was razed and something new was built. However,
21 under the new guidelines -- or only the old guidelines
22 I would only be able to replace it with a
23 single-family home.

24 So there's no incentive for someone like

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

37

1 myself -- and I know there's many other instances of
2 these around. There's no incentive to ever dismantle,
3 tear that building down and replace it with a newer,
4 fresher look that produces no more burden on the city,
5 two units, in other words, and a new structure.

6 So I would ask that you take your time and
7 look at the 1500-square-foot proposal because I think
8 it's exactly right on, and something like that is
9 going to create the environment for folks like myself
10 that own properties like that to possibly reinvest and
11 create a fresher, better look for the neighborhood,
12 the street scape, and so forth.

13 So I've tried to market my properties, and
14 there's no interest and no value as the zoning stands
15 now, so I'm kind of locked in a mode and stuck without
16 options under the current. I think that the proposal
17 that's before you guys right now is excellent but for
18 one exception, and that's I think as opposed to the
19 2200 square foot per unit, I think it should really be
20 1500 square feet. And that kind of a change in zoning
21 is going to definitely create a situation where I'm
22 looking at redevelopment as opposed to just maintaining
23 and getting by, and that would be a huge betterment
24 for the community.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

38

1 I've been in St. Charles and owned property
2 here for 30-some years. I'm in the home building
3 business, and I'm now on year 36. We're building
4 homes so I'm trying do more teardowns and
5 redevelopment here in town and making every effort to
6 make a difference in that regard.

7 So I think that there would be a lot said
8 for you to really dissect that because I can tell from
9 listening that there is some confusion about the lot
10 size and the unit size.

11 As you finally reach a conclusion, that
12 property, that 3,000-square-foot property would
13 produce a 2400-square-foot building and 1200 square
14 feet on each level, very similar to what I'm occupying
15 right now myself for my office at 311. That's a small
16 lot and I've got three levels at 1,000 foot each, and
17 the other proposal that you guys just looked at with
18 the 1500 square foot would give you 1200 square feet
19 on each floor, for each level.

20 So that's all I have to say, and I hope that
21 it comes around where at some point there is a change
22 because I definitely have plans and would like to act
23 on them to recreate the building I'm in now and put
24 some high-end for their size nice apartments, not just

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

39

1 rental units. I'm trying to develop a better tenant
2 and have a better life for myself and the community.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I ask you a
4 question?

5 MR. DERRICO: Sure.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: At 311 Walnut,
7 that's an upper-level dwelling?

8 MR. DERRICO: Yes.

9 MS. JOHNSON: Is that where your office is?

10 MR. DERRICO: I'm sorry?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Your office is
12 there, so you have an office at a lower level, and one
13 level up is --

14 MR. DERRICO: More office. So I've got
15 office on two levels. The basement is roughed out for
16 at the time I was --

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you have a
18 dwelling unit above your office?

19 MR. DERRICO: I do not. I'm proposing that.
20 I want to put a dwelling unit on the second floor,
21 which is a very nice space. The entire building has
22 10-foot ceilings upstairs. I've got some 14- and
23 15-foot ceilings.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I ask you

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

40

1 another question?

2 MR. DERRICO: Sure.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is it about
4 4500 square feet, your lot?

5 MR. DERRICO: My lot is 4500 square feet.
6 So 1500 square feet would net me -- under the right
7 circumstances I could have then possibly a three-
8 dwelling unit there as opposed to the mixed use.
9 That's another option for me. Because as you all know
10 right now, there's an overabundance, a glut on the
11 market of commercial office space. You virtually
12 can't give it away, and my property is literally in
13 competition with what goes on on 1st Street and we all
14 know -- I don't know all the details, but I have
15 enough hearsay to know that it's super competitive and
16 what was done to move folks into those spots. So I'm
17 not going to compete with that and I'm not trying to.
18 I feel like I could exist and get by with a very nice
19 high-line but small residential unit for somebody who
20 wants something a little bit nicer.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just so I can
22 understand and kind of break that down to one thing,
23 you're in favor of the alternate proposal of the
24 3,000 square foot per unit for single-family and

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

41

1 1500 square foot for the multifamily?

2 MR. DERRICO: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you very much.

4 MR. DERRICO: And that, as I said, is a
5 direct parallel with what already exists very close by.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you
7 very much.

8 MR. DERRICO: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions or
10 comments?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: My motion is on the
12 table to close the public hearing.

13 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'll second it.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any
15 discussion on the motion?

16 Tim.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

18 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes, to close the public
19 hearing.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

42

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 PRETZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Public
hearing is closed. That concludes Item No. 4 on the
agenda.

(Off the record at 8:55 p.m.)

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 4
Conducted on October 6, 2015

43

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 12th day of October, 2015.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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

Proceedings held at the location of:

CITY OF ST. CHARLES COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
(630) 377-4400

Before Paula Quetsch, CSR, and Notary Public
in and for the State of Illinois.

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

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:

- TODD WALLACE, Chairman
- TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman
- BRIAN DOYLE, Member
- DAN FRIO, Member
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member
- MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner
- RITA TUNGARE, Director

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

4

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 7 is General Amendment (City of St. Charles) Chapters 17.08, 17.14, and Table 17.14-2. Is there a motion?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would recommend approval of the proposed lot area requirement as stated -- as described in the agenda.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is that sufficient for a motion, Ellen?

MS. JOHNSON: Can you clarify which proposal?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's not the alternate proposal; it's what you described as conforming lots, proposed lot area requirement 4400 square foot per unit and 2200 for two-family townhome and multifamily upper level.

MEMBER DOYLE: And, also, to clarify, Tim, does your motion include proposal one?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

MEMBER DOYLE: Nonconforming lots of record to grandfather in?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. I guess I'll

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

5

1 read it.

2 I would recommend approval of the General
3 Amendment for Chapter 17.08 "Nonconformities,"
4 Section 17.08.050 "Nonconforming Lots of Record" and
5 Chapter 17.4 "Business and Mixed Use Districts,"
6 Table 17.4-2 "Bulk regulations" (RT-4 and CBD-2
7 nonconforming lots and CBD-2 lot area and lot width
8 requirements.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And just for the record
10 it was 17.14 and Table 17.14-2; correct?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's correct.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So that is
15 now the motion that is on the table for approval of
16 the application.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: To recommend
18 approval.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct.

20 Okay. Any discussion?

21 MEMBER DOYLE: What did you think about the
22 discussion we just had with the gentleman regarding
23 the alternate proposal?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that --

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

6

1 well, first of all, I think that the alternate proposal
2 bears some discussion, but I think that's a discussion
3 for a different meeting.

4 I think what we're attempting to do here is
5 to bring as many properties into conformity as we can
6 within the guidelines of lot sizes as they exist today
7 in the city of St. Charles. I think that doing the
8 alternate would begin policy change, which I'm not
9 totally against, but I don't think that's what we're
10 here to discuss today.

11 Because this is a nonconformity issue here.
12 If we take on the alternate, I think we're taking on a
13 policy change that may take care of some additional
14 nonconformities, but that isn't the purpose of studies
15 that Ellen and Russ have taken on.

16 I also think that there are situations,
17 there are always going to be situations regardless of
18 what we do that are going to put some lot owner, some
19 property owner in -- burden some property owner.

20 I think the fact that we have, you know,
21 grandfathered the lots that are nonconforming to bring
22 most of them up top 100 percent takes most of that
23 burden off. I'm frankly not convince that you're
24 going to be able to satisfy 100 percent of the

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

7

1 property owners in an area where you don't have exact
2 same sized lots throughout. It's an old district.

3 I'd like to see if there's something you
4 could do to help him. You know, I think there's a
5 fine line between somebody's idea of what they want to
6 do -- you know, he wants three apartments, fancy
7 apartments with some office use there. Maybe that's
8 not going to happen there. There's a disconnect
9 between what somebody dreams of having and what they
10 can actually do.

11 If there's something -- I think we talked
12 about dropping the 100-foot wide lot requirement, so
13 that's gone anyway, so he doesn't have that to deal
14 with. He's got a 4500-square-foot lot. At -- he
15 could get --

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Two.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: With what we're
18 proposing, he could get two nice units and good-sized,
19 as well. So I don't think that we're so far off
20 giving him the opportunity to do something with his
21 property. It may not be exactly what he wants to do,
22 but I don't think we're unduly burdening that one lot
23 owner.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: What I would say is that the

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

8

1 proposal -- the motion in front of us does include
2 changing the lot size from 3750 to 2200. So to some
3 degree the barn door is open. We are changing lot
4 sizes, the minimum lot requirement. And as such, one
5 could argue that does already sort of introduce a
6 policy question.

7 I mean, we're addressing nonconformities
8 with the grandfathering, and if we just use the
9 existing lot area requirement, we would fully address
10 the nonconforming issue. We would have the same
11 number of grandfathered units covered, and we would
12 have the same number of noncompliant multifamily and
13 upper-level units with 2200 square feet per unit.

14 So we're already changing the lot
15 requirements from 3750 for two-family down to 2200 and
16 from 3,000 square feet for townhome down to 2200 for
17 townhome, which is going to have -- I think have a
18 positive impact on development activity and economic
19 activities downtown. The question is how much gas do
20 we want to give to that kind of activity.

21 So I'm supportive of the motion as it
22 stands, and I also agree with you that we shouldn't
23 try to accommodate every person that comes into the
24 City. The question is whether or not the alternate

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

9

1 proposal and giving it a little bit more gas is going
2 to do something good for downtown development and if
3 that kind of pattern of development is something that
4 we want to encourage then we in good conscience would
5 say to be P & D committee, we think this is in the
6 interests of the city to generate more economic
7 activity downtown and to promote more redevelopment.
8 You know, I don't know. Is 2200 square foot the right
9 threshold? Is 1750 the right threshold?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I don't want to put
11 too fine a point on it. You're right we are opening
12 the barn door, but I don't think that going from
13 3750 to 2200 is indicative of a policy change because
14 I think it's more in conformance with what we have
15 existing now. I think that dropping to 1500 does --
16 there are some PUDs that are at that. It's not the
17 policy of the City to allow that kind of density
18 anywhere. 2200 square feet is --

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Except in CBD-1.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Except in CBD-1.
21 But typically in residential areas you don't have that
22 kind of density.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: What is our assessment on the
24 state of development activity in the CBD-2? Are we

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

10

1 satisfied with it? Do we think that redevelopment is
2 happening at the pace that we want to see?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, frankly, I
4 have to tell you what strikes me the most is the
5 number of units we're talking about here. I mean,
6 we've got 100 units. They don't turn over that often.
7 When you talk about pacing development, I mean, what
8 is our expectation of the pace of development with
9 100 lots that are existing and have been existing for
10 decades? Probably not that much.

11 MS. TUNGARE: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

13 MS. TUNGARE: Speaking about the potential
14 for development, there's more potential for
15 redevelopment within our CBD-1 district than there is
16 within the CBD-2 district within the near future.
17 Given the scope of CBD-2, I would agree with
18 Commission Member Kessler that there's really not a
19 lot there. It's really about preserving what we have
20 in the CBD-2 district that we have at this point.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: So I'm satisfied with the
22 motion as it is. Thank you for entertaining the
23 question.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No, it's a good

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

11

1 question.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other discussion?

3 MEMBER FRIO: Tim, you kind of threw me a
4 curve ball. Because when we were talking earlier, you
5 said 1500 square foot would be a -- present a good
6 living area space.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It would.

8 MEMBER FRIO: So why are you against it?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm not against it.
10 I'm against piling on -- I think what we're discussing
11 here is dealing with nonconformities. We're not
12 dealing with nonconformities and making a policy
13 change to existing density in the CBD-2 district.

14 So since those aren't the two questions that
15 we're dealing with here, we're dealing with one
16 question addressing nonconformities, we've done it
17 with the proposed alternate. And I did say I'm not
18 against the 3,000 and 1500, but I think that's a
19 discussion for another time.

20 MEMBER FRIO: Got you.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: He changed his mind is what
22 he's trying to say.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: No, I didn't.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

12

1 discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

4 MEMBER SPRUTH: Yes.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

12 MEMBER FRIO: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That motion
19 passes unanimously. That concludes Item No. 7 on the
20 agenda.

21 Item 8 is the weekly development report
22 which I'm presuming you've all seen. Are there any
23 questions on that?

24 (No response.)

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

13

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 9, meeting
2 announcements. We have meetings upcoming on
3 October 20th, November 3rd, November 9th we have the
4 continuation of the joint meeting between the
5 Plan Commission and City Council, and on the 17th we
6 have a meeting. Anyone -- does anyone know that they
7 will not be able to attend any of those meetings?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Not the Plan
9 Commission but I do have -- the planning and
10 development committee on the 20th, will this be on
11 their agenda?

12 MS. JOHNSON: On the 12th this will be
13 on there.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Who can attend that
15 meeting? Brian, can you go to that meeting?

16 MEMBER DOYLE: On?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Monday the 12th at
18 7:00 p.m.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes. Yes, I could.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's Columbus Day.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any additional business?

22 (No response.)

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

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

14

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

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motioned and seconded.

All in favor.

(Ayes heard.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The St. Charles Plan
Commission is adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

(Off the record at 9:09 p.m.)

Transcript of General Amendment - Item 7
Conducted on October 6, 2015

15

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

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 12th day of October, 2015.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois