

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2015**

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

Members Absent: Dan Frio
Michelle Spruth
Laura Macklin-Purdy

Also Present: Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson, Planner
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 October 20, 2015 meeting.

Motion was made by Kessler, seconded by Schuetz and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2015 meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. Hillcroft Estates, 1147 Geneva Rd. (Hillcroft Estates, LLC)

Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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 Kessler, seconded by Pretz and unanimously passed by voice vote to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission
Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Page 2

Ayes: Wallace, Kessler, Holderfield, Schuetz, Pretz, Doyle
Nays:
Absent: Frio, Spruth, Macklin-Purdy
Motion carried: 6-0

MEETING

5. Hillcroft Estates, 1147 Geneva Rd. (Hillcroft Estates, LLC)
Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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. Doyle and seconded by Mr. Kessler to recommend approval of the applications for Special Use for Planned Unit Development and PUD Preliminary Plan for Hillcroft Estates, 1147 Geneva Rd. (Hillcroft Estates, LLC), as submitted, contingent upon resolution of all staff comments.

Motion was made by Mr. Doyle and seconded by Mr. Pretz to amend the motion to include the condition that the maximum building height be reduced to 52.5 ft. above existing grade at the front setback.

Roll Call Vote (*on motion to amend*)

Ayes: Doyle
Nays: Wallace, Kessler, Holderfield, Schuetz, Pretz
Absent: Frio, Spruth, Macklin-Purdy
Motion failed: 1-5

Roll Call Vote (*on motion to recommend approval*)

Ayes: Doyle, Wallace, Kessler, Holderfield, Schuetz, Pretz
Nays:
Absent: Frio, Spruth, Macklin-Purdy
Motion carried: 6-0

6. Gralewski Health Club, Pine Ridge Park PUD Lots 6 and 7 (Sam Salahi)
Application for PUD Preliminary Plan

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. Doyle and unanimously passed by voice vote to recommend approval of the application for PUD Preliminary Plan for Gralewski Health Club, Pine

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

Ridge Park PUD Lots 6 and 7 (Sam Salahi), contingent upon resolution of all staff comments.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Absent: Frio, Spruth, Macklin-Purdy

Motion carried:

7. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff

8. Weekly Development Report

9. Meeting Announcements

a. Plan Commission

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

Tuesday, December 8, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, December 22, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

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

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

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

10. Public Comment

11. Adjournment at 8:39 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: :
Hillcroft Estates -- :
1147 Geneva Road :
(Hillcroft Estates, LLC) :
Application for Special :
Use for Planned Unit :
Development, :
Application for PUD :
Preliminary Plan. :

- - - - -x

Public Hearing
Council Chambers
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, November 3, 2015
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 74376A
Pages: 1 - 50
Reported By: Paula Quetsch, CSR

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 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
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

3

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: The meeting of the
St. Charles Plan Commission will come to order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 3 on our agenda,
presentation of the minutes of the October 20th, 2015,
meeting, is there a motion to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

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

(Ayes heard.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

4

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes.

3 Item 4 on the agenda is Hillcroft Estates,
4 1147 Geneva Road, Hillcroft Estates, LLC, Application
5 for Special Use for Planned Unit Development and
6 Application for PUD Preliminary Plan.

7 For those of you who haven't been here
8 before, welcome. St. Charles Plan Commission is
9 commissioned by the City Council to conduct public
10 hearings on certain applications that come before it,
11 and that's what we're doing tonight.

12 The Applicant is here and they will present
13 their application, after which time the Plan Commission
14 will ask any questions and make any comments that they
15 may have followed by questions and comments from the
16 audience, at the end of which the Applicant will have
17 a chance to make a rebuttal statement if they wish.

18 If at that time the Plan Commission has
19 determined that we have enough evidence in order to
20 make a recommendation for action to the City Council,
21 then we will close the public hearing. After that,
22 Item 5 on our agenda is action on this item, and that
23 action would be recommending approval or denial to the
24 City Council.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

5

1 Any questions regarding that procedure?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. At this time
4 anyone who wishes to offer any testimony, including
5 asking any questions or making any comments, I would
6 ask that you raise your right hand to be sworn in.

7 (Eight witnesses sworn.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And when you ask
9 questions or offer any comments, I would ask that you
10 wait to be recognized by me and only speak one at a
11 time. We have a court reporter here that is taking
12 down a record of the proceedings, and when you do
13 speak, I would ask that you come up to the lectern,
14 state your name, spell your last name, and also give
15 your address for the record.

16 Any questions?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Staff, is there
19 anything before we begin with the Applicant?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is the
22 Applicant ready?

23 MR. MARSHALL: I am. Do we have the visuals
24 on this?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

6

1 Hi, my name is Dan Marshall, 812 East Main
2 Street, St. Charles, for Marshall Architects.

3 So last meeting we were here we presented
4 you with a 12-unit town house concept, and we got some
5 feedback from you and from the neighbors. The project
6 was reassessed with that input and has come out after
7 much work to be four single-family lots.

8 These lots all meet the requirements of
9 straight zoning. The houses are anticipated to meet
10 the requirements of straight zoning. The only part
11 that we wanted to make a PUD was for the height, and
12 that is because we have a massive hill on the site,
13 and that throws off the height calculations by the
14 City's formula.

15 The City's formula for determining height
16 involves measuring existing grade at the front setback
17 which is off of Geneva Road, Route 31, and that grade
18 is very low there, and then our hill goes up in the
19 back, up significantly. So that throws off the
20 possibilities of building a house higher on the hill
21 at all and would mean that the houses would have to be
22 buried into the hill in the back.

23 So what we are proposing now is to -- we
24 haven't designed the buildings yet because they're

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

7

1 four custom single-family homes. We're not looking
2 for approval on the buildings; we're looking for
3 approval on the land use for the four single-family
4 homes with a height that -- I believe probably we have
5 some diagrams in here.

6 You can see by this site plan that we're
7 proposing two detention ponds in the low area with an
8 entrance landscape feature and there's no sign. We're
9 going to put the two pillars, the stone pillars that
10 are on the south end of the site right now, we're
11 proposing to move those to the entrance that is in the
12 middle. This T-shaped drive comes from fire
13 department access to get turnaround for the fire
14 truck, and we've got some guest parking spots here,
15 proposed here.

16 You can see the hill. Okay. Here's some
17 height calculations.

18 So you can see how on the right side of the
19 page there, 703, that's the front setback. We're
20 digging down a little bit to make a pond, and then
21 we're kind of balancing the fill to try to get the
22 house halfway up the hill and then digging out of the
23 hill quite a bit on the back side of it.

24 From the west side -- I'm not sure how we

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

8

1 get this to fit all on the screen. My normal way is
2 not doing that. You guys have it; right? I'm holding
3 the control, going up and down -- oh, there you go.

4 So these diagrams are just showing kind of a
5 box of a house that's 36 feet wide with a roof on it
6 starting from the first floor heights that we set, and
7 then the yellow and orange line is the existing house.
8 And you can see the ridges of the new houses are about
9 the same as the ridge of the existing house that's
10 there.

11 The dark green line is actually the grade at
12 the property line or the west property lane. So that
13 shows you a little bit how these houses will be seen
14 from the neighbors behind them as far as where our
15 west property line is.

16 This is a tree survey. We're working with
17 an arborist to define -- it's hard to see. There's
18 red lines which define the tree preservation area of
19 the trees that are being proposed to save. We're
20 working on this right now and trying to mesh with the
21 engineer's drawings with the retaining walls.

22 We are not proposing to dig anywhere west of
23 the existing driveway currently. Everything is being
24 dug east of the driveway. So the driveway or the

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

9

1 paving itself is the area that we're going to start to
2 cut the hill down to get a road in. So we felt pretty
3 good about that paved area, disturbing the area that's
4 paved already as far as preserving the trees.

5 The nicest trees are actually on the
6 neighboring property there, and those are the ones
7 that we're going to pay special attention to, making
8 sure we do everything we can to preserve those trees.

9 So just to reiterate, the only thing that
10 doesn't meet straight zoning is the height, and that's
11 due to the anomaly of this grading situation.

12 Any questions I can answer?

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes. What is the
14 difference in grade from the eastern to the western
15 lot line?

16 MR. MARSHALL: Well, on the north side it
17 goes about 30 feet, 28 feet.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the height of the
19 building from the west lot line it looks like is
20 33 feet.

21 MS. JOHNSON: It's right after the plans.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just before the tree
23 survey.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: Page 38.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

10

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: There we go.

2 MR. MARSHALL: Sorry. What was your
3 question?

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that's showing that
5 the height -- the maximum ridge that you're showing
6 here for the houses would be 33 feet above the west
7 grade?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Correct, yeah, at that Lot 1.
9 This is Lot 1, which is kind of the worst case
10 scenario on the north end. So things change as you go
11 south, but that's the worst case scenario right there.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, my question
13 goes to the next one. I see you have -- there. You
14 show a maximum ridge line -- the existing grade 731,
15 then 763 on Lot 1, and then maximum ridge 763.5, 760.4
16 760.2. I don't get that.

17 MR. MARSHALL: That's the zoning code
18 basically saying that you set it above of the existing
19 grade or the grade at the front setback. So that's
20 from the other side is what's setting this, which is
21 the way the code has defined building height. So we
22 picked a number.

23 Really our goal is just to leave enough
24 flexibility. We're not proposing to build houses

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

11

1 exactly this shape or anything. We're just saying
2 that we want to have the flexibility to create nice
3 designs in there. The market is going to determine
4 the style, and they're going to be sold houses, and we
5 want some flexibility. We don't want to be hemmed in
6 to not be able to give somebody something they want.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is it safe to say,
8 then, that from the approximate existing grade west of
9 731 feet that some of those -- Lot 1 the maximum
10 height would be 33 feet, but Lot 3 could be 34 feet?

11 MR. MARSHALL: 44 feet.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Or 44 feet.

13 MR. MARSHALL: To the ridge, which is
14 usually the smallest part of the house. You might
15 remember the last proposal had two three-unit
16 buildings 24 feet back from this west property line.
17 This building -- this lane now sets the buildings at
18 90 feet back from that west lot property line.

19 So these buildings are much farther back,
20 significantly farther back, which is one of the
21 comments we had in the concept meeting. So we tripled
22 the distance going back from this, and we feel like
23 that will mitigate any sense of scale or mass of these
24 houses. Plus, the last plan, basically everything

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

12

1 across the page that you saw was building except for
2 little spaces between two buildings. Now you see how
3 much space is between the buildings. And these are
4 not even -- these are kind of drawn as a chunky wide
5 building to establish maximum ridge.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

7 MR. MARSHALL: So the ridge probably won't
8 be as high as these are drawn most likely.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: So if you could go back one
10 page to page 38.

11 So looking at the approximate proposed grade
12 from the front setback, which is the point at which
13 you say the building height, the code required, that's
14 where you measured building height, going back to the
15 front of the structure displayed, the proposed grade
16 doesn't appear to be that much different from -- you
17 know, at the front of the house to the front setback.

18 MR. MARSHALL: This to this you're saying;
19 right?

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Correct.

21 MR. MARSHALL: That to that, yeah.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: To the setback. Right?

23 MR. MARSHALL: Right.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: So if you go from that point

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

13

1 there to the ridge line where it says 704 up, straight
2 up to the ridge line, what is that height? That's
3 approximately 60 feet?

4 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. 59 feet.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

6 MR. MARSHALL: This will be -- there will be
7 decks on the back of this. This will be like a
8 walkout basement.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: But this is the front of the
10 property; right?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Technically it's the front of
12 the house, yeah.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

14 MR. MARSHALL: But it will have a terrace on
15 the front, and we're going to be looking over ponds,
16 and there's a big hedge row on the front. So we're
17 not really treating it so much as the front of the
18 house. It's going to be beautiful.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, I just want to
20 understand in terms of the -- because the existing
21 grade, it looks like you're excavating quite a lot of
22 material to regrade the site.

23 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: And just as it's drawn here,

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

14

1 I think with a terrace or with a deck or something,
2 what I was thinking about is the appearance from the
3 street. Knowing that you're going to be grading the
4 site to a large degree, what is -- can you describe
5 more what the appearance of the buildings is going to
6 be in terms of of the height?

7 MR. MARSHALL: I can't because they're not
8 designed yet. This is something that we're just
9 looking at the lots, not the houses.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

11 MR. MARSHALL: This grade may be higher.
12 This is -- again, this is kind of a worst case
13 scenario. We could choose to cut it to here to the
14 first floor. I don't think we'd want to bury the
15 first floor, but from there over we could leave. So
16 that's showing a walkout basement, which is yet to be
17 determined whether that's exactly what's going to
18 happen or not.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

20 MR. MARSHALL: Each house will be designed
21 individually with that settled.

22 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I guess I'm getting
23 confused when I look at this elevation because we
24 won't be looking at a gabled end in this position?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

15

1 MR. MARSHALL: No. It's just a diagram to
2 say that most houses we don't go over 36 feet because
3 rafters can span 18 feet, so that sets up your general
4 width, that sets up your ridge, which determines your
5 height.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So how far back from
7 the property line on the east side would the houses
8 probably be?

9 MR. MARSHALL: The houses -- you mean like
10 they could go all the way up to here.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That's what I was
12 thinking. They could come to that.

13 MR. MARSHALL: We can't go into the pond, so
14 they could be up to here. The setback is all the way
15 to here.

16 So in a straight zoning situation we could
17 be putting the house right here, but we're asking for
18 this height, and we're asking to put the -- showing
19 the detention basins.

20 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And one other question.
21 The west side of the house going to the west lot line,
22 going stepped up -- I'm sure it will be a slope. Right?

23 MR. MARSHALL: Well, there will be terraces.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Retaining wall.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

16

1 MR. MARSHALL: It will it be terraced
2 retaining walls. So there will be stone and
3 landscape. Maurice has got some beautiful vision for
4 that. So these are going to be nice houses and
5 beautifully landscaped all around them.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a question on -- if
7 you could just clarify. I know last time you had
8 mentioned at the last meeting we had the existing home
9 there. It appears that the ridge is 763 for that
10 home. Is that correct?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So will that home actually
13 be higher than these homes?

14 MR. MARSHALL: It -- most likely they will
15 be, yeah. But worst case scenario they'd be about
16 the same.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Because the concern we had
18 last time I think, if I remember right, was the first
19 proposal they were going to be much higher than the
20 existing home. Is that correct?

21 MR. MARSHALL: No.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: The town houses or
23 whatever, I thought they were.

24 MR. MARSHALL: They were both the same. They

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

17

1 were much bigger mass much closer to the property.
2 This is much smaller massing set three times as
3 far back.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

5 MEMBER DOYLE: I'm sorry. I'm going to go
6 back to this.

7 So if the -- if I'm just looking at this
8 proposed grading, approximately 60-foot structure, I
9 guess I have two questions. Is that kind of structure
10 viewed from the street, is it typical or is it in
11 character for the surrounding residential community,
12 and is there any concern about the, you know, apparent
13 higher massing from the street and ways to
14 mitigate that?

15 I'm not really -- I'm not really concerned
16 about the height in relation to buildings behind the
17 property. I'm just thinking about it if you're
18 looking at it from the street, and now the grade has
19 been lowered, and you have a three-story house with a
20 very high peak, what I'm visualizing in my mind is a
21 very tall, very tall house that could look just
22 gargantuan in terms of its height.

23 I'm having a hard time visualizing it. When
24 you say these are going to be attractive houses, I

1 have no reason to doubt that. I'm just trying to
2 understand what their appearance will be from the
3 street and ways to mitigate that sort of possibility
4 of it appearing just enormously tall.

5 MR. MARSHALL: The houses built a little
6 north of there that have detention, the shingle-style
7 ones that were built -- I'm blanking of the name right
8 now. But they're similar, two stories, with a
9 walkout, with a roof like that, and they're much
10 closer to the road and a little bigger embankment
11 coming up there.

12 It's not uncommon, when you're on a hill
13 face, to expose that foundation either with steps or a
14 terrace because you're working with a hill. So,
15 otherwise, your house is buried in the hill on the back
16 side, and you get no windows in your house. So it's
17 not uncommon when you're working with a hill. Would
18 we rather have the hill slope the other way? Sure but
19 it doesn't so we've got to work with it this way.

20 But we will -- and I think reputation here
21 would be that it will look nice and that we'll be
22 concerned as you are about making it look nice because
23 we want to be able to sell these, and we want people
24 to be happy with them.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

19

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think, too, here, the
2 possible design of the front elevation can soften that
3 concern. It can be a smaller gable.

4 MR. MARSHALL: In fact, we're really
5 thinking that most of these are going to be
6 story-and-a-half houses, first-floor masters. That's
7 the big market right now. So we think we'll actually
8 have much lower houses, and that back end will be the
9 one-story element. So I don't think you'll see the
10 two-story element on that side. That's probably going
11 to be on the west side on the garage, and on the east
12 side is going to be the family room and master bedroom.

13 But, again I don't have these designed yet.
14 Next step. Give us the approval or and we'll -- one
15 of them at least.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: So I have one more question
17 on a separate topic.

18 On page 6 of the staff memo regarding the
19 tree preservation plan, staff comments -- there are
20 two comments. One is that staff commented that it may
21 be beneficial to keep some of the trees to retain the
22 landscape buffer along the back property line. And
23 then the second comment was that it appears that the
24 tree conservation zone may interfere with the

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

20

1 retaining walls on Lots 1, 2, and 3.

2 Have you had any subsequent conversations
3 with staff about that?

4 MR. MARSHALL: Not with staff but we met out
5 there and looked at it, and we will work with the
6 arborist and the engineer to try to mitigate that as
7 much as possible.

8 Like I said, the arborist has some of his
9 tree preservation lines drawn over the paving, which
10 we were hoping to take out the area that's paved and
11 that's where -- I can't say anything he says we'll do,
12 but we're going to try to do everything we can to save
13 those trees. We want those trees to live, too. It's
14 the backdrop.

15 As far as the ones they commented about,
16 there are a bunch of red cedars that are there. Those
17 have been cleaned up, and we would like them to be a
18 buffer, as well. So the current thought is to keep
19 those and add more buffer, actually, because for these
20 homes we'd like to have that landscape buffer. Also,
21 keep in mind that the houses are going to be dropped
22 down in the hill quite a bit, so just the retaining
23 walls, the terraced stone retaining walls are going to
24 give you a lot of buffer for these houses.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

21

1 MEMBER DOYLE: What are the trees that
2 are -- I'm just going now to the tree preservation
3 plan itself -- where there is interference with the
4 paving?

5 MR. MARSHALL: Well, if you see the red line
6 on there, it goes across the existing driveway there.
7 I'm thinking it's from trees 3, 4, 5, and 6 and 1 and
8 2, and then down there near Tree 10, it jumps across
9 the road there, too.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. And 3, 4, 5, and 6 are
11 off of the --

12 MR. MARSHALL: Neighbor's property, yeah.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: So what are -- given that the
14 preservation line comes into the proposed driveway,
15 what are ways that you would mitigate that issue or
16 ways that you might resolve that?

17 MR. MARSHALL: The first thing would be to
18 talk to the arborist and try to understand why the
19 preservation line would be under asphalt paving. We
20 haven't had a chance to talk to him.

21 So we can talk to him and find out what the
22 issues are with him. I'm sure there's rationale to
23 it, but that's something to consider and see what we
24 can do with the retaining walls to pull them back.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

22

1 We have discussed turning the parking spaces
2 to parallel spaces that are currently perpendicular
3 spaces, and that would allow us to pull the retaining
4 walls closer.

5 Like I said, we're pretty far back, so
6 especially in that area we'd be fine and be able to
7 miss that line. So we'd just have to do a little bit
8 more work on that.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
11 questions?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Questions
14 from members of the audience?

15 Yes. If you can just state your name, spell
16 your last name, and also state your address for the
17 record.

18 MR. FORSELL: My name is Dave Forsell,
19 F-o-r-s-e-l-l, and my address is 43 McKinley Street.

20 I'd just like to say that 43 -- I'm the
21 property owner directly behind and to the west of
22 Lot 4. I've been there about 14 years now. And
23 although I'm certainly in favor of any new development
24 on the Hillcroft property, I just wanted to comment

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

23

1 that any future development should be respectful and
2 sensitive to existing homes in the immediate area and
3 that the development should maintain a setback and
4 height similar to surroundings.

5 So specifically on the building height I'd
6 like to -- was that 38?

7 Well, 38 does show the elevation east/west
8 for Lot 1. This particular slide for Lot 4 is -- my
9 property is behind Lot 4. And I would just like to
10 say that the heights of all the buildings are
11 approximately the same or relatively the same, and the
12 property line does drop. And if I do the math, it's
13 about 19 feet from Lot 1 down to Lot 4. So that
14 also -- my property also drops from that sloping on
15 that property line, as well.

16 So if you look at perceived height on Lot 1,
17 if you're standing on the property line at Lot 1 --
18 and we've already talked about that it's maybe 32 feet,
19 33 feet -- by the time you get down to Lot 4 where the
20 elevation is at 712, the roof is at 762, and the lot
21 line -- or the property line is at 712, that's 50 feet.

22 That's a 50-foot-high building. So I just
23 don't believe that a 50-foot-high building is being
24 respectful and sensitive of the existing homes in the

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

24

1 area, and I just hope that you take into consideration
2 the topography of the land both east and west and
3 north and south.

4 And one thing I also heard was there was a
5 comment that the roof heights of neighbors to the west
6 are relatively equal to the roof heights of those
7 homes where they're laid out now. And, in fact, my
8 home on Lot 4 is raised. There's another aspect to
9 this. It's a slope down. So I'm actually probably
10 about 10 feet higher than 712. My house at the
11 foundation is around 722 based on my plat.

12 And if my house is about another 25 feet,
13 which I tried to guess, that puts the height of my
14 roof at 747. Compare that to 762, and that means that
15 the house is planned to be 15 feet higher than mine.

16 So I'd just like you to take that into
17 consideration, and thank you for your time.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

19 Yes.

20 MR. MUSSER: Hi. Tom Musser, M-u-s-s-e-r,
21 40 McKinley. My property is right behind Lot 2. I
22 appreciate everything that has been done since the
23 last time we were here, the density, the distance from
24 our property. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

25

1 The question, the concern we have, if I may,
2 is the trees. Our trees -- we have some very nice
3 large trees in this area right here, and why does that
4 parking spot need to be right there is my question
5 essentially. We have some pictures of the trees.
6 They're gorgeous large trees.

7 And the retaining wall, I know it's not
8 designed, but it looks like it gets very close to the
9 property line. Do you have any idea at this point
10 what that actually looks like as far as the retaining
11 wall and how that's going to fit in? Because if you
12 remove that two-spot parking lot and make it a
13 straight line, that slope, if there is a slope there
14 at all anymore, just becomes a wall would really help
15 that tree in my opinion.

16 I mean, the arborist obviously feels there
17 is an issue in that area, and that's our main concern
18 is our trees.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

20 MR. MUSSER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

22 Yes.

23 MR. MC NALLY: Maurice McNally,
24 36W442 Hunters Gate Road, St. Charles, Illinois.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

26

1 As you know, the last time we were here we
2 brought in the 12-townhome concept, and I met all the
3 neighbors individually, and I agreed with them that
4 when we did have the townhomes and we were 24-foot
5 setback from their lot line that we were basically
6 going to be looking at, you know, our row of
7 townhomes. They have some beautiful trees on their
8 property, and I said that I would do everything that I
9 possibly could and will do to protect the trees.

10 John recommended the arborist, Andrew Lueck.
11 I hired Andrew; I brought Andrew out; I told him it
12 was my priority to protect all those trees, and that
13 is one thing that I want to do. Because when you're
14 talking about the vision of the homes that I want to
15 see and that you're looking at from Route 31 is,
16 number one, each one of these lots are approximately
17 half an acre in size. Number two, where Dan has come
18 up with the size of these homes, all I'm really
19 looking for is probably an 8- or a 9-foot basement,
20 and 9 foot on the first floor, and 8 foot on the
21 second floor, and Dan wants 16/12 pitch, which, you
22 know, I'm happy to get away with a 12/12 pitch with
23 the price of lumber.

24 You know, the homes, I very much have kept

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

27

1 the neighbors in consideration because all we have
2 really created here is building pads, and they're pads
3 to build these homes on. What I want to build is I
4 want to build, you know, 3,000-, 3200-square-foot homes
5 that when you're looking from -- when you're looking
6 from Route 31, you know, you're going to have the
7 entranceway, you're going to have two beautiful ponds,
8 and you're going to be looking at four single-family
9 homes, and you're going to be looking at my neighbor's
10 trees above the homes, above the roof lines.

11 So I see that vision, and I think it would
12 be beautiful. I do not want to destroy the trees.
13 I'm happy to meet with them anytime with the arborist,
14 with the engineer, and work on the parking spots.
15 I'll work around whatever I want to do.

16 The lot is a difficult lot. There's 30-foot
17 difference between the northwest corner all the way
18 down to the front of the property. We have worked
19 very, very hard with engineers to make the roads work,
20 worked very, very hard with the fire department to get
21 them in, and I can just promise the neighbors that
22 I'll do what I can to work with them -- I'm not
23 against them -- which I did with the townhomes
24 concept.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

28

1 Any questions?

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Mr. McNally?

3 MR. MC NALLY: Yes.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: I just want to preface this
5 comment by saying that the plans that you presented
6 are really very commendable, and the work that you've
7 done with the arborist and the meetings with your
8 neighbors is commendable.

9 Would -- so considering the testimony that
10 your neighbor behind Lot No. 4 has given about the
11 change in the lot line at the west end from Lot 1 to
12 Lot 4, if the Plan Commission were to contemplate a
13 recommendation or a condition on our recommendation to
14 City Council that said something to the effect that
15 building height at the rear lot line shall not exceed
16 35 feet at the rear lot line, would that be a
17 stipulation that you and your architects could work
18 around and achieve your vision?

19 MR. MC NALLY: You know, I'm not absolutely
20 sure. Like I said, the only thing I'm trying to
21 achieve is the typical home that I'm building right
22 now, and I don't even know if that calculates out, the
23 rear lot line at 35 feet.

24 MR. MARSHALL: Can I answer that?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

29

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I jump in
2 here? I'm just curious -- I'm curious about that
3 comment, too.

4 From east to west in the proposed grade --
5 from east -- I'm sorry -- from north to south in the
6 proposed grading -- am I looking at north to south?
7 Actually, I'm looking from west to east.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: No, you're looking north.

9 MR. COLBY: You're looking east right now.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm looking east,
11 okay. So in the proposed grading are you proposing --
12 you're proposing to not level but make it somewhat
13 equal --

14 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: -- from north to
16 south?

17 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: But the grade in the
19 existing is not somewhat equal, and that's I think
20 what --

21 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So do you know what
23 the difference is in the existing grade at the north
24 end and the existing at the west property line?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

30

1 MR. MARSHALL: It goes from about 731 to 710.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So there is a
3 20-foot difference.

4 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. But our building pads
5 aren't doing that, and it would be very unique to set
6 the height off the back property line. And really
7 this is just a two-story building that we're showing.
8 It's not an excessively tall building especially from
9 the west side. The houses behind there going west
10 from there are going uphill. Just looking out this
11 guy's second floor will probably be looking at the
12 first floor of the gentleman on Lot 4.

13 So it is not that they're extremely tall
14 buildings or anything. They're two-story buildings.
15 We are trying to allow for some steeper roofs for
16 possible Old World style. We don't know that that is
17 going to happen, but that is one of the styles on the
18 market that people like, so we want to be able to
19 allow for that. Victorian styles have high ridge
20 lines; there's other styles of architecture that might
21 come into play here that we don't want to be locked
22 into a small footprint that doesn't allow for these
23 homes to look like homes that would be on a main
24 highway out of town, typically big houses not

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

31

1 cottages. Having said that, they're probably going to
2 be story-and-a-half houses.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What's the distance
4 from -- I can't really see these here -- but from the
5 west lot line of 4 to the building? What is the
6 setback?

7 MR. MARSHALL: 90 feet.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 90 feet from the
9 lot line?

10 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. These are way back.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 90 feet.

12 MR. MARSHALL: Actually, that one is
13 100 feet from Lot 4.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And what's the
15 distance from the lot line to the back of -- do
16 you know?

17 MR. FORSELL: How far the lot line is?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: From the back of
19 your house to your lot line.

20 MR. FORSELL: Oh, I don't know that.

21 MR. MARSHALL: They're pretty far. You are
22 kind of on a pie-shaped lot.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: At the closest
24 you've got to be 40 feet.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

32

1 MR. MARSHALL: The setback is probably
2 40 feet.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So approximately
4 130 to 140 feet between the two buildings.

5 MR. MARSHALL: These are deep lots,
6 different than most lots in town set back to back.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: So I just -- you know, I'm
8 trying to sort of talk through this and understand it.
9 But part of the premise of the PUD has to do with the
10 grading at the front of the site would be a
11 considerable slope. And I acknowledge that setting a
12 condition based on the rear lot would be unorthodox,
13 but since that is the -- you know, building height is
14 controlled primarily to balance adjacent uses and
15 that's the adjacent use.

16 Right now on Lot 4 we're looking at I think
17 712 from -- to 762 about a 50-foot-high structure from
18 the rear lot, 15 feet above zoning.

19 MR. MARSHALL: At 90 feet back.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: At 90 feet back.

21 MR. MARSHALL: Which is not much higher than
22 zoning would allow.

23 MS. JOHNSON: The required setback is
24 40 feet for the rear setback.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

33

1 MR. MARSHALL: What's the maximum height?

2 MS. JOHNSON: 35 feet.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: So there's a difference of
4 15 feet even at the rear lot line.

5 So just as the Commission considers the
6 testimony that your neighbor, you know, provided about
7 the difference between Lot 1 and Lot 4, you know, how
8 would you respond to the testimony that we've heard
9 about the 50-foot height for Lot 4?

10 MR. MARSHALL: I would say, again, that it's
11 a two-story house. We're not talking about that large
12 of a house, and this is the worst case scenario to
13 allow for some flexibility. But to have to lower that
14 one house or the left two houses or something like
15 that is -- it should be going more from the proposed
16 grade of where we're proposing because we still have
17 to build a two-story house off of that. So if you
18 crunch it, then that means that's going to be Prairie
19 style or something with a very low roof, and I don't
20 think the plans should dictate the style of the house
21 so much.

22 We've left a lot of open area here. We've
23 cleared out six units of back wall and have given
24 little spot areas. So going up a little higher in

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

34

1 that little spot area does not hurt them nearly like
2 it did before. So we've made a huge concession here,
3 and now we're worried about a little triangle. So it
4 seems burdensome.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have to ask this
6 question now that you've alluded to this. What are
7 the grades at 712 approximately at the back of the
8 house on Lot 4?

9 MR. MARSHALL: Lot 4?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Approximately.

11 MR. MC NALLY: Existing grades?

12 MR. MARSHALL: They're about 715.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 715?

14 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And what are the
16 grades approximately at the back -- the western
17 boundary of Lot 4?

18 MR. MARSHALL: Western boundary of Lot 4 is
19 on McKinley?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah.

21 MR. MARSHALL: I don't know.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You said you're at
23 731 at the north end, and at the south end you're at
24 about 720?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

35

1 MR. MARSHALL: Oh, I'm sorry. Say it again.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm trying to figure
3 out if you were to set this at -- if you were to move
4 that house back to the 40-foot -- required 40-foot
5 setback, move it west, what would the grade at the
6 back of that house be at that point?

7 MR. MARSHALL: About 712.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It would be the
9 same.

10 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So, essentially,
12 Lot 4 from east to west is going to be about 712?

13 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So that lot would be
15 somewhat level?

16 MR. MARSHALL: Kind of at the midpoint, yeah.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

18 MR. MARSHALL: This sets up -- that kind of
19 sets the plateau that we're cutting out into the hill
20 to build these houses off of that south end.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just want to make a
22 comment. My experience -- and it's a positive
23 thing -- is our home is a very normal box. I'm not
24 crazy about it, but I've lived there 20 years. And

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

36

1 the homes behind us are probably 130 to 150 feet away,
2 and they are the design -- because you built most of
3 them in your neighborhood, and I think they look
4 fantastic. And there's a row of trees behind us that
5 are similar to what you have. It's a safe area; we're
6 not allowed to cut any trees down and all that kind of
7 thing. The deer run through there constantly. I
8 don't like that; they're always eating my plants.

9 But my point of mentioning this, looking at
10 this diagram and it sounds to everybody here I think
11 that 50 feet staring at you 130 feet away is a lot,
12 but the homes behind us are probably, I want to say
13 60 or 70 feet higher than ours because we have, you
14 know, 3,000 -- a small home and the ones behind are
15 whatever, 7, 8, 10,000 square feet.

16 So my point of mentioning that is although
17 this diagram may sound or look like it's obtrusive,
18 and I am sensitive to the neighbors behind you or
19 potentially, it really turned out to be a beautiful
20 community, and the homes are gorgeous, and the type of
21 roof you're talking about I think looks fantastic
22 myself, and I don't see it as obtrusive at all. It's
23 probably like I said 130, 150 feet away from my home
24 to their home, and there's trees back there, and it's

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

37

1 softened, and I think it's a beautiful home to look at.

2 So it's just a comment I wanted to make.

3 MR. MARSHALL: The distance away is a bigger
4 deal than the height. If it's closer to the property
5 line, then the height makes a big deal.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I think so. In 20 years
7 I've never, ever thought of those homes as being
8 obtrusive ever.

9 MR. MARSHALL: And this, again, it's
10 two stories. I did draw a steep roof on there.

11 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Right. That's a big
12 difference compared to our two-story home. I mean,
13 you build a beautiful home.

14 MR. MC NALLY: Thank you.

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: They're gorgeous. I just
16 can't afford them.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
18 questions?

19 Yes.

20 MS. MUSSER: My name is Jeanette Musser.

21 I just wanted to say we came before you on
22 May 5th and talked about the tree line on the back of
23 our property, and you encouraged us to meet with
24 Mr. McNally. We did that on two different occasions.

1 He's hired an arborist that we requested.

2 We're thrilled with the fact that this has
3 gone to single-family homes but completely perplexed
4 at the continued statements that he is trying to
5 protect the trees in our back yard.

6 I don't know if I can scroll down to the
7 tree preservation plan.

8 MR. MARSHALL: Keep scrolling up.

9 MS. MUSSER: Oh, thank you. I passed it.

10 The site plan shows three retaining walls
11 and a parking place that are directly behind one of
12 the largest trees on our property. It's Tree No. 6.
13 We don't know the dimensions of exactly the location
14 of those, but it appears that it's more intrusive than
15 the previous plan.

16 Mr. Marshall stated that there's already a
17 paved driveway there, but that's easy to look at and
18 say there's already asphalt there. That driveway has
19 been there for a number of years; it's established.
20 We're talking about ripping that out, repaving,
21 digging under the root zone of the trees. And the
22 tree preservation plan says that they require 1 foot
23 per inch in tree diameter. Tree No. 6 on that plan is
24 a 30-foot diameter tree. They want temporary fencing.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

39

1 No machinery or equipment can be used within the
2 protection fence.

3 I got an estimate of what it would cost to
4 take that one tree down if it were to die. That
5 would cost us \$2800. We have five trees that are in
6 that zone. And Mr. McNally stated earlier that it's a
7 2-acre property. In 2 acres we have two locations on
8 those 2 acres where a 30-foot diameter needs to come
9 out from that to protect our tree, and I just would
10 like to see if there's some way that they can design
11 around those two little 30-foot pockets.

12 I know that everything we're looking at
13 here, we have a lot of black-and-white drawings, and
14 it sounds like it's just a tree, but I have a
15 photograph of the tree. When it's leafed out, it's
16 the height and width of a house. When it's leafed out
17 it would provide complete screening of one of the
18 three homes that are in full view of the back window
19 of our house.

20 We just disagree with the statement in this
21 plan that this is not injurious to our property. I
22 mean, with all the construction that's going to go on
23 there; they're going to root prune the tree. It's
24 just a constant source of worry and expense for us for

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

40

1 them to come that close to it, and I ask you to please
2 not approve a plan that cuts into those two areas of
3 the two largest trees on our property.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Anything else?

6 Yes.

7 MS. SPIERS: Carrie Spiers, S-p-i-e-r-s.
8 I'm at 15 Horne kitty-corner behind -- I don't have my
9 glasses. I think it would be Lot 4 --

10 MR. MARSHALL: Lot 1.

11 MS. SPIERS: Yeah, you've got considerable
12 slope going on, gorgeous property. I think you made
13 an error buying it for what you want to do with the
14 property. I'm extremely saddened by this.

15 My home can see just about that whole lot
16 from where I am planted on that lot. Deciduous trees
17 follow my land, but the shrubbery that was on that
18 back corner, a lot of it is gone, and it's a deciduous
19 tree, and I'm looking at as opposed to this all
20 concrete roofs and building. If I wanted to live in
21 the city, I'd go live in the city.

22 St. Charles is charming, full of integrity,
23 character, but we do not need more buildings on these
24 types of lots. That's what makes St. Charles

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

41

1 St. Charles.

2 I've watched too many towns put in too many
3 buildings on condensed lots, and it's just ruined the
4 charm of the town; the traffic has increased; this is
5 not what we need.

6 You're talking roughly 3200-square-foot
7 homes did I hear you say?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Didn't say.

9 MS. SPIERS: What are you thinking?

10 MR. MARSHALL: Probably around there.

11 MS. SPIERS: I'm looking at homes -- by the
12 way, I've got 30-plus years of experience in
13 architectural design, a little bit of landscaping, as
14 well. So if I could just please give a little insight
15 of what I know, of my expertise.

16 You've got a gorgeous lot, there's no doubt
17 about it, a beautiful lot. You've got a slope. Thank
18 you. You toiled over this and you put in some sweat I
19 see and you've revised this. That's great.

20 You've got these four single-family homes
21 that you want to put up where only one single-family
22 is -- I believe -- what is it, two acres that we're
23 talking about? Why don't you just take that beautiful
24 slope that's in the back and reverse this? I've seen

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

42

1 this; I've worked with this myself. Put the parking
2 lot in front -- I don't know if we can go back here.
3 Am I going the right direction?

4 All right. So if you're looking at this
5 lot, this is 31. Are you looking at these being the
6 front or the back of the house? I'm assuming your car
7 is back here. Is there going to be a garage?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

9 MS. SPIERS: All right. So that's pulled in
10 and you're looking at this being the front.

11 Quite honestly, I've talked to several of my
12 colleagues on this, and they're like why don't they
13 just reverse the house. You're going to go save a
14 boatload of money on this project when you lower this.
15 We're talking about the slope; we're talking about
16 some trees; we're talking about the height of the
17 buildings of what we all have to endure to look at.

18 Put your parking lot down here. I'm sure
19 the fire trucks, the garbage trucks would surely
20 appreciate that. And make your back yard going up to
21 the slope. You're going to save a lot of money;
22 you're not going to need all those retaining walls,
23 and you're going to have your landscape flow. We're
24 going to have our back yards to still look at. Just

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

43

1 reverse the flow of the house.

2 It's doable and it's going to save money in
3 the long run. Quite honestly, if I were looking for a
4 house to buy, I'd rather buy a house where my back
5 yard is visually more beautiful. I don't see any
6 beauty in this. You keep talking about how beautiful
7 these are going to be. We don't even -- your homes
8 are even being speculated, so we don't even have an
9 idea of what those are going to look like. We just
10 don't have any idea.

11 Just consider reversing it or think about
12 just putting it back to a single-family and finding
13 another piece of land. It's sad. It's sad.

14 Just an idea to consider.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

16 MS. SPIERS: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions or
18 comments?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Does the Applicant
21 wish to offer any additional testimony before we close
22 the public hearing?

23 MR. MC NALLY: The one thing I would say
24 about the last lady is I've been doing this for too

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

44

1 long, 25 years, 30 years. I've built probably
2 60 homes in this area. I'm just doing a project right
3 now in Geneva where I'm building five homes beside
4 each other on 8,000-square-foot lots. I'm probably
5 working with the most gifted architect in this area,
6 and I have all the trust and all the belief that what
7 I'm doing here is right for the property. I think
8 it's right for the city, and it's going to be the
9 right vision which is going to be seen right from 31.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a couple more
13 questions for staff before we close the hearing.

14 First question is -- I'll start with a
15 simple one. On the zoning review table on page 4 of
16 the staff memo, RS-3 district, next building height,
17 the underlying zoning is 35 feet or two stories,
18 whichever is less.

19 We heard testimony from the Applicant that
20 it's a two-story structure from the rear. Could you
21 just describe -- help me understand, 35 feet or
22 two stories, whichever is less, what is that? So if
23 it's a two-story building, that's 40 feet. What does
24 that mean?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

45

1 MR. COLBY: Well, it essentially means that
2 the structure cannot exceed two stories, and the
3 limitation of the ridge line is 35 feet. So when the
4 structure hits two stories, an additional story can't
5 be added regardless of the height.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: The second question is
7 regarding the tree conservation plan, tree
8 preservation plan, whichever it is, what, if anything,
9 does our zoning ordinance say about tree preservation
10 on the property itself or on adjoining properties?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Well, we included in the
12 packet a summary page of the tree preservation plan
13 requirements, and essentially what it says is when a
14 property is subdivided for development that an effort
15 should be made to preserve the existing trees and that
16 they should be protected in accordance with normal
17 practices. There's not a specific requirement that
18 trees have to be preserved, but it's a requirement
19 that they show that they've demonstrated some
20 sensitivity in the site planning and they've also
21 taken measures to protect the trees they're intending
22 to preserve.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: What page of the staff memo
24 is that?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

46

1 MR. COLBY: It's actually on the last page
2 if you scroll all the way to the end.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: I see.

4 MR. COLBY: The requirements are in a
5 separate section from the code than the zoning
6 ordinance, and they're in a different chapter of the
7 tree preservation section.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything
10 further?

11 MR. THORNHILL: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Oh, yes, sure.

13 MR. THORNHILL: I'm John Thornhill. I live
14 in The Oaks, 44 White Oak Circle.

15 I've heard a lot of these comments before a
16 few months ago when there was much higher density
17 being proposed, and like at that time I haven't heard
18 anything recently that cannot be addressed by the
19 developer by shifting lines, shifting walls, treatment
20 of trees, an education by the arborist's counsel in
21 collaboration between the arborist and the engineering
22 staff of the developer.

23 The lady that spoke last, I can appreciate
24 her concern about the change right behind her home,

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

47

1 but every one of us that live in The Oaks or in
2 Kimball Hill's development, which is what you live in,
3 was the beneficiary of Kimball Hill who developed
4 property much like Maurice McNally is doing today.

5 In '68 when Kimball Hill approached the City
6 for approval on The Oaks of St. Charles and the
7 Fox Glen development, I believe there were only
8 three homes in the area at that time, the farmstead
9 where The Oaks is, the property across the road near
10 the river, that was another part of the development,
11 and the portion that goes out to McKinley Street. I
12 think there was only one house at the corner of
13 Horne Street and Route 31 and another house up the
14 hill further west.

15 At that time those people must have been in
16 shock to see what happened to this property which is
17 now The Oaks and the Fox Glen development. So I think
18 in time all of the concerns people have for change and
19 who may be averse to change, those concerns will
20 eventually wither away just as they did with the prior
21 owners of these properties.

22 So I think if people will bear with the
23 passage of time, these changes that are coming all
24 around us will fall into perspective and will not be

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

48

1 nearly as onerous as people might think.

2 I am in support of -- and speaking for
3 The Oaks, we have no objection to this proposal
4 whatsoever. We realize the tax revenue coming off of
5 this property is probably \$12,000 a year right now.
6 Three more homes is going to replicate that greater
7 return and should return about 50 grand off of this
8 same piece of property. I think it's a good deal for
9 everybody in the long run.

10 This particular property, I believe the style
11 of development will encourage empty nester-type people
12 whose demand for services will be very minimal, and
13 since the road will be a private driveway, there's even
14 less concern for public improvements being maintained.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

17 Anything further? Yes, ma'am.

18 MS. SPIERS: Not all change is positive.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

20 Before I entertain a motion to close the
21 public hearing, the exhibit that was given to Plan
22 Commission, do we have a list of exhibits?

23 MR. COLBY: We don't other than the
24 application, no. So we can label it as --

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

49

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I'll just call this
2 Commission Exhibit A without any objection. All right.

3 Is there a motion?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I move that we close
5 the public hearing.

6 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. It's been moved
8 and seconded. Any discussion of the motion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The vote is
23 unanimous. The public hearing is now closed.

24 (Off the record at 8:06 p.m.)

Hillcroft Estates (Item 3 and 4)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

50

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 8th day of November, 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: :
Hillcroft Estates -- :
1147 Geneva Road :
(Hillcroft Estates, LLC) :
Application for Special :
Use for Planned Unit :
Development, :
Application for PUD :
Preliminary Plan. :

- - - - -x

Report of Proceedings
Council Chambers
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, November 3, 2015
8:06 p.m.

Job No.: 74376B
Pages: 1 - 21
Reported By: Paula Quetsch, CSR

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 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
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

3

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: Next item on our agenda is Item 5, Hillcroft Estates, 1147 Geneva Road (Hillcroft Estates, LLC) Application for Special Use for Planned Unit Development, Application for PUD Preliminary Plan.

Is there a motion?

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I want to make sure -- before I make a motion I want to just talk about what we are -- the application we're voting on here.

The special use for the planned unit development -- the purpose of the planned unit development is to create an opportunity for the building plan because they don't require zoning. So that's that application; it's about the land. And the preliminary plan is simply a footprint.

Now, correct me if I'm wrong. The tree preservation plan, will that -- that will not come up again -- I mean, that's part of the PUD plan; is that correct?

MR. COLBY: Yes. The tree preservation plan is one of the documents required with a PUD preliminary plan. So it's part of the set that's

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

4

1 being presented.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So in my mind the
3 issue is the building height in the approval for the
4 planned unit development, and then the tree
5 preservation plan seems to be the issue that we're
6 dealing with in the PUD preliminary plan.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, is that correct?
8 If the applicant was coming in -- or if the applicant
9 wanted to build structures that were 35 feet in the
10 height, would they have to come before the Plan
11 Commission on this application?

12 MR. COLBY: They would still require a
13 subdivision, and the tree preservation requirements
14 are triggered by the subdivision application, as well.
15 So in this case the PUD preliminary plan is in place
16 of a preliminary subdivision plat.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So we actually have
18 two applications that we're considering here. Okay.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: Can I just follow up?

20 So the PUD preliminary plan -- I'm sorry --
21 the special use application to establish a PUD and
22 unique development standards for the property. So the
23 special use application establishes the PUD and the
24 development standards, and how are the development

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

5

1 standards in that PUD application -- I'm sorry -- in
2 the special use application articulated? Is it
3 according to the table on page 4 of the staff memo,
4 the proposed plan?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: In which case then
6 the only variance would be in building height.

7 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: So really the application
9 is -- the special development standard is 60 feet from
10 existing grade for the proposed plan?

11 MR. COLBY: Correct.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

13 MR. COLBY: And I should add the PUD
14 preliminary plan shows the site plan or the building
15 footprints, and so that's being approved along with
16 this, but there are not any deviations otherwise to
17 the zoning requirements other than building height.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a question for staff.
19 Procedurally we have an application in front of us
20 with a particular development standard. Is the
21 Commission -- does the Commission have -- at liberty
22 to recommend an alternative standard, or is the
23 Commission bound to either vote yes or no to the
24 proposed application?

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

6

1 MR. COLBY: You can provide a recommendation
2 on the application with conditions that modify what's
3 been requested.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. And one more question
5 for staff. Regarding the issue of the tree
6 preservation plan, the last portion of that plan under
7 standard Section 2.6 reads, "All reasonable efforts" --
8 this is for removal of trees -- "shall be authorized
9 by the plans only when one or more of the following
10 conditions exist: 2.6, all reasonable efforts have
11 been undertaken in land planning, architectural and
12 engineering design of the proposed building, building
13 addition, development, or site improvement to minimize
14 tree damage or removal, and the tree or trees to be
15 removed to provide adequate space for permitted
16 construction."

17 So that is part of the City code; correct?

18 MR. COLBY: Correct.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: And so the Applicant needs to
20 comply with that portion of the code regardless of
21 what we recommend?

22 MR. COLBY: Well, as part of the Plan
23 Commission's review because you are reviewing the site
24 plan and the tree preservation plan, if you believe

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

7

1 that additional measures need to be taken or changes
2 to the plan to protect the trees, then you should
3 include that as a condition of your recommendation.

4 If you want to make specific mention of
5 areas of the site that need further analysis, you can
6 do that. But because the plan is being presented in
7 conformance with these standards, the Plan Commission
8 should feel the ability to add conditions to ensure
9 they're complying with that standard.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Conditions or
11 recommendations?

12 MR. COLBY: Well, it would be conditions on
13 your recommendation.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Are you considering
15 that? Because if you are, I suggest you make a motion.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: I am considering conditions.
17 It might be best for us to make a main motion and then
18 move to amend so that we can talk about each condition
19 separately.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. And what
21 would you suggest?

22 MEMBER DOYLE: How about I make a motion.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Would you
24 make a motion on both applications or each of them

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

8

1 individually? How about you make a motion.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: How about I do that. Let me
3 just find the language here.

4 I move to recommend approval of an
5 application for special use for planned unit
6 development and application for PUD preliminary plan
7 as submitted by Hillcroft Estates, 1147 Geneva Road
8 (Hillcroft Estates, LLC) contingent upon approval of
9 all staff comments.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
13 seconded. Discussion on the motion?

14 MEMBER DOYLE: So I do have two recommended
15 conditions that I'd like to propose.

16 So I would move to amend that the proposed
17 architectural standard for building height be reduced
18 to 52 1/2 feet from the existing grade.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Which grade?

20 MEMBER DOYLE: So detailed in the plan -- so
21 building height is 60 feet from existing grade, which
22 according to the City code begins at the front setback
23 at the front of the property, and the main motion is
24 60 feet, and my recommended motion to amend would be

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

9

1 to reduce that to 52 1/2 feet.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Why 52 feet?

3 MEMBER DOYLE: The -- so Lot 4, the back --
4 the rear of Lot 4, the height of the building is
5 50 feet, which is 15 feet above the underlying zoning.
6 We've heard testimony from both the property owner at
7 the rear that that is -- that that's going to be
8 incompatible with his property use, and we've heard
9 testimony from the Applicant that it's a nominal
10 deviation considering the concessions that
11 they've made.

12 I think there are merits to both arguments,
13 and I propose that we split the difference, which is
14 7 1/2 feet. So we have a 15-foot delta between 35 and
15 50 feet, and so split the difference by 7 1/2 feet,
16 and we basically acknowledge that there are concessions
17 that have been made and that it is basically a very --
18 I think a very good plan, very good proposal but that
19 ultimately what we are approving here are building
20 standards and not a promise for a pretty house, and
21 building standards are what govern the development.

22 So I think in consideration of the
23 concessions that have been made and the quality of the
24 application, which I think is very good, I'd generally

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

10

1 recommend approval, but I would add that condition.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second to the
3 motion?

4 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second it.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
6 seconded. Then what we'll do is we'll have discussion
7 on the motion to amend.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So I just want to be
9 clear. You say 52 1/2 feet and the building height is
10 determined by the elevation at the front of the
11 building; correct? At the front of the lot line?

12 MR. COLBY: Correct. It's measured at the
13 midpoint of the front setback line.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: In the midpoint of
15 the front setback line, which is in this particular
16 case the east elevation?

17 MR. COLBY: Yes. The front yard setback off
18 of Route 31.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any further discussion?

20 I -- personally, I mean, I'm going to vote
21 no on the motion to amend for the reason that I think
22 that the -- changing the Applicant's building
23 standards will have an adverse effect on the quality
24 of the product that they're planning on putting in

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

11

1 there. I think that they've laid out their case that
2 what they're putting in at the heights they're putting
3 them in is going to be desirable, and in my opinion I
4 think that they've stated their case for the height
5 that they're requesting.

6 I just -- I don't want them to be boxed into
7 having to create something architecturally that looks
8 squished. If what they're planning on putting in
9 there that they determine is right for the market has
10 to have higher -- you know, a higher gable or higher
11 roof line, I don't want them to have to resort to
12 putting in something that is Prairie style or a
13 mansard roof or something like that, even though I
14 don't think our coding allows that anymore.

15 So that's my two cents.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Can I comment?

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Uh-huh.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: I don't disagree with you. I
19 think there's merit to that argument. I also think
20 the adjacent property owner came prepared with
21 information and testified in a way that was compelling,
22 and I think that granting an extra 7 1/2 feet gives
23 some leeway in consideration of the quality of the
24 application. It's just a matter of how much leeway

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

12

1 to give.

2 So, you know, I see both sides of the issue,
3 and I want to acknowledge and honor the quality of the
4 application but also acknowledge and honor the
5 testimony of surrounding property owners.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: See, I was more sensitive
7 to that argument when they presented their concept
8 plan, but in that plan the buildings were 20 feet from
9 the lot line at the same height and now they're -- I
10 mean, I think that the Applicant has put a lot of
11 effort into revising their plan to address our concerns.
12 I mean, really this is completely different, and it's
13 completely what we basically recommended that they
14 come back with.

15 So I think tripling the amount of space from
16 the rear lot line to the structures in my mind
17 addressed that concern, addressed the height concern.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think I'd have to
19 agree that with the distance between these properties
20 at 150 feet -- you know, I'm trying to think what's
21 150 feet. If you stand at your front door, and you
22 look across the street at the house across the street
23 from you, that house is maybe 70 feet, maybe 80 feet.
24 You have two 25-foot setbacks and a 30-foot street.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

13

1 Consider you're looking at a house a block away, over
2 a block away.

3 So given those distances and the fact that
4 the sight lines are considerably different if you have
5 a 50-foot structure 20 feet from your house and a
6 50-foot structure, you know, a block away.

7 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I think you also have
8 to consider, too, a tree line lies between the
9 proposed structure and the existing homes. When we
10 think about this, it's easy just to assume there's
11 nothing there; you're looking from one house to the
12 other. This is going to be screened. And they have
13 made concessions and now we're delving into the design
14 of it. I think that's stepping over a bit.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, I would point out that
16 the tree preservation plan calls for the removal of
17 trees behind Lot 4, the red cedars. I think that a
18 certain amount of weight should be given to
19 concessions. On the other hand, we have an
20 application that sort of has to stand on its own
21 merit.

22 So, you know, if someone comes to me and
23 asks for -- and an applicant asks for something that
24 is just -- I mean, we saw this -- we've seen this in

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

14

1 past applications where we have an application for
2 1,000 multifamily units and it drops down to 400, and
3 all of a sudden it drops down to 400 and, oh, my gosh
4 400 is pretty good compared to 1,000.

5 So, I mean, I'm not interested in trying to
6 micromanage. I am interested in striking the right
7 balance in the development standard. So -- as the
8 Applicant said, we don't have design plans in front of
9 us. So we don't have particular elevations that we're
10 estimating; we don't know what the quality of the
11 buildings are going to be. We know that there's an
12 intent to build high-quality upscale homes.

13 Unless there's further -- I don't have any
14 further comment on the discussion in that particular
15 motion to amend.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Any further
17 discussion on the motion to amend?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then we'll
20 take a vote. This is on the motion to amend to place
21 a condition that the maximum roof height be
22 52 1/2 feet.

23 Tim.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 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

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, no.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That motion
to amend fails, and on the table now is the main motion.

MEMBER DOYLE: Chairman Wallace, I have
another motion to amend.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

MEMBER DOYLE: So I'm trying to think of how
to articulate this motion. But, basically, a motion
concerns tree Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6.

I guess my motion is to recommend that the
Applicant resolve an apparent discrepancy between the
arborist's report and recommendation as related to
Tree Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 as detailed on the tree
preservation plan in order to comply with Standard 2.6
of the City's requirements for tree preservation plans

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

16

1 detailed in Chapter 8.30.070 of the City code.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I don't know if that
3 motion would be in order because those trees don't
4 even reside on this particular lot, and I think it
5 would be governed by the provisions of City code.

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So the Applicant would
7 not be in a position to remove the trees. I see what
8 you're saying.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Uh-huh.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Then I withdraw the
11 motion.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I mean, unless you
13 can think of another way to word it. Otherwise, I
14 think it's just governed by City code because he
15 doesn't -- really he doesn't have control over that.

16 MR. COLBY: He would have control over the
17 tree preservation zone on the subject property. So if
18 you wish to impose a condition on the subject property
19 in the tree preservation zone, you could do that.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So as not to adversely
21 affect --

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So as not to go
23 beyond the tree preservation zone.

24 MR. COLBY: I think what's at issue is where

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

17

1 the tree preservation zone is identified on the plan
2 and how that relates to what's shown in the engineering
3 plans. Correct?

4 MEMBER DOYLE: Correct. We have a tree
5 preservation plan that has been submitted by an
6 arborist, and there is a discrepancy between the
7 preservation plan and the engineering plan, and I
8 think that should be resolved to -- either the
9 preservation plan needs to be amended by the arborist,
10 you know, in consultation with the arborist, or the
11 engineering plan should be amended to comply with it.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So would you want to
13 place a condition that the Applicant make reasonable
14 efforts to -- to resolve the conflict between
15 the plans?

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Explain to me what
18 the conflict between the plans is.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: As I understand it from the
20 staff memo and the drawing, it has to do with the
21 paved area for the rear drive. Which on page 41 of
22 the packet there is a red line that shows the
23 protection zone, and, actually, Trees 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,
24 and 6, I guess, their preservation -- or their

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

18

1 protection area extends into -- I'm not certain if I'm
2 reading this correctly.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I can't see where
4 that drive is. I'm not sure where that drive --

5 MEMBER DOYLE: What we heard was testimony --
6 I'd rather base it off of the testimony.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's inside the
8 existing drive, the tree preservation zone.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. I see.

10 MR. COLBY: I think the concern that was
11 expressed is relating to the retaining walls that were
12 shown on the engineering plans and their proximity to
13 the tree preservation zone in that area.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: So we have an existing driveway.
15 Now, removing the driveway itself would disrupt the --
16 would entail construction in the protection area,
17 would it not?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yeah. Depends on
19 how it's graded I suppose. I mean, it could or
20 could not.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: It's removed by hand, not
22 by tractor.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my
24 motion to amend.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

19

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. So the main
2 motion on the table is to recommend approval of both
3 of the applications. Anything further?

4 (No response.)

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And this motion is
6 to recommend approval?

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Correct.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And we're going to
9 vote on that now?

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Unless there's any other
11 discussion or amendments.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Tim.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

17 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 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

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That motion passes
unanimously. That concludes Item 5 on the agenda.

(Off the record at 8:30 p.m.)

Hillcroft Estates (Item 5)
Conducted on November 3, 2015

21

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 8th day of November, 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: :
Gralewski Health Club, :
Pine Ridge Park PUD Lots :
6 and 7 (Sam Salahi) -- :
Application for PUD :
Preliminary Plan. :
- - - - -x

Public Hearing
Council Chambers
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois
Tuesday, November 3, 2015
8:30 p.m.

Job No.: 74376C
Pages: 1 - 13
Reported By: Paula Quetsch, CSR

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 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
- JAMES HOLDERFIELD, Member
- TOM PRETZ, Member
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

- RUSSELL COLBY, Planning Division Manager
- ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

3

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 6 on the agenda is
Gralewski Health Club, Pine Ridge Park PUD Lots 6 and
7 (Sam Salahi) Application for PUD Preliminary Plan.

MR. COLBY: Yes. I'll be presenting this
one. I'll wait until it clears out.

It's a PUD plan proposing to develop two lots
in the Pine Ridge Park subdivision. A PUD preliminary
plan review is required prior to development of those
lots that were previously platted, and the subdivision
has been established, but it's a requirement that the
Plan Commission review preliminary plans for
development those lots for conformance with zoning
ordinance standards and PUD ordinance standards.

So what's being proposed is a one-story
health club around 12,000 square feet with a 60-space
parking lot accessed off of Woodward Drive and a
shared access drive that exists to the south of the
property. Staff has reviewed the plans for
conformance with zoning requirements and PUD standards
and found that the proposal is in compliance with
those standards with a couple of minor notes.

We will need to have the building materials
identified on the plans, particularly because vinyl

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

4

1 siding is not permitted. Siding materials, provided
2 it's an acceptable siding material, that would be
3 allowed.

4 We also need information on the trash
5 enclosure, essentially utilizing the same material as
6 the building.

7 Also, the development of the lot would need
8 to include a sidewalk along Woodward Drive. We need
9 clarification from the Applicant as to whether they
10 will be installing that or if that would be something
11 that needs to be installed by the subdivider because
12 the City is currently holding a financial guarantee
13 for the installation of the sidewalk.

14 So those are relatively minor issues we
15 believe that the Applicant can provide additional
16 information on to comply with the PUD. So with that
17 staff is recommending approval. I know they have a
18 representative here in the audience, also, if there's
19 any questions on the plans.

20 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just want a clarification.

21 On the landscape plan it said that the
22 standard was 10 percent, and it came out at 7, but
23 then it was something about redrawn at 7.4. I guess I
24 didn't really understand it. I read it a couple times.

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

5

1 MR. COLBY: That was the landscape architect
2 who drew that plan had calculated it at 7 percent
3 based on how they drew the box around the parking lot.
4 We include more areas than I think they drew the box
5 around to include the corners in the parking lot in
6 our calculation. So when you include all of those
7 areas, it does exceed the 10 percent.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: But they wouldn't normally
9 be included you're saying?

10 MR. COLBY: No, it would be. It was just a
11 matter of that they did not interpret the code
12 language the same way we have, which is how we arrived
13 at 11.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it's good?

15 MR. COLBY: Yes. It meets the code
16 requirement.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Under the staff comments on
18 the sidewalk, who pays for that?

19 MR. COLBY: Well, it's a subdivision
20 improvement, which means that the entity that
21 originally subdivided the properties was required to
22 provide sidewalks, street trees, and improve the
23 parkway area. What was done was that that was --
24 those improvements were not installed at the time the

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

6

1 subdivision was created in anticipation of that being
2 done as the lots were developed. This lot has since
3 been sold to another entity, but the City maintains a
4 financial guarantee to pay for the installation of
5 those improvements if the original subdivider is
6 unwilling to. So it's an obligation that rests with
7 the original subdivider unless there's an agreement
8 reached with the property owner for them to install it
9 themselves.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: But we're not going to,
11 meaning the City?

12 MR. COLBY: In the event that neither the
13 lot developer or the subdivider is willing to install
14 the sidewalk, the City has the ability to withdraw
15 money from that financial guarantee to have it
16 installed. So it will be installed one way or another.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And the City will
18 not pay for it.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: That's my point.

20 MR. COLBY: Correct.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there a motion?
22 Anything from the public?

23 (No response.)

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Entertain a motion.

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

7

1 Brian, you're doing fine. Keep it up. Do you want to
2 make a motion? Go ahead, Tom.

3 Just please make a motion.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: I move to recommend approval
5 of the PUD preliminary plan for a health club
6 submitted by Gralewski Health Club and Sam Salahi of
7 Architectural Planning Services contingent upon all
8 staff comments.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Any discussion on
10 the motion?

11 (No response.)

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

13 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

19 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That motion
24 passes unanimously, and that concludes Item 6 on the

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

8

1 agenda.

2 Item 7, additional business for Plan
3 Commission members. Staff?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Citizens?

6 MEMBER DOYLE: Are we reviewing the weekly
7 development status report? Because I wanted to ask
8 about the general amendment for the provisional
9 housing ordinance.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's on Monday, next
11 Monday's --

12 MR. COLBY: It is on the upcoming agenda.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: So have we determined if --
14 now, regarding the Open Meetings Act, can any number
15 of commissioners attend that meeting? Is that
16 violating the Act?

17 MR. COLBY: You could attend the meeting.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We can't discuss business.

19 MR. COLBY: You can't discuss business so
20 you probably should not be seated together.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Brian, I was
22 expecting to attend, and I figured you might, as well.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: So two members can attend,
24 three members would be a quorum; correct?

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

9

1 MR. COLBY: Technically you can all attend
2 but you can't discuss business.

3 MEMBER DOYLE: But three members discussing
4 business would be a violation?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Brian, would you
7 come to the meeting with me on Monday night, the
8 planning and development committee meeting?

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. So Brian and
11 I are going to go. Anyone else who wants to come
12 can't talk to us.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And that was the planning
14 and development and meeting announcements.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Also, remember that
16 the meeting on the 9th before the planning and
17 development committee meeting is our joint meeting
18 with planning and development committee.

19 MR. COLBY: Yes. And we are still trying to
20 determine if we have a quorum with both groups. So I
21 wanted to just reconfirm with the Plan Commission
22 members here who can and is planning to attend and who
23 cannot.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There is a possibility

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

10

1 that I may be late to the meeting. I have to pick
2 someone up from the airport, so I hopefully will be
3 back in time.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Jim, do you intend
5 to be there?

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'll be there at 5:30.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Brian?

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

9 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I cannot.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'll be there. Tom,
11 will you be there?

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So we have to talk
14 to Laura and Michelle. We have four.

15 MR. COLBY: We need at least one additional
16 member.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We need four definitely.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would count on it.
19 We'll strong-arm one of the three.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think Michelle and
21 Laura said they'll be there.

22 MR. COLBY: We'll still need to verify that
23 we have adequate number from the planning and
24 development committee.

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

11

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That you don't know.

2 MR. COLBY: So we will know by Friday when
3 the agenda is being posted.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Did we add a
5 public comment session?

6 MR. COLBY: We updated all of our meeting
7 agendas for commissions to be consistent. The Plan
8 Commission there previously was -- under "Additional
9 Business" there was an item for citizens. It was
10 suggested that we clarify that there's an opportunity
11 for public comment separate from that official
12 business section.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

14 MR. COLBY: So that's a change to the
15 agenda.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Does any member of the
17 public wish to comment?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do you wish to
19 comment, Paula? No?

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a motion to
21 adjourn?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

12

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

seconded. All in favor.

(Ayes heard.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

(Off the record at 8:39 p.m.)

Gralewski Health Club
Conducted on November 3, 2015

13

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 8th day of November, 2015.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois