

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLAN COMMISSION
TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015**

Members Present: Chairman Todd Wallace
Vice Chairman Tim Kessler
Brian Doyle
James Holderfield
Laura Macklin-Purdy
Tom Pretz
Tom Schuetz

Members Absent: Michelle Spruth

Also Present: Russell Colby-Planning Division Manager
Ellen Johnson-Planner
Court Reporter

1. Call to order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Election of Officer

Vice Chairman Kessler nominated Todd Wallace for Chairman. Seconded by Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. Schuetz nominated Tim Kessler as Vice Chairman. Seconded by Mr. Pretz.

Roll Call Vote on both nominations:

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

Nays:

Absent: Spruth, Doyle

Motion carried: 6-0

4. Presentation of minutes of the March 17, 2015 meeting.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Schuetz and passed by voice vote of 5-0 to accept the minutes of the March 17, 2015 meeting. Mr. Pretz abstained.

PUBLIC HEARING

6. 1202 Pomeroy Court, Salvation Army (Salvation Tri-City Corps.)

Application to amend Special Use Ordinance #1962-34 in order to allow expansion of the Salvation Army parking lot at 1710 S. 7th Ave.

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 Vice Chairman Kessler to close the public hearing. Seconded by Mr. Pretz.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays:

Absent: Spruth

Motion carried: 7-0

MEETING

7. 1202 Pomeroy Court, Salvation Army (Salvation Tri-City Corps.)

Application to amend Special Use Ordinance #1962-34 in order to allow expansion of the Salvation Army parking lot at 1710 S. 7th Ave.

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 Vice Chairman Kessler to recommend to the City Council to deny the application to amend Special Use Ordinance 1962-34 in order to allow expansion of the Salvation Army parking lot at 1710 South 7th Avenue. Seconded by Mr. Schuetz.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Kessler

Nays: Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Macklin-Purdy, Pretz, Wallace

Absent: Spruth

Motion failed: 1-6

Motion to amend was made by Mr. Doyle to recommend approval of the Special Use Ordinance 1962-34 as detailed in the Staff Memo with four conditions:

- Condition 1, that there shall be no curb cut on Pomeroy Court now or in the future,
- Condition 2, that the height of lighting fixtures on the parcel in question shall be limited to 15 feet in height,
- Condition 3, that the applicant shall work with the City staff to make reasonable accommodations to increase the height of the landscaping screening on the north side of the parcel on Pomeroy Court.

Seconded by Mr. Schuetz

Motion was made by Mr. Holderfield to amend the main motion to include a Condition 4, the applicant shall work with City staff to move the parking lot and place additional landscaping along the east side of the property, as discussed during the public hearing. Seconded by Mr. Shuetz.

Roll Call Vote on motion to amend the main motion:

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

Nays:

Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

Page 3

Absent: Spruth

Motion carried: 7-0

Roll Call Vote on the amended main motion, with 4 Conditions.

Ayes: Holderfield, Doyle, Schuetz, Macklin-Purdy, Pretz, Wallace

Nays: Kessler

Absent: Spruth

Motion carried: 6-1

5. Hillcroft Townhomes, 1147 Geneva Rd. (Hillcroft Estates LLC)

Application for Concept Plan

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

8. Meeting Announcements

- a. Plan Commission
Tuesday, May 19, 2015 at 7:00 pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, June 2, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Tuesday, June 16, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
- b. Planning & Development Committee
Monday, May 11, 2015 at 7:00pm Council Chambers
Monday, June 8, 2015 at 7:00 pm Council Chambers

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

9. Adjournment at 9:35 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 CITY OF ST. CHARLES

PLAN COMMISSION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

St. Charles, Illinois

Tuesday, May 5, 2015

7:00 p.m.

Job No. 74364

Pages: 1 - 129

Reported by: Jean S. Busse, CSR, RPR

Notary Public, DuPage County, Illinois

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 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

Report of proceedings held at the location
of:

City of St. Charles
2 East Main Street
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
(630) 377-4400

Pursuant to Notice before Jean S. Busse, a
Certified Shorthand Reporter, Registered Professional
Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State of
Illinois.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 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;
- LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member;
- TOM PRETZ, Member;
- TOM SCHUETZ, Member.

ALSO PRESENT:

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

**REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015**

1	C O N T E N T S	PAGE
2	1. Call to Order	5
3	2. Roll Call	5
4	3. Election of Officers	6
5	4. Presentation of Minutes of the	
6	March 17, 2015, Meeting	7
7	5. Meeting - Hillcroft Townhomes, 1147	58
8	Geneva Road (Hillcroft Estates, LLC)	
9	Application for Concept Plan	
10	6. Public Hearing - 1202 Pomeroy Court,	8
11	Salvation Army (Salvation Tri-City Corps.)	
12	Application to amend Special Use Ordinance	
13	No. 1962-34 in order to allow expansion	
14	of the Salvation parking lot at	
15	1710 South 7th Avenue	
16	7. Meeting - 1202 Pomeroy Court, Salvation	43
17	Army (Salvation Tri-City Corps.)	
18	Application to amend Special Use Ordinance	
19	No. 1962-34 in order to allow expansion	
20	Of the Salvation Army parking lot at	
21	1710 South 7th Avenue	
22	8. Meeting Announcements	126
23	9. Additional Business	127
24	10. Adjournment	127

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

5

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: This will be the meeting
of the Plan Commission. Come to order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: 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: All right. Before we get
to Item No. 3 on the agenda, without objection --
actually, we're still on Item 2.

We have another member here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Macklin-Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Before I get to Item 3 on
the agenda, unless there is any objection, I'd like to
take Item 5 after Items 6 and 7.

Any objection?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

6

1 MEMBER PRETZ: No.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Sounds good.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Moving on to
4 Item 3, election of officers.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I nominate Tom
6 Wallace for Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Do we take
10 all nominations? We only do this once a year.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: Do you want to nominate him?

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: As Co?

13 MR. PRETZ: Yes.

14 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I nominate Timothy Kessler
15 as Cochairman.

16 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: As Vice Chairman.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Vice Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been seconded.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other nominations for
22 either of the positions? All right. Then we'll vote
23 on the slate as it is.

24 Would you like to take a roll call?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

7

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.
2 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.
4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Macklin-Purdy.
6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.
8 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That concludes Item 3 on
13 our agenda.
14 Item 4 is presentation of minutes of the
15 March 17, 2015, meeting.
16 Is there a motion to approve?
17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So move.
18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.
19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?
20 (The ayes were thereupon heard.)
21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?
22 MEMBER PRETZ: I'm going to abstain.
23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Abstain. Okay.
24 So the motion passes by a vote of five, two

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

8

1 none, with one abstention.

2 Next is Item 6 on your agenda, which is
3 1202 Pomeroy Court, Salvation Army (Salvation Tri-City
4 Corps.) Application to amend Special Use Ordinance
5 No. 1962-34, in order to allow expansion of the
6 Salvation Army parking lot at 1710 South 7th Avenue.

7 This is a public hearing; and for those of
8 you who have not been to a Plan Commission meeting
9 before, welcome. The Plan Commission is tasked by
10 the City Council to conduct public hearings on
11 certain applications that come before it. One of
12 those applications is special use ordinances or
13 amendments to special use ordinances, which is what
14 this is.

15 What the Plan Commission does is we accept
16 evidence both for and against an application; and once
17 we have all of the evidence, then the Plan Commission
18 will close the public hearing.

19 Subsequent to closing the public hearing,
20 the Plan Commission will make a decision whether to
21 recommend to the City Council approval or denial of
22 the application.

23 This item is actually on our agenda tonight
24 twice because we intend to conduct a public hearing,

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

9

1 take all the evidence, close the public hearing,
2 and then vote on whether to recommend approval or
3 denial.

4 If we feel that we don't have enough
5 evidence to make an informed decision, if we feel that
6 we need other evidence, then the appropriate motion
7 would be to continue the public hearing to a future
8 date. Obviously, that means that we would not be
9 voting on action tonight.

10 Any questions regarding our procedure?

11 Okay. Then what we do is the applicant
12 first will make a presentation in favor of the
13 application followed by questions from Plan Commission
14 members and members of the public.

15 After that if anyone wishes to offer any
16 testimony either for or against the application, they
17 may do so; and I will give the applicant an
18 opportunity to rebut any testimony at the end. Then
19 the Plan Commission will discuss and decide whether to
20 close the public hearing or not.

21 So at this time anyone who wishes to offer
22 any testimony, including even asking questions, I ask
23 that you now be sworn in. If you'd raise your right
24 hand.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

10

1 (Witnesses sworn.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

3 And when you speak, I ask that only one
4 person speak at a time and that you wait to be
5 recognized by me before you speak.

6 Also, if you would approach the lectern and
7 speak into the microphone so that we can all hear.
8 State your name, spell your last name, and also state
9 your address for the record.

10 Any questions?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We should recognize
12 Brian Doyle. Brian Doyle has joined the meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

14 Any questions?

15 Okay. Is the applicant ready? All right.
16 I'm sorry.

17 Staff is there anything before the applicant
18 begins? All right.

19 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If you can just pull the
21 microphone around and towards you. Pull it so that
22 the long end is towards you. There you go.

23 MR. PETERSON: I thought it was a bar mic,
24 not "bar" as in tavern, but I'm a lot more nervous on

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

11

1 this side of the half circle than I was on the other
2 side of it.

3 My name is Charles Peterson,
4 P-e-t-e-r-s-o-n. I'm the applicant for the property
5 owners at 1202 Pomeroy Court.

6 The Salvation Army has experienced
7 substantial growth over the past 13 years that we've
8 been there. We started operations in approximately
9 2002. I think in your packet you'll find some of the
10 statistics that we have presented to justify -- or to
11 verify, I should say, the increased numbers that we
12 have.

13 At some times -- church on Sunday is one
14 time, but other times we have different programs at
15 the building, food pickups, which have increased
16 considerably, and we find that we have a lot of
17 parking on 13th Avenue and some of the adjacent
18 streets along there which we would like to get off of
19 the streets and into a parking lot, which is the
20 reason we have taken this opportunity to try and
21 purchase the property at 1202 Pomeroy Court and expand
22 our present parking lot to take some of that traffic
23 off the streets.

24 Basically that's our presentation. I think

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

12

1 you have everything in your packet. If there are any
2 questions, I would be happy to answer them.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. I'll just turn to
4 Staff. If you could just let us know -- or if you
5 could give us a quick review of the Staff Report.

6 MS. JOHNSON: The proposed site plan is here
7 on your screens. Basically what they are proposing
8 are 20 additional parking spaces to be constructed on
9 the 1202 Pomeroy Court property, which is an existing
10 single-family home that they are proposing to purchase
11 and tear down to construct this parking lot.

12 So the zoning of the property is RS-4, and
13 a special use for a place of worship was approved
14 for 1710 South 7th Avenue, which is where the
15 Salvation Army facility is located now.

16 So the proposal is to amend the special use
17 to include 1202 Pomeroy Court as part of a special use
18 for a place of worship, which is required for that use
19 in the RS-4 zoning district.

20 So the proposed parking lot meets all the
21 setback requirements. There will be landscape
22 screening along South 7th Avenue and Pomeroy Court,
23 and there will also be a 6-foot screen fence on the
24 east property line between the residential property to

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

13

1 the east of the new parking lot, which meets
2 requirements.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So there aren't any
4 variances that are being requested?

5 MS. JOHNSON: No.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
7 Questions?

8 MEMBER PRETZ: I have a question as it
9 relates to the property line with the resident which
10 would be to the east of your property, I guess, up
11 there.

12 MR. PETERSON: On the other side of Pomeroy
13 Court? Is it 1208?

14 MEMBER PRETZ: 1208. And according to what
15 Staff said, it's a 6-foot fence.

16 My general feeling would be that if I was
17 the resident there, while I understand the need for
18 the parking, if I was the resident at 1208, I would
19 have a little bit of concern with just having a fence
20 without some additional landscaping.

21 I don't know if there's enough room to be
22 able to actually provide that, but that would be one
23 thing that I would be interested in hearing more about
24 on how to buffer between that 1208 and your parking

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

14

1 lot.

2 MR. PETERSON: We have very little room
3 there, but we can add some landscaping along that
4 screen because our individual parking space depth is
5 big enough.

6 I believe, Ellen, we have more than enough
7 room on the 7th Avenue side. We could push that
8 parking lot towards 7th Avenue, couldn't we?

9 MS. JOHNSON: You could, yes.

10 MR. PETERSON: So we could add some space
11 there and definitely take a look at that, yes.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: I just think it would be in
13 the best interest of your neighbors.

14 MR. PETERSON: I would agree.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is there any
16 existing buffer between the Salvation army property
17 and the residential?

18 MR. PETERSON: Not at that point.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Anyplace along that
20 whole south?

21 MR. PETERSON: There are trees along the
22 whole space between the Salvation Army and the
23 residential area, yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So just trees?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

15

1 MR. PETERSON: Uh-huh, and there's fairly
2 heavy landscaping on the residential side of that
3 property line as well. We've added some trees along
4 the side of the Salvation Army building, again, fairly
5 large over the 13 years.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I was just scanning
7 through here as far as parking. You're proposing 54
8 spaces on the site that would include this new --

9 MR. PETERSON: That would include the new --
10 well, there are 20 spaces in the proposed parking lot
11 and 34 in the existing parking lot. We would add
12 handicap parking in front of the building to
13 accommodate the additional parking.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So even with this,
15 it still doesn't meet the parking requirements.
16 They're still two spaces short.

17 MR. PETERSON: We're still short, but we
18 have on-street parking.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is it shared
20 parking?

21 How is the additional parking? Because
22 according to this, there's 56 spaces required; and
23 with this new parking lot, there will be a total of
24 54.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

16

1 So they're still two spaces short; is that
2 correct?

3 MR. COLBY: That's correct.

4 The existing parking does not meet our
5 ordinance current requirement. So the addition of
6 this parking would bring it closer, but there would
7 still be the two-parking-space deficiency.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Did it meet the
9 requirement when it was built?

10 MR. COLBY: It doesn't appear that it met
11 our current requirement.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It could have met
13 what was existing when it was built?

14 MR. COLBY: It could have.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. That's a good
16 thing.

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have a quick
18 question on the parking as well.

19 Right now your on-street parking, will you
20 be taking some of those off likely because of the
21 additional 20 spaces, or do you feel there's going to
22 be more on-street parking?

23 MR. PETERSON: No. I would think that would
24 reduce the on-street parking considerably, the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

17

1 additional parking lot.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: How many do you estimate is
3 on-street now? Do you have any idea? Just a guess.

4 MR. PETERSON: I don't.

5 Major, do we have any?

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Did you raise your hand
7 before?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: He did. I saw him.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Were you sworn in?

10 MAJOR MILLER: Yes, I was.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thanks.

12 MAJOR MILLER: I'm Major Jonathan Miller,
13 M-i-l-l-e-r, and I'm the Corps officer at the
14 Salvation Army.

15 I would estimate that there are probably
16 40 cars that park on the street, particularly on
17 Tuesdays and Fridays when we have additional
18 programming that's going on.

19 There are several programs going on at the
20 same time, and there are some people who park about
21 four blocks away to come to the Salvation Army
22 programming, particularly on Tuesdays and Fridays.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So you are envisioning this
24 to lighten the load a bit off the streets?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

18

1 MAJOR MILLER: Yes. It would pull people
2 off the street and into the parking area.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Where is the primary
4 location that cars park during those times?

5 MAJOR MILLER: We see them primarily on
6 13th Avenue, and it's my understanding that there are
7 those who do park on Pomeroy Court as well and walk
8 over.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Thank you.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions, Plan
12 Commissioners?

13 Any questions from members of the audience?
14 Yes, sir? Were you sworn in?

15 MR. CHOATE: Yes, I was.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

17 MR. CHOATE: My name is Nicholas Choate,
18 C-h-o-a-t-e. I live at 1632 South 7th Avenue, which
19 is right across the street. I just have a few
20 concerns.

21 First of all, the parking lot that they have
22 now, especially in the wintertime, everybody goes out
23 and starts their cars at 9:00, 10:00 o'clock at night
24 when they have meetings. It sounds like a train is

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

19

1 coming through.

2 There's a house and a fence blocking it.
3 Now when they put this parking lot in, there's going
4 to be 20 cars. We live on a court. It's just going
5 to vibrate the noise that's going to go around.

6 We get a huge amount of overflow from
7 traffic that can't find parking on 13th Avenue. So
8 they do park in our court. There's 50, 60 cars out
9 there when they have big meetings. A 20-car lot is
10 not going to change anything.

11 In fact, now people are going to be parking
12 in our court as opposed to 13th Avenue. Because of
13 the parking lot that they're going to try to fit in,
14 they're going to have to turn on Pomeroy Court to try
15 to get in there, and they're going to end up parking
16 on our court.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: They don't have an
18 entrance from Pomeroy Court.

19 MR. CHOATE: Right, I know they don't. But
20 you know how people are driving. That's the first
21 street. They're going to turn in there.

22 Especially living on a court, they can't
23 turn around. So they have to drive all the way around
24 the court. Headlights are shining on all the houses.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

20

1 It's just little things like that that I'm concerned
2 about.

3 I guess I'm just curious about this.
4 Wouldn't this be opening a can of worms? There's lots
5 of businesses that would love to buy houses in
6 St. Charles and buy the houses and make parking lots
7 and little warehouses out of them. This is a
8 neighborhood that -- I love the Salvation Army. I
9 think they do great things for the community.

10 They've already built a giant building
11 there, which is fine. Last year they put a
12 Vegas-style neon sign up, which just lightens up the
13 whole street. It's literally very bright.

14 Now they're going to buy a house, tear it
15 down to put 20 spots in. It doesn't seem worth it for
16 20 cars to tear down a nice house.

17 You know, I'm sure property values are going
18 to go down a little bit, I would assume. I mean, I
19 would think. I'm not sure.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yeah.

21 MR. CHOATE: So those are just my concerns.
22 That's it.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: There's a distinction to
24 be made between businesses being able to purchase

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

21

1 residential houses and put up parking lots. I mean,
2 this isn't considered a business under our zoning
3 ordinance. It's a place of worship.

4 MR. CHOATE: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That is the only
6 reason that it would be allowed in a residential
7 district.

8 MR. CHOATE: As opposed to a residential
9 district.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Exactly. All right.

11 MR. CHOATE: Thank you.

12 MEMBER PRETZ: Could I just ask the
13 homeowner, how long have you lived in your residence?

14 MR. CHOATE: 11 years.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: 11 years?

16 MR. CHOATE: Yes.

17 MEMBER PRETZ: So they were existing?

18 MR. CHOATE: I think the year I moved in is
19 when they built that, yeah, or they were in the
20 process of building it.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

23 Members of the audience? Yes, sir.

24 MR. NAGENGAST: Yes. Is this the time for

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

22

1 questions or comments or both?

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I'd like to start
3 with questions, if we could, just so that the
4 applicant has an opportunity to answer, and then if
5 people want to make comments.

6 MR. NAGENGAST: My name is Tim Nagengast,
7 N-a-g-e-n-g-a-s-t. I live at 1211 Pomeroy Court.
8 We've lived there for 18 years.

9 I have some comments to start off with, but
10 I'll just start with my questions. If the zoning is
11 allowed, what door does that open for future
12 additional expansion?

13 If others on the street can't sell their
14 houses because -- if they can't sell it for as much as
15 they think or they hope they can maybe because the
16 value has been diminished, will they be able to sell
17 out the rest of the neighborhood again so that they
18 can get the top price from the church that's probably
19 going to be expanding?

20 Because, number one, I resent, Major Miller,
21 that you told me when we had our face-to-face
22 meeting a couple of weeks ago -- or I'm sorry -- a
23 few months ago that the problem was that they wanted
24 to expand their services, and they were looking at

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

23

1 buying this home, not the lot, the home, and using
2 that house to increase the services that they could
3 provide.

4 At the time it came up as mentioning the
5 possibility of filling in the swimming pool and making
6 additional parking behind. My comment at the time
7 was, "As long as Pomeroy remains a residential area
8 and it looks like a residential area, I don't have a
9 problem."

10 I appreciate all the things that the
11 Salvation Army does, but to me this is bait and
12 switch. You tell me you're going to take the house
13 and make it into a nice place for people to do
14 additional things and maybe put some parking in back,
15 and now you show me you want the whole thing to be a
16 parking lot.

17 I don't appreciate that. That's not what I
18 was told at the time.

19 How will the zoning change prevent future
20 modifications to the parking lot, such as allowing
21 expansions off of Pomeroy Court? Is there any way
22 to make sure that that never happens?

23 I don't know.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me stop you for a

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

24

1 second there.

2 Maybe Staff, if you could answer that.
3 What would the procedure be if they wanted to change
4 the configuration of the parking lot at a future
5 point?

6 MR. COLBY: Well, if the Plan Commission
7 would like to see a restriction placed on the access,
8 that could be included as part of the recommendation.
9 It can be written into the ordinance approving the
10 special use if the City Council adopts it.

11 Then in the future, to be able to put an
12 access onto Pomeroy Court, there would need to be a
13 special use amendment, which would require a new
14 public hearing. So a condition would be placed on it
15 to limit that.

16 MR. CHOATE: And likewise, I hope, then, a
17 potential to put a parking garage?

18 Because obviously the issue isn't expanding
19 services. It's taking care of parking that should
20 have been considered before they built the monstrosity
21 that's there with not enough parking to begin with.

22 So now they want to increase parking.
23 What's to stop it from just going on down the street
24 so pretty soon all I'm looking at is a parking lot

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

25

1 with a big blank wall behind it? That's not why I
2 bought into this nice residential area.

3 Just two days ago I was having coffee in my
4 front room looking out the window thinking, "Now, this
5 is a nice place to live." Then I remembered that I
6 had to come here tonight to do this. I'm sorry. I
7 got off track there.

8 The other thing, it was mentioned earlier
9 about the people that come into the neighborhood
10 because they missed their turn because they need to
11 turn around. They need to get back. There's already
12 a lot of traffic that goes whipping around that circle
13 to get back on the street because they're late for a
14 meeting or something.

15 This is a residential area. There's kids
16 and grandkids that play near and in the street. I've
17 almost thrown a brick at somebody a couple of times
18 for driving too fast around the parking lot -- or the
19 circle in there, the traffic circle.

20 I guess the last thing that I wanted to say
21 was I just hope you all consider the next time you
22 have a cup of coffee and you look out your window in
23 your residential area whether you want a parking lot
24 in your view.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

26

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

3 Any other questions? Yes, sir?

4 MR. KAHWAHJI: My name is Ted Kahwahji,
5 K-a-h-w-a-h-j-i. I live at 1624 South 7th.

6 How high is that light that's going to be
7 installed in that parking lot? What kind of light?

8 MS. JOHNSON: The height of the parking lot
9 light fixtures can be no higher than the height of
10 the -- the maximum height of homes in that
11 neighborhood.

12 So 34 feet would be the maximum, and the
13 light fixtures have to be designed so that they direct
14 light downward so that there is no glare on the
15 surrounding property owners.

16 So if this was approved and they came in for
17 a building permit for the parking lot, they would need
18 to submit a lighting plan showing that the lighting
19 requirements of the ordinance are met.

20 MR. KAHWAHJI: Thank you.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Can I ask the homeowner how
22 long you've been a resident?

23 MR. KAHWAHJI: I'm sorry?

24 MEMBER PRETZ: Can I ask you how long you've

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

27

1 been a resident?

2 MR. KAHWAHJI: I just purchased that house
3 two years now.

4 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

5 MR. KAHWAHJI: And my concern is the value
6 of the property and the traffic it's going to create
7 and these kids who play in the cul-de-sac. It's just
8 not making sense to me.

9 MEMBER PRETZ: Thank you.

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

12 Nothing else from the audience? All right.
13 Yes, sir?

14 MR. HATCHER: My name is Robert Hatcher,
15 H-a-t-c-h-e-r. I live at 1217 Pomeroy.

16 I guess I was a little disappointed about
17 the answer to the question about preventing a
18 connection onto Pomeroy Court. I mean, while it can
19 be written in the -- while it's not allowed, it sounds
20 like they could reopen it at any time by coming back
21 to the planning meeting.

22 I think that would be a disaster for the
23 court. It would destroy the traffic pattern and be
24 very dangerous. I don't like the possibility of that

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

28

1 being opened up at all.

2 I also want to reiterate some of the other
3 questions that were brought up about lighting and the
4 noise. Those are my concerns.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

6 Yes?

7 MR. PETERSON: Just a comment on the access.

8 There is no intention either by this design
9 or for future designs to ever put any access onto
10 Pomeroy Court. We realize that that would be --
11 because it's a cul-de-sac, it would be of no advantage
12 for us to do that. We have already a curb cut on
13 7th Avenue and a curb cut on 13th Avenue. There would
14 be no need for anything else.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So the applicant would
16 agree to having a restriction placed?

17 MR. PETERSON: Absolutely.

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

20 Anything else from the Plan Commission?

21 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a couple questions.

22 The first question for the applicant or
23 surrounding property owners, the parcel which is to
24 the immediate east of the parcel in question, 1208, I

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

29

1 believe, Pomeroy Court, that's where the fence would
2 be. It backs up to the existing lot where the
3 Salvation Army facility is.

4 Could you tell me, is there any kind of
5 screening on the -- I guess that would be the south
6 border of that property. So the backyard that's
7 facing the facility, is there any sort of screening
8 there?

9 MR. PETERSON: The rear of that yard is
10 screened. There is also a fence along there. Other
11 than the two trees you see there, there is no
12 additional screening.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: So that property owner has
14 screening on the rear of their yard?

15 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Did you contemplate any sort
17 of landscape screening on the north face of this
18 property, that is, the face that would be adjacent to
19 Pomeroy Court itself?

20 MR. PETERSON: That is shown on the plan.
21 Between the parking lot and Pomeroy Court, there is a
22 landscape buffer.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Could you just describe the
24 landscaping there, specifically the height of it and

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

30

1 what that would look like if you're viewing the parcel
2 from Pomeroy Court itself?

3 MR. PETERSON: Most of the small plants you
4 see there would be 4 to 6 feet in height with
5 variations in plants at the ground level. So there's
6 no additional mowing, et cetera, required within the
7 plant material.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

9 MR. PETERSON: But that would be subsequent
10 to further zoning regulations by the City as well.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: One additional question
12 regarding lighting. We heard a question about the
13 height of the lighting.

14 Now, the code would allow you to go up to
15 34 feet, approximately.

16 MR. PETERSON: We have no intention of going
17 that high. We will try to minimize the lighting as
18 much as possible. I realize that concern. I
19 understand it. We will be in conversation with the
20 City regarding that.

21 My approach in designing lighting has always
22 been to minimize that lighting, and I even follow the
23 guidelines by most parking lot people. So it would be
24 as minimal as we can make it.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

31

1 MEMBER DOYLE: Let me ask -- this is for you
2 as well as for Staff.

3 If the Plan Commission were to consider a
4 condition with its recommendation that restricted the
5 height of the lighting, what would be -- given that
6 the applicant has indicated an inclination to reduce
7 that height anyway, what would be a height that
8 would address community concerns on impacting
9 surrounding properties but not be overly restrictive
10 in terms of -- I mean, would 15 feet, 18 feet be
11 reasonable?

12 MR. COLBY: I was going to say 15 feet.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: 15 feet. Okay.

14 Those are all my questions.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any further
16 questions or comments from the Plan Commission?

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a comment.

18 An issue has come up here that I hadn't
19 expected. That seems to be the traffic on Pomeroy
20 Court. Actually, when I took my tour today and went
21 out to the site, I didn't realize it was not a through
22 street.

23 So I'm just wondering, Staff, or maybe this
24 can be brought in some other venue, is there signage

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

32

1 as you enter that street that says "No outlet"
2 presently? If there is, is it prominently displayed
3 as you come into your court?

4 MEMBER PRETZ: The answer is yes, Jim, there
5 is.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: There is?

7 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I did not see it. I've
9 lived there 11 years, and I haven't seen it.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: It's right on the corner.

11 MR. HATCHER: There's a sign, but it's hard
12 to see. When you make the turn, it's too late to
13 actually read the sign.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: All right. So maybe
15 that needs to be examined to some degree. I just
16 didn't realize that when I saw it. I just want to
17 make that part of the conversation.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a general question.

20 As far as the approval or nonapproval,
21 being a house of worship, what does the future hold
22 for any ordinances as far as expansion or how does
23 that work?

24 It was brought up as a concern. Is there

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

33

1 anything in place?

2 MR. COLBY: That would be a more appropriate
3 question for the applicant to respond to.

4 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I think they already did.

5 My question is: As far as expansion, I
6 believe you already addressed it, but what's the
7 five-year, ten-year plan? Do you have a five-year,
8 ten-year plan?

9 MR. PETERSON: We would like to create some
10 additional space, if that's possible, by purchasing
11 additional property along the contingent line, but it
12 would not be necessarily for parking. It would be
13 perhaps for a playground.

14 I don't have any idea what that time frame
15 might be. I might be long gone by that time.

16 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question
19 for the residents. Perhaps Mr. -- I'm sorry. I can't
20 pronounce your name.

21 MR. NAGENGAST: Nagengast.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Nagengast.

23 I'm looking at it on Google Maps. I see
24 what the site looks like now. If this is approved, is

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

34

1 there anything that you would like to see on the site
2 to buffer it?

3 I mean, now when you come from the south
4 heading north, you see a split-rail fence on two
5 corners coming up to it.

6 Would you like to see that continue? I
7 mean, would you like to have that there to block it?

8 Is there anything that you would like to
9 see, if it was approved, that would block that lot
10 from your sight?

11 MR. NAGENGAST: The landscaping, he
12 described the bushes as 4 to 6 feet. That's a little
13 taller than what I expected based on what's existing
14 along 7th Avenue. So that might be a little bit,
15 but --

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I wondered about
17 even a berm there on Pomeroy Court.

18 MR. NAGENGAST: Yeah, but it's not
19 residential. I bought into a residential area. It's
20 not going to be a residential area if it's got a
21 parking lot on the corner of the entrance to my
22 street. It's not a residential area.

23 He just admitted that they plan and hope to
24 continue building. That was my concern all along. So

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

35

1 the next house gives in and sells and the next house.
2 Pretty soon you've got houses on one side of the
3 street, and you've got parking lot and church on the
4 other side of the street on what used to be a
5 residential street, you know?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I understand. I do.
7 I have to ask this question.

8 Right now there isn't enough parking there
9 and they're there.

10 MR. NAGENGAST: And here's my concern.
11 Okay? Why did you put that huge building and plan all
12 this stuff if you didn't have parking to begin with?
13 Now you want to expand services and you want to expand
14 parking and just eat up the neighborhood.

15 There's a lot of businesses for sale that
16 already have huge parking lots, and they're for sale
17 already. Go get something that is more suited to your
18 needs, and don't eat up my neighborhood.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's an answer.
20 Thank you.

21 MR. NAGENGAST: Thank you, because I do
22 believe it's going to decrease the value of my
23 property.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

36

1 questions or comments? Brian?

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

3 So I'm just looking at the property history
4 here. I presume this entire area was residential
5 prior to 1962 when the original special use for a
6 place of worship was approved for the Church of the
7 Fox Valley First Church of Nazarene.

8 "The Salvation Army purchased the property
9 in 1992 and constructed the existing building in
10 2002."

11 This is a question for Staff. So at that
12 time when the new building was constructed in 2002 --
13 let me ask you this: Prior to 2002 was there
14 sufficient parking on the premises? I know there was
15 a code change in 2006.

16 What was the precedent that we had to deal
17 with between 1962 and 2002?

18 MR. COLBY: We don't have that information
19 on the previous building.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Do you have
21 the information on this new building that was built
22 in '92?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes. There's a table in the
24 Staff Report -- it's on Page 4 -- that lists the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

37

1 parking requirement that would apply now. It also
2 lists the amount of off-street parking that exists
3 today.

4 In the discussion that's there as well,
5 there's also a reference to the previous ordinance
6 requirement. Under the ordinance in effect in 2002,
7 42 spaces would have been required.

8 We were unable to determine how the building
9 was able to be constructed and now only have 34 spaces
10 today. It's possible that that may have been due to
11 changes in how the parking lot was striped, something
12 like that, but that's the historical information we
13 have on the parking count.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: As far as you know,
15 that site met the parking requirement in '92 when the
16 building was built?

17 MR. COLBY: In 2002?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 2002. I'm sorry.
19 Yes.

20 MR. COLBY: We would assume so.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This is for the
23 applicant. If the City Council does not allow this
24 application or denies the application, does the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

38

1 Salvation Army have the ability to reconfigure the
2 existing lot to add more spaces?

3 MR. PETERSON: No. We are right up to the
4 boundaries of the setbacks at this point in time.

5 Originally when the -- I was on the
6 Salvation Army Board when the building was built, and
7 we were told by the City that a number of parking
8 spaces on 13th Avenue would suffice to make up our
9 difference between the required and the --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So it was shared
11 off-street?

12 MR. PETERSON: It was shared off-street,
13 right.

14 MR. COLBY: And just to clarify, our zoning
15 ordinance currently in effect does not allow property
16 in this zoning district to utilize on-street spaces to
17 meet its requirement. It might have been allowed with
18 the zoning that was in effect then.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is that only allowed in
20 CBD-1 and -2?

21 MR. COLBY: Correct.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: Can I ask a follow-up?

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

24 MEMBER DOYLE: So often when we have

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

39

1 rezoning, one of the considerations that the Plan
2 Commission and the City Council have to consider is
3 whether it creates nonconformities.

4 Now, I acknowledge that we can't say for
5 certain whether there was a nonconformity before. It
6 would appear that at least the zoning change in 2006
7 at best increased it -- or say it increased the
8 nonconformity; right?

9 MR. COLBY: Correct.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: It either increased the
11 nonconformity or it made the nonconformity worse.

12 MR. COLBY: That is correct.

13 MEMBER DOYLE: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions or
15 comments?

16 MR. HATCHER: I just want to state for the
17 record that I bought my property in 2001. So it was
18 not a big, humongous building at the time.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything else
20 from the Plan Commission?

21 Does the applicant wish to offer any further
22 testimony or rebuttal?

23 MR. PETERSON: Well, we certainly would
24 consider all of these issues. We would be willing to

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

40

1 meet with those concerned to improve our plan within
2 reasonable limits.

3 We can increase the berming. That's not a
4 problem. We can reduce the lighting. The lighting is
5 required. If we put the parking lot in, we have to
6 put lighting in.

7 I understand the concerns. I would hope
8 that we can override some of those, if not all of
9 them, and we are certainly willing to work with anyone
10 that wants to work with us.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Plan
12 Commissioners?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to just
14 make a couple of comments.

15 I understand that the Salvation Army has the
16 need for more parking. I think the City in our
17 ordinance, in fact, requires the need for more parking
18 for the size of that building.

19 I can't speak to what happened in the past
20 or why there isn't enough parking on that site, but
21 I also feel for the residents in that neighborhood.
22 I mean, we have a church in a neighborhood. It's
23 been there. The property has been zoned for a church
24 since 1962, but it was a church that apparently fit

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

41

1 the site. Now the new building is there. While it
2 may fit the site, it doesn't have the required
3 parking.

4 I have a concern about expanding that site
5 so that it includes more parking so we can meet the
6 standard, but I have a further concern in that the
7 Salvation Army, which God love the Salvation Army, is
8 quite open about the fact they would consider
9 expanding even further.

10 That's where I have a problem because I
11 think, you know, you're in a residential neighborhood.
12 Somehow it can't keep growing bigger and bigger and
13 bigger in a residential neighborhood.

14 Somebody made a comment -- I believe it was
15 one of the residents -- that there's properties around
16 town that could accommodate what the Salvation Army is
17 trying to do. So I'm very torn in the direction to go
18 with this.

19 Those are my comments.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
21 motion? If there's any further evidence -- go ahead,
22 Brian.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, do I make my comments
24 before or after the motion is made?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

42

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, we're up for action
2 on the next item. If we have enough evidence to close
3 the public hearing, then that's what would be in order
4 now.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'll make a motion
6 to close the public hearing.

7 MEMBER PRETZ: I'll second that.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
9 seconded.

10 Any discussion on the motion?

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: Macklin-Purdy.

18 MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

24 MEMBER WALLACE: All right. The public

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

43

1 hearing is closed, which moves us on to Item No. 7 on
2 the agenda, which is action on 1202 Pomeroy Court,
3 Salvation Army.

4 Is there a motion? Would you like to have
5 further discussion before a motion? Go ahead.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'd like to make a
7 motion to recommend to the City Council to deny the
8 application to amend Special Use Ordinance 1962-34 in
9 order to allow expansion of the Salvation Army parking
10 lot at 1710 South 7th Avenue.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second?

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

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

15 Discussion on the motion?

16 MR. COLBY: If I could just make a comment,
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 The Commission's recommendation will need to
19 reference the Findings of Fact. You will need to
20 identify which Findings of Fact the proposal is not
21 complying with and provide some explanation as to why
22 should the Plan Commission make a denial
23 recommendation.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would say that my

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

44

1 recommendation for denial would fall under Item C of
2 the Findings of Fact.

3 "Effect on Nearby Property: That the
4 Special Use will not be injurious to the use and
5 enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity
6 for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially
7 diminish or impair property values within the
8 neighborhood."

9 For those reasons that I stated, I am not as
10 opposed to expanding the parking lot to bring it to
11 current code, but what I think this does is it is
12 going to further expand that site within a residential
13 neighborhood. I think that's injurious to the
14 surrounding properties.

15 I think it would have some sort of effect on
16 development of the surrounding property, how anybody
17 would choose to improve any residential properties
18 around that parking lot.

19 So those would be my two items of Findings
20 of Fact.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I have a question.

22 Do we know any information about the
23 property value before and after what's currently here
24 now?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

45

1 Do we know anything about what effect this
2 current facility has had on the property value?

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We didn't have any
4 evidence presented in favor of the contention that
5 property value would be adversely affected. So the
6 only thing we have to go on are kind of antidotal
7 statements that property value would be adversely
8 affected.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I would also add
10 to that that seldom in our findings do we ever have
11 empirical evidence that could prove that.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's difficult.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It's very difficult
14 to prove that. While I read that and that is part
15 of the Findings of Fact, I wouldn't hang my hat on
16 that.

17 What I would hang my hat on is it's
18 injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property
19 in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already
20 provided.

21 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Well, I guess in the
22 adverse, I guess I would ask: If the Salvation Army
23 continues to grow, what kind of effect will a big,
24 huge, empty building, if they move, have on the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

46

1 property value?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It could be a
3 church. It was a church once. It was purchased again
4 as a church. It could be purchased again as a church.
5 I mean, that would be the third time.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The issue that I have
7 with denying their application is the bigger picture
8 of us placing into effect a zoning ordinance that
9 requires a certain number of spaces for a building
10 this size; and now when they're coming in trying to
11 spend their own money to create these spaces, we're
12 recommending denial of that application.

13 So I guess I have a more basic issue with
14 that.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would agree with
16 you.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian?

18 MEMBER DOYLE: Tim, I agree that Finding of
19 Fact C is the one that is really -- what I'm thinking
20 about is whether the effect on nearby property is
21 caused by this application for special use or whether
22 the effect is preexisting.

23 We've heard testimony tonight that we
24 already have cars that are parking on 13th Street. In

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

47

1 fact, we heard testimony that presumably the
2 application for special use in 2002 would have been
3 predicated on shared parking on the street.

4 We've also heard testimony that we have
5 motorists who are already cutting into or driving down
6 Pomeroy Court in their effort to find parking and then
7 racing around the turnabout prior to any new
8 application for special use. So some of the negative
9 effects on the surrounding properties and the
10 surrounding community already exist.

11 Well, I think the City sort of, right or
12 wrong, laid the foundation of this problem in prior
13 actions. It created an intensified nonconformity in
14 2006. It approved special uses in 2002.

15 So we have these precedents that I think
16 have to come into the conversation and have to be
17 considered in terms of, as Chairman Wallace said,
18 weighing the existing problems with something that is
19 in nonconformity right now with the risk and sort of
20 the increased slide and the issue of this property
21 taking over the surrounding neighborhood.

22 I would say that at this point we're only
23 recommending for a single application for special use.
24 Anything beyond that in the future is speculative and

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

48

1 would come under the review of the Plan Commission and
2 the City Council.

3 It would be incumbent on the Plan Commission
4 and the City Council and the community at that time to
5 make that judgment in the future.

6 We can't procedurally limit the freedom of a
7 future deliberative body to make that recommendation.
8 All we can act upon is the information that we have in
9 front of us today.

10 I would like to ask to consider whether or
11 not certain conditions on the application, such as
12 limiting the ability of the property owner to make a
13 curb cut on Pomeroy Court at any point in the future,
14 such as limiting the height of light fixtures on the
15 property, and perhaps increasing the height of
16 landscape screening on Pomeroy Court would mitigate
17 our concerns and mitigate the legitimate concerns of
18 the community in terms of preserving the residential
19 character.

20 If we could come to that determination, then
21 I would say that we might be able to find Finding of
22 Fact C in the affirmative.

23 Those are my comments.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other discussion on

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

49

1 the motion? Seeing none, Tim, roll call.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: No.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: No.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

7 MEMBER SCHUETZ: No.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Macklin-Purdy.

9 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: No.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: No.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That motion fails by a
16 vote of one to six.

17 Any other motions?

18 MEMBER DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a
19 motion to recommend approval of the special use as
20 detailed in the Staff Memo with three conditions:

21 Condition 1, that there shall be no curb cut
22 on Pomeroy Court now or in the future.

23 Condition 2, that the height of lighting
24 fixtures on the parcel in question shall be limited to

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

50

1 15 feet in height.

2 Condition 3, that the applicant shall work
3 with the City Staff to make reasonable accommodations
4 to increase the height of the landscaping screening on
5 the north side of the parcel on Pomeroy Court.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I would like to add to
7 that not only on the north side, the east side along
8 the fence there. There was talk about that by the
9 homeowner directly next to that. So that was brought
10 up.

11 MEMBER PRETZ: 1208.

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So the height of those
13 sign heights need to be to the level that they are
14 above the 6-foot-high fence. So however you want
15 to blend that in there, you're better at that than I
16 am.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian, would you like to
18 include that in as a condition?

19 MEMBER DOYLE: I would say that that is an
20 issue between that particular property owner and the
21 applicant.

22 We heard testimony that the property owner
23 on that parcel to the east already has screening on
24 his property. I would suggest that that be offered as

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

51

1 a motion to amend and that the Commission be --

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me make sure that I'm
3 clear on the conditions.

4 Your motion is to recommend approval with
5 the conditions of, one, that there be a restriction to
6 access to Pomeroy Court --

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: -- two, that the lights
9 be limited to 15 feet in height; and three, that the
10 applicant make, shall we say, a genuine effort to work
11 with City Staff to increase landscaping in a way that
12 would screen the property and maintain the residential
13 character of the neighborhood?

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

15 My main motion is for that screening to be
16 on the north side of the property facing Pomeroy
17 Court. I would prefer that that remain the main
18 motion and the Plan Commission consider a motion to
19 amend for any future conditions.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Before we second, can I just
21 state the applicant said that he would work and
22 provide additional landscaping to the resident at
23 1208 by moving the parking lot. So he's already
24 agreed to do that.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

52

1 So maybe it still could be part of yours,
2 but I'll leave that up to you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, the way it's worded
4 right now, it's on the north side of the property.
5 Let's take a second on that.

6 Is there a second on that motion?

7 MEMBER PRETZ: I would second it.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. And for the
9 discussion on the motion, if you wish to make an
10 amendment to the motion, you can -- or anyone.

11 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I wish to amend that in
12 regards to the screening of the landscaping, as
13 discussed earlier here, but I want to see that part
14 of the motion that we're taking care of that east
15 side.

16 The idea was to move the parking lot a
17 little further to the west closer to 7th Street so we
18 could put bigger landscaping trees along that fence.
19 I think that's essential.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So Jim, are you
21 making an amendment for additional screening on the
22 east side of the parking lot?

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: The east side of the
24 parking lot.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

53

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just as far as what we're
2 saying here, we've already placed three conditions
3 on the main motion to a recommendation for approval.

4 So would that be placing a fourth condition?
5 That would probably be the cleanest way to do it.

6 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I suppose so.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Your motion is to amend
8 and place a fourth condition for the applicant to work
9 with City Staff to move the parking lot and place
10 additional landscaping along the east side of the
11 property, as discussed during the public hearing?

12 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Is there a second to the
14 motion to amend?

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I'll second it.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and
17 seconded.

18 Go ahead and do roll call.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This is on the
20 amendment?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This is the motion to
22 amend.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes or no.

24 Holderfield.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

54

1 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.
2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.
3 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.
4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.
5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yes.
6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Macklin-Purdy.
7 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.
9 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.
10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.
11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.
12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.
13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That now becomes the main
14 motion, which is to recommend approval with those four
15 conditions.
16 Further discussion on that motion?
17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: On the motion or on
18 the amendment?
19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Just on the motion
20 because the amendment has already passed.
21 So any discussion on the motion?
22 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a question.
23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian?
24 MEMBER DOYLE: I have one question for the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

55

1 City Staff about how we convey to the Council that
2 this is a conditional recommendation to approve and
3 make it clear that our recommendation to approve is
4 conditional.

5 I know in the past that on certain minutes
6 that we see after the fact, you know, I'm concerned
7 that sometimes the Council may say "We approved
8 without condition," and it shows that it accepted the
9 Plan Commission's recommendation to approve.

10 So in this case I think given the concerns
11 of the community, it would be particularly important
12 for us to make that crystal clear.

13 MR. COLBY: Yes. We can highlight that
14 when the recommendation is presented to the City
15 Council.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: One of the other things
17 is that the City Council -- or we've had discussion as
18 a body here to send a representative to the City
19 Council in cases where it's something that's not
20 routine, such as a denial or a recommendation for
21 approval with conditions.

22 Tim, I believe, is intending on being in the
23 Planning and Development Committee meeting.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'll speak to

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

56

1 whatever recommendation we have.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: In terms of comment, just to
3 reiterate, I think that many of the effects on the
4 property are preexisting.

5 I believe that this motion strikes a balance
6 between providing relief to the community from those
7 effects and also limiting any additional effects and
8 mitigating those additional effects that would be
9 created by this particular application.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Brian, I do agree
11 with everything you say. I'm glad this is on record
12 because I know how difficult it is for Staff to find
13 history on why certain things were done 30, 40, 50
14 years ago and even 15 years ago.

15 I want to highlight my reasons for moving
16 forward with the denial. It is simply that while I
17 agree with you that this is mitigating some existing
18 conditions, it is bringing the property up to current
19 standards, I'm concerned that this property is ripe
20 for doing exactly what some residents have suggested,
21 and that is continuing to expand in a residential
22 area.

23 I hope we're on the Plan Commission when
24 that occurs, and I want future Plan Commissions to

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

57

1 understand what happened here, that we need to limit
2 that. It is up to future commissions and bodies to
3 make that decision.

4 They've made no bones about the fact that
5 that is a consideration, and my recommendation on that
6 information would be "If you need to expand, start
7 looking around town. There's a lot of beautiful
8 sites."

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Further
10 discussion on the motion?

11 Seeing none, call the vote.

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: Macklin-Purdy.

19 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, no.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

58

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. That passes
2 by a vote of six to one, and that concludes Item No. 7
3 on our agenda.

4 Moving on or back, as the case may be, to
5 Item No. 5, Hillcroft Townhomes, 1147 Geneva Road
6 (Hillcroft Estates, LLC).

7 What's before us tonight is an application
8 for a Concept Plan. The Plan Commission, in addition
9 to conducting public hearings for the City Council,
10 will also give applicants the opportunity to come
11 before with us with a Concept Plan.

12 What a Concept Plan is, before an applicant
13 spends a substantial amount of money on doing all the
14 things that are required for a formal plan before the
15 Plan Commission, this gives the applicant the ability
16 to just kind of put it up the flagpole and see what we
17 think about it.

18 It's an informal plan. Even though there's
19 a court reporter here for our public hearing, this
20 isn't something that is subject to the same rules as a
21 public hearing. It's really an opportunity for the
22 applicant to say, "Here's what we plan on doing," and
23 for the Plan Commission to give feedback.

24 Now, at the end of tonight's Concept Plan

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

59

1 review, nothing will happen. The City will not do
2 anything. If the applicant wants this to go forward,
3 they have to submit an application to the City.

4 So at that point in time, depending on what
5 the application is, most likely the Plan Commission
6 will conduct a public hearing and vote on whether to
7 recommend approval or denial to the City Council. So
8 this is really the first step in our procedure
9 tonight.

10 Now, along those same lines, usually we will
11 limit a Concept Plan hearing review to the developer
12 showing us what he intends on doing. As a courtesy,
13 we give members of the audience the ability to ask
14 questions. If there's anything that's unclear or that
15 requires clarification, then we as a courtesy will
16 allow members of the public to do that.

17 Really, it's a chance for Plan Commissioners
18 to let the applicant know the aspects that they do and
19 do not like about the intended plan.

20 Staff, did you have anything before we go to
21 the applicant for the Concept Plan review?

22 MR. COLBY: No.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: At this point in time
24 I'll turn to the applicant.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

60

1 How long do you think your presentation will
2 take?

3 MR. MARSHALL: Less than ten minutes.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

5 MR. MARSHALL: My name is Dan Marshall,
6 M-a-r-s-h-a-l-l, and the address is 812 East Main
7 Street, St. Charles. I'm from Marshall Architects,
8 and I'm here representing the applicant. We designed
9 this project with them.

10 The project consists of four buildings.
11 There's two two-unit buildings on Geneva Road, which
12 is Route 31, and two four-unit buildings set back
13 behind those two units.

14 The plan was shaped, and the road that we're
15 proposing, a private driveway, is shaped in a tee to
16 maximize the fire truck entrance to the site for
17 safety and to allow the buildings to be built in a way
18 that would maximize the site.

19 The site has quite of bit of topography on
20 it, if you've driven by it. There's a large hill.
21 It's got an existing single-family house that would
22 come down.

23 The two buildings on Geneva Road are
24 first-floor master, two-unit townhomes, and they're

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

61

1 story-and-a-half buildings. Those buildings primarily
2 look like one-story buildings. There are some dormers
3 coming out of the attic. Because of the hill, they
4 have a lookout basement, a half basement sticking out
5 of the ground facing Route 31.

6 The buildings behind that are the four-unit
7 buildings. They are what we call walk-up townhomes.
8 They have garages on the first floor, a small space
9 behind the garages, and then the living space on the
10 second floor and bedrooms above that.

11 These buildings are dug into the hill per se
12 so that on the backside they -- on the north side of
13 the north building, which is Building 4 on your
14 screen, that building will appear as a
15 story-and-a-half building. A whole story and a half
16 is sunk into the hill.

17 As you go south from there, the hill falls
18 away; and at the very south end of Building 3, it
19 becomes a two-and-a-half-story building where half of
20 the basement or the grade level from the east side is
21 sticking out of the ground.

22 So those buildings, the hill is sloping up
23 against the backside of those buildings. We're
24 attempting to leave the -- 24 feet away from the back

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

62

1 property line there's a heavy tree line there, which
2 we'd like to maintain.

3 We're sensitive to our neighbors. We'd like
4 to work with the neighbors to make sure this is a good
5 project for the whole community. We believe that this
6 project would be beneficial for the community because
7 we believe that this kind of density is good for the
8 community.

9 It brings in tax revenue. It brings in
10 people to the downtown. As you know, I'm also
11 involved in some downtown projects where we are
12 putting in retail and office space. What we have
13 heard is that some of the main retailers would be more
14 prone to move to St. Charles if we had higher
15 densities.

16 We are consistent with the densities in the
17 property to the south, which is The Oaks, and then to
18 the east there's the Willowgate town houses and the
19 Park View Apartments -- I can't remember the name
20 exactly --

21 MEMBER PRETZ: Park Shore.

22 MR. MARSHALL: -- Park Shore Apartments.

23 There's also higher-density projects going
24 further south on 31, including a 32-unit project on

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

63

1 Stevens Street in Geneva.

2 So this is a trend that we're seeing in city
3 planning. This is a very high-quality project that is
4 beneficial for home values in the area. It's the type
5 of residence we expect will be paying a significant
6 amount of taxes, yet probably not putting a
7 significant amount of students into the school system
8 or overburdening our infrastructure in any way.

9 What else can I answer?

10 The materials are stucco and stone, cement
11 stucco and stone, not synthetic stucco and stone,
12 high-end materials, as I said.

13 We haven't proposed a landscape plan yet
14 because part of this concept hearing, as Chairman
15 Wallace said, is that we're trying get some feedback
16 from everybody without spending too much on that.
17 Our next step would be to provide a landscape plan
18 that would help answer some more questions about
19 that.

20 Anything else you guys want me to say?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Dan, can you describe
22 what the elevation is from the houses at the end of
23 McKinley Street, so like from the backyards of those
24 houses, what happens -- I know that there's a pretty

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

64

1 good drop after those houses.

2 How many feet does it drop from the back of
3 the property down to the front?

4 MR. MARSHALL: About 30 feet overall from
5 the very north corner to the northwest corner to the
6 southeast corner.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: At the houses,
9 though, it's not quite that much because doesn't it
10 drop to the south?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah. Along that west
12 property line? Is that what you're asking?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes, the west
14 property line.

15 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I can tell you that.
16 That would drop about 15 1/2 feet.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 15 1/2 feet?

18 MR. MARSHALL: 15 1/2 feet across that line
19 because on the north end of Building 4 we're about
20 23 feet from the ground. Well, that's not even true.
21 It's much less than that where the existing ground is.
22 We're probably 15 feet from there.

23 Really, that's where we're going to cut down
24 right against the building. Really, we're more like

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

65

1 18 feet across that.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm interested in
3 that topography and how they go. I guess the real
4 question to me would be: What's going to be the
5 elevation of the building directly behind the two
6 houses at the cul-de-sac compared to those two
7 houses?

8 Where would the ridge of the buildings be
9 compared to -- I'm looking at it on Google Maps. You
10 don't have it.

11 Do you want to look at mine?

12 MR. MARSHALL: This one is Building 4, so
13 that's the north unit.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's the north
15 unit, right. Okay.

16 MR. MARSHALL: And you can see where the
17 hill is up against on the left side of that. So
18 that's about a story and a half out of the ground.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. A story and a
20 half out of the ground?

21 MR. MARSHALL: I believe those houses are a
22 story-and-a-half to two-story houses.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You don't really
24 have any elevation --you don't have any measurement of

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

66

1 that ridge line at the west end there?

2 MR. MARSHALL: I do. It's back on my --

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Oh, here it is.

4 38 feet? No, that's not the west end.

5 MR. MARSHALL: This one shows you that on
6 Building 4 -- this is kind of combined elevation in
7 the black and white scheme where Building 4 is 23 feet
8 off of the grade that we're cutting down; but up right
9 against the building right on the side, it's actually
10 higher than that.

11 Again, these are preliminary drawings.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I understand.

13 MR. MARSHALL: It's been changing even since
14 I turned this in. The colored ones are more up to
15 date than the black and white ones.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm just trying to
17 get a sense of if I'm standing in the back yard of
18 one of the houses, where this building is going to
19 fall.

20 MR. MARSHALL: I believe that they're going
21 to be pretty consistent with the heights of those
22 houses, possibly even lower in that it continues to go
23 up a little bit there.

24 So as I said, on a north end it's a story

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

67

1 and a half, which looks like that. See, these
2 buildings -- even on the south end of this Building 4
3 is only a two-story building. That basement floor,
4 just like a two-story house, is sunk into the ground.
5 So that garage level is all underground. It would be
6 like parking under your house.

7 As you go to Building 3 and the grade
8 keeps falling away -- right there -- you can see how
9 it's become a two-and-a-half story. It's like a
10 two-story house with a lookout basement.

11 They have some little decks, too, so that
12 when you come out of your first floor you don't fall.
13 You have a little deck there, which is pretty typical
14 of any house on a hill.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Mr. Holderfield?

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes, I have a question.

17 This two-and-a-half-story, story-and-a-half
18 Concept Plan that we were given talked about
19 two-story, three-story structures.

20 So to clarify, when we're looking at this,
21 just so we're all on the same page, you're calling the
22 basement a half story?

23 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

24 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: And then there's no

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

68

1 attic?

2 MR. MARSHALL: There's no attic story on
3 these, no. It's actually a pretty low roof because
4 similar to, say, the Brownstones, the front-to-back
5 pitch on this is pretty low.

6 So the ridge height -- and they're very
7 small footprints in that they have a two-car garage
8 and a small room behind them. They're not really
9 deep buildings, and the ridge doesn't come up really
10 high.

11 We get some architectural interest by
12 turning the gables perpendicular to the main ridge,
13 and that's where we can get some steepness to get a
14 traditional lookout. That keeps the roofs low, but it
15 doesn't allow you to do a lot of attic space.

16 Compare that to -- we built these buildings,
17 the front buildings, Geneva Road buildings. They have
18 a taller pitch, which allows you to do some rooms up
19 in there and pop-out dormers for that. So that's why
20 I call these one-and-a-half-story buildings in that
21 they've got that half story that comes out of the
22 attic.

23 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: But you're not counting
24 the basement --

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

69

1 MR. MARSHALL: I'm not counting the
2 basement.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- on this one?

4 MR. MARSHALL: On this one, right, because
5 these you park on this main level. That's your main
6 level, where the other ones you're parking in that
7 basement level.

8 Really, it's like that. There we go.
9 That's the front side.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So that would be the
11 two-and-a-half?

12 MR. MARSHALL: That's a three-story building
13 from that side.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: From that side --

15 MR. MARSHALL: From that side.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: -- depending on which
17 side you look at it.

18 MR. MARSHALL: Correct, yeah.

19 I think the question was how would they
20 look from the west. From the west, they go from a
21 two-and-a-half-story building to a
22 one-and-a-half-story building.

23 It would even be better to see the sides of
24 the building where you can see how it slopes towards

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

70

1 the right towards the east, which turns into a full
2 story on that side; but if you go to the other side
3 here, there's quite a big hill. We've kind of used
4 that hill to slope down on both sides and reduce the
5 height from that side.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: This facade here, would it
7 face the homeowners at all?

8 MR. MARSHALL: It faces north. So there's
9 no home -- there are north homeowners, but they're
10 pretty far away.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: So this is the end of the
12 building?

13 MR. MARSHALL: This is the north end of the
14 building.

15 There are homes towards the north. They're
16 pretty far away. It's the side of the one home that's
17 on Geneva Road. Then the home behind that just barely
18 touches the property on a little corner.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: So you mentioned a buffer,
20 you know, a tree line --

21 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

22 MEMBER DOYLE: -- that's existing?

23 MR. MARSHALL: On the west side.

24 MR. DOYLE: Are those all deciduous?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

71

1 MR. MARSHALL: There's a mix in there,
2 deciduous and evergreens. There's more evergreens --
3 I believe towards the south end there are some
4 evergreens in there.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sorry. I have a question
6 for Staff.

7 In their application it says, "The current
8 zoning is RS-3 suburban family PUD."

9 Is it RS-3 currently?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes, it is RS-3. It's not
11 currently PUD.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's not currently PUD?

13 MR. COLBY: This site is not, no.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Why would they be doing a
15 PUD application instead of just a map amendment to
16 RM-1?

17 MR. COLBY: They have that option. There's
18 potential for certain zoning deviations to be
19 necessary based on their plan.

20 The primary one we identified is building
21 height measurement. If you were to look at this site
22 as one single lot, depending on how it's subdivided,
23 the building site is measured from the midpoint of the
24 front setback line.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

72

1 So it starts the building height measurement
2 down close to Route 31, which would make it difficult
3 to build out building height and occupy the entire
4 site, but there's potentially other factors.

5 From the City's perspective in terms of the
6 review process, it does allow us to be able to see
7 complete plans in terms of architecture, landscape
8 design, and engineering when the project is being
9 rezoned. So it does have benefit.

10 MEMBER PRETZ: So it should be a PUD is what
11 you're saying.

12 MR. COLBY: Ultimately, it's the property
13 owner's choice as to what they request.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: I didn't phrase it correctly.

15 But a PUD would be appropriate in order to
16 take care of the variances that they are talking about
17 in their Concept Plan in order to meet code?

18 MR. COLBY: Yes. It would be the only
19 mechanism to address the height.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't
21 phrase it right to begin with.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions? Brian?

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Two questions.

24 Could you go back to the site plan that

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

73

1 shows the -- in terms of -- so right now I see a gate
2 on the entrance --

3 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: -- of Private Lane.

5 Are there sidewalks displayed there?

6 Could you explain pedestrian ingress and
7 egress to these properties? Because there's a park
8 right across the street, and I can imagine --

9 MR. MARSHALL: That's a good point. We
10 haven't really addressed that yet.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: In terms of -- that would be
12 one thing that I'd say is with a park right across
13 the street, I can manage residents would want to walk
14 out.

15 MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Secondly, the properties,
17 typically the bigger properties, are very vertical.

18 MR. MARSHALL: I'm sorry. Which properties?

19 MEMBER DOYLE: The rear. Buildings 3 and 4
20 are very vertical.

21 A lot of times when we look at concept plans
22 or applicants come before us, they will tout living in
23 place or retiring in place and, you know, changing
24 demographics.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

74

1 Who is the target purchaser of these
2 properties? I mean, given that they are so vertical,
3 it makes me think that this would be a younger buyer.

4 MR. MARSHALL: Actually, we feel the target
5 purchaser is the baby-boomers. There are elevators
6 planned for these units.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Elevators?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Elevators, yeah, as were
9 planned for the Brownstone units. Some of them have
10 those.

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

12 MR. MARSHALL: That's becoming more and more
13 common, elevators within houses.

14 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Are we just taking
15 general comments here?

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let's do questions. I'll
17 turn to the audience for questions, also.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: All right. Go ahead, Tom.

19 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Are you done?

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes, I am.

21 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have one additional
22 question on that buffer in the back there that abuts
23 the homeowners.

24 What is it, 15, 20 feet deep now?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

75

1 MR. MARSHALL: 24 feet.

2 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Pardon me?

3 MR. MARSHALL: We're proposing the setback
4 to the buildings to be 24 feet.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: But then to the woods --
6 let's call it the buffer -- how deep is that buffer,
7 and do you plan on beefing it up, enhancing it?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yes. I would presume that we
9 would. It would be part of our landscape plan, fill
10 in any gaps that are in there.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any another
12 questions?

13 Questions from members of the audience?
14 Sir?

15 MR. MUSSER: Thank you. Good evening. I'm
16 Tom Musser, M-u-s-s-e-r, 40 McKinley, the property
17 directly behind.

18 My question was kind of covered, but the
19 first point of order, I have a presentation with my
20 concerns. I assume that's not available for
21 presentation tonight?

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What do you mean?

23 MR. MUSSER: We have three concerns.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

76

1 MR. MUSSER: One is the height and density,
2 especially to our properties. The changes in grade --
3 dramatic changes in grade, the retaining wall in
4 particular and what is seen from our properties.

5 From 43 McKinley it does look like a
6 three-story, two-and-a-half, and that's a dramatic
7 change.

8 The third is the tree line. There are some
9 old-growth trees, and we have questions -- I can show
10 you this -- about the retaining wall, how far it is
11 off the trees. We think it's within the tree drip
12 line, which is very dangerous for old-growth trees. I
13 don't have clarification as far as where exactly that
14 line is.

15 That's the end product for that line for the
16 retaining wall. To put in a retaining wall, my
17 understanding is you have to go in further to actually
18 make a retaining wall, to place a retaining wall, then
19 pack in material behind it; correct?

20 So the end product of that retaining wall as
21 it stands is within the drip line, which is dangerous
22 to these trees, but to have to move it even further to
23 create this would be even worse.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: How old are those

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

77

1 trees?

2 MS. MUSSER: 70 to 80 years.

3 MR. MUSSER: 70 to 80 years is an estimate.

4 MS. MUSSER: The oak trees, they have 24 to
5 30 inches diameter. They're very old.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Do you want the applicant
7 to answer?

8 MR. MUSSER: Yes, please.

9 MR. MCNALLY: I'm Maurice McNally.
10 M-c-N-a-l-l-y, 36W442 Hunters Gate Road, St. Charles.

11 The one thing I would like to say is as far
12 as the grade of the property, we know it was a
13 difficult site; and to be honest with you, I don't
14 think we've changed too much off the actual grids as
15 far as where they are existing right now.

16 It's not like we're going in and completely
17 creating a flat side. We're going in. We are digging
18 into the hill. On the one -- on the northwest corner,
19 which is the one elevation there, actually, in that
20 corner there it only shows as one story.

21 So I think, to be honest with you -- first
22 of all, what I should have said is that I apologize
23 that I didn't get to the homeowners behind me and to
24 the north of me. I was kind of waiting to get as many

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

78

1 colored elevations as we possibly could to make it
2 look as nice as possible so it would have been a
3 little bit more self-explanatory.

4 Moving forward, if any of you would like me
5 to come and meet with you individually, I'm happy to
6 do it.

7 As far as the tree line is concerned, that
8 was a concern for us, too. We wanted to steer back
9 24 feet. There are some beautiful trees there. I
10 have owned our property from 2001, and a year ago I
11 met a company called Big Trees that has a 110-inch
12 tree spear.

13 My plan is to -- there are some big,
14 beautiful evergreens on the property, and especially
15 on the southwest corner there's a little opening
16 there where the shed is. My goal was to take three of
17 those big evergreen trees and close that hole early
18 on.

19 So we're trying to save as much of that tree
20 line as possible. I know it's a nice tree line, and
21 that's why we stayed at 24 feet.

22 As far as the retainer walls, we have looked
23 very close into that. We're trying to get the
24 retainer walls to a point where we don't want to have

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

79

1 to put footings underneath them. So we want to keep
2 them tiered at approximately -- I think the code is
3 36 inches.

4 So we've looked at all that. Again, thank
5 you. Anybody that I can meet with and share any more,
6 I'm happy to do it.

7 MR. MARSHALL: I want to point one other
8 thing out.

9 There's a driveway along that west line
10 there. So those trees have grown with the paving not
11 too far from them as it is. The existing driveway
12 goes right along that tree line. So they've already
13 been growing with this paving there.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Can I just ask, you had
15 mentioned -- the applicant, you had mentioned a
16 110-inch tree mover.

17 MR. MCNALLY: Yes.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: Is the grade going to
19 prohibit that truck to come in and actually be able to
20 do that?

21 MR. MCNALLY: No. He thinks he can actually
22 come in and move those trees.

23 MEMBER PRETZ: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sir?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

80

1 MR. BYRGE: Hi. I'm Ken Byrge, B-y-r-g-e,
2 1206 Willowgate on the east side of the road there.

3 Is that pond that you see there the one
4 that's already existing or is that the new one?

5 MR. MARSHALL: That's a new one.

6 MR. BYRGE: We've had flooding problems on
7 that property. Every time there's a bad storm, the
8 water comes from the top of the hill, goes across 31,
9 and floods many of the houses we have there. They put
10 a retention pond in there last fall and into the
11 winter to eliminate some of that problem.

12 When I look up there, all I see is a lot of
13 concrete, asphalt, a lot of roofs, not enough to soak
14 up all of that rain coming through there.

15 So how do you plan to eliminate any runoff?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm sorry. Could
17 I please ask you sir, you live on Willowgate, you
18 said?

19 MR. BYRGE: Yes, 1206 Willowgate.

20 When there's a bad storm, it's like a river
21 coming down that hill. Right now at least there's
22 grass up there, and that will soak up most of that
23 stuff or at least some of it.

24 When you have nothing but asphalt and

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

81

1 concrete driveways and asphalt roofs, there's no --
2 are there four living units in each of the units up in
3 4 and 3 and 1 and 2?

4 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

5 MR. BYRGE: Thanks.

6 MR. MARSHALL: By doing a development like
7 this, you're subject to the Kane County Stormwater
8 Ordinance, which, as you may know, has become really
9 intensive, more intensive than it has been in the
10 past.

11 So we would be subject to meeting those
12 requirements and definitely not making it any worse
13 and probably making it better than the situation is.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The gist of that
15 ordinance is that you can't create any more runoff --
16 basically water runoff than there is existing
17 currently in the development.

18 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

19 There's coefficients for grass, paving,
20 rooftops. Everything is considered in that. It's not
21 an easy ordinance to meet, and I would hope that it
22 would make it better. I would hope that what The Oaks
23 did with their detention basin would have helped that
24 as well.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

82

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I want to ask, sir, have
2 you had any issues since The Oaks finished theirs?

3 MR. BYRGE: It's pretty new.

4 Well, actually, we have a pond that's right
5 between the front of my house and one of their houses,
6 and it's continuously filled up over the years with
7 sludge that came across from Highway 31.

8 We've got like a babbling brook that goes
9 all the way through to that, and it just accumulates
10 in each of the little retentions that are in there.
11 We're in the process now of digging that pond out.
12 It's basically not for our edification. It's strictly
13 a retention pond to reduce flooding.

14 It's to the point now where it used to be
15 fairly good-sized bodies of water, roughly the size of
16 this hole from here, that are almost completely filled
17 over with sludge that came in from above the river.

18 So our association is paying something like
19 \$90,000 to dig that out and put in new retainer walls
20 under the assumption that what was put up there has
21 eliminated some of those problems here.

22 So it's too early to tell if we'll have no
23 issues. Hopefully, it will be better. So that's the
24 concern we had over there.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

83

1 Again, when I look at this, I see an outline
2 of the building that's all asphalt. All the way
3 around the front of it, that tee slot coming in,
4 there's all asphalt or concrete driveway and just a
5 little bit of grass in the front.

6 So you're saying there's going to be a
7 retention pond. Is that just lower elevation so
8 water will accumulate, or is it actually just like
9 what is existing now? That lower recessed area, is
10 that --

11 MR. MARSHALL: That will be a detention
12 pond -- I mean, a retention basin.

13 MR. BYRGE: Yeah. It's not water in there
14 all the time. It will accumulate?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would like to
16 point one thing out. I wanted to say this at some
17 point.

18 You realize this is just a Concept Plan.
19 They don't have final engineering, which you will be
20 more than welcome to review before it's final, but
21 this is a Concept Plan.

22 MR. BYRGE: What they've come up with looked
23 real nice. The building is good.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The fact that it is

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

84

1 a Concept Plan, I'm glad you are all here so that we
2 can tell them, you and us, our concerns so that they
3 can go back to the drawing board.

4 Maurice has made the offer -- and I hope
5 that you take him up on it -- that he'll meet with you
6 so that he can help talk these concerns through
7 before they come to us with a plan because this is
8 just a concept. This is not a plan for our approval
9 at all.

10 MS. MUSSER: My name is Jeanette,
11 J-e-a-n-e-t-t-e, Musser, M-u-s-s-e-r. I live in the
12 property that says, I believe, "Lot 3" up there, and I
13 have a concern about the tree line.

14 I actually have a slide where I could
15 clarify my concerns, if you'll allow me to show it.
16 It's loaded already. I had spoken to Ellen. It was
17 my understanding that we would be able to show that to
18 you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure. Go ahead.

20 MS. MUSSER: Can you pull it up for me?

21 In the meantime, I have a question for
22 Mr. McNally about which trees you're talking about
23 moving.

24 Are they trees that are on the Hillcroft

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

85

1 property, or are you talking about moving the trees
2 that are in the tree line?

3 MR. MCNALLY: No, we would not touch any of
4 the trees that are in the tree line.

5 MS. MUSSER: Okay.

6 MR. MCNALLY: What we're talking about
7 are the evergreens that are in the middle of the
8 property.

9 MS. MUSSER: Okay. So this is my concern, if
10 you look at the slide up here. These four trees that
11 we've identified are very old oak trees.

12 It's not clear exactly where that retaining
13 wall lies, but I believe it's at least 25 feet from
14 the fence line. All four of these trees fall within
15 the property line of either our property or our
16 neighbors to the south in Lot 4 up there.

17 The retaining wall is underneath the drip
18 line of the trees. I know that currently there's a
19 driveway there, but the driveway is about 14 feet away
20 from the fence. So if they build that retaining wall,
21 they're going to be digging well under the tree line.

22 They're changing the drainage of the
23 property, potentially changing the amount of sunlight
24 that these trees get. So it's not just like putting

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

86

1 something where something already exists.

2 There's a huge potential to damage these
3 trees. They're irreplaceable. It's the only barrier
4 that we have between these and a monstrous-size
5 building behind us.

6 So I would like to see if they could get a
7 consulting arborist in there to assess the possibility
8 of keeping those trees alive when they're getting that
9 close because they've moved -- it's not only the
10 building. They have concrete patios planned under
11 there, too. So they're really disturbing the root
12 systems of all of those trees.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Sir?

15 MR. ARENDS: Hi, my name is John Arends,
16 A-r-e-n-d-s. I'm the owner of the property furthest
17 to the north. I guess it's Lot No. 2.

18 My question at this point, have any of you
19 walked the site or visually seen and been on the site
20 yet?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes.

22 MR. ARENDS: You have. Okay.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Many, many, many
24 times.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

87

1 MR. ARENDS: Many times. Okay. So you're
2 clear.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Many, many, times.

4 MR. ARENDS: The first question, while we're
5 on drainage, there's different coefficients and
6 ratings for grass and asphalt.

7 What end of the scale? I'm not in that
8 business. Does grass absorb more water?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That would be part
10 of the engineering plan, which they haven't presented
11 to us yet.

12 MR. ARENDS: Well, the entire site is grass
13 right now. The entire site is going to be a 48-car
14 parking lot with residences on top. I didn't hear
15 that brought out. We have 48 cars coming in there.
16 It's entirely paved now.

17 So my question is: Will that improve
18 drainage over the current status of the site or tip it
19 the other way?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I think what
21 Chairman Wallace pointed out and we pointed out as
22 well is that they have to meet the Kane County
23 Stormwater Management Code if they move forward with
24 this.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

88

1 That requires them to at least -- they have
2 to at least keep it the way it is, if not improve it.
3 It's more likely that it would be improved through the
4 stringent code of the Kane County Stormwater
5 Management, but we can't speak to that only because
6 they haven't come to us with an engineering plan
7 yet.

8 If this concept -- if what they take out of
9 here causes them to come back with a plan, at that
10 point we would have that information; but the
11 likelihood is that it would improve the stormwater
12 management on the site.

13 MR. ARENDS: So all of the development on
14 top would manage the water flow more than its current
15 natural state?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm going to be
17 perfectly honest with you. I'm not an engineer.

18 MR. ARENDS: And I'm not either.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: That's why we wait
20 for the engineering plan because we can't speak to it
21 until we see it, but the code does require them to
22 meet certain stormwater management.

23 MR. ARENDS: Understood.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: As Dan pointed out,

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

89

1 it's pretty stringent.

2 I mean, it's not something that they're just
3 going to be able to build there and it's going to be
4 washing across 31 and the property below. There are
5 safeguards in place to mitigate that and most likely
6 improve it; but until we get it, I apologize, we just
7 can't speak to it.

8 MR. ARENDS: That's okay.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I'm going to be
10 perfectly honest with you. I'm not an engineer.

11 MR. ARENDS: I'm not either. Thank you for
12 that.

13 Where that concern is coming from is we have
14 lived in our house since 1993. So we have over 20
15 years of living in this particular spot at the end of
16 the cul-de-sac at the bottom of McKinley. Essentially
17 our side backyard overlooks the current yellow house
18 that is there, and we have a clear sight line. We
19 can see the east bank of the Fox and the trees over
20 there.

21 There's a characteristic to that that makes
22 it a very special place for everyone in that PUD, but
23 especially for the three lots that we have down at the
24 end. It is an enormous -- it is just an entire

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

90

1 flipping of the character of that parcel that this
2 particular concept comes in with such a heavy
3 footprint.

4 It's quite literally, in terms of just
5 visualizing from the top, it's taking one of the
6 Brownstones and putting it on the highest part of this
7 parcel, which is essentially putting a wall 24 feet
8 from our property lines.

9 Those are 4-foot lightings. So it's from
10 that to that second down thing. That's 24 feet. So
11 currently we have a residence there. It's currently
12 zoned for single-family residences.

13 I understand Maurice's need to maximize the
14 value of his property, but a change of this magnitude
15 goes to all sorts of questions in changing the
16 character of what we have, which goes right to the
17 value of those three properties and the experience of
18 living there.

19 The experience is going from, in that span
20 of space we are going to see, depending on if you're
21 on the north or the south, a 24-foot to a 30-foot wall
22 because those are just straight across. They're not
23 single-family residences.

24 Down at the bottom, that wall is going to be

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

91

1 close to 40 feet. If you cut that in half, there's a
2 retaining wall through 2 thirds of it.

3 My question is specifically I thought I
4 heard that we're taking -- from a two-and-a-half-story
5 building, we're putting a story and a half into the
6 ground, is that correct, to keep the sight -- the roof
7 line height of Building No. 4 down in that northwest
8 corner, I guess how to do that? How many feet is a
9 story and a half?

10 How deep is that retention wall going to be
11 right at that northwest corner is my question.

12 MR. MARSHALL: Thank you for your comments.

13 The cool thing about this design is that
14 first story is like a garage in a basement space. So
15 We're not cutting a retaining wall the depth of that
16 first story. We're losing about 10 feet of that
17 height by going underground.

18 So the retaining wall isn't that tall. The
19 retaining wall is only -- on the very north end, it's
20 one story. As you go down the hill, the retaining
21 wall gets smaller and smaller.

22 MR. ARENDS: Okay. So right at the bend in
23 the top of the fourth it's -- how many feet is a
24 story? I don't know. I'm not an engineer.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

92

1 And what that gets to is the construction of
2 a retaining wall that is -- I don't have -- Staff,
3 what is one story? How many feet?

4 MR. MARSHALL: About 10 feet.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Probably 10 feet.

6 MR. ARENDS: Okay. So we have a 10-foot
7 retaining wall. I guess it's a little bit below those
8 lines.

9 The thickness of that thing to be
10 structurally stable, not speaking as an engineer,
11 there is some depth to that. So if we are working
12 with just this amount, that's 16 and that's 8 feet.
13 That's 24 feet; right?

14 We're going to have about three actual cuts
15 in digging on that north side of that screening,
16 10 feet and stuff behind, which will really tear into
17 the screening and the trees that are there.

18 So we're not only losing our current sight
19 lines, the stuff that is there that blocks it half
20 the time of the year when the leaves are out is going
21 to be decimated by packing this much into this parcel.

22 I guess that would be my chief concern is to
23 do the zoning to put that many units will really
24 decimate and affect our property values and the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

93

1 character of the place.

2 We do have The Oaks to the south. We do
3 have multifamily across 31; but it comes down to you
4 folks to mitigate how much more we allow that to creep
5 up into the old west side, which is residential and
6 which is currently zoned as that.

7 So those are the comments. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you. All right.

9 MS. SPIERS: Theresa Spiers, S-p-i-e-r-s,
10 15 Horne Street.

11 The deciduous tree in the corner, which we
12 don't see on this lot -- I don't know if I'm allowed
13 to flip the screen or if somebody can here, the site
14 analysis, the far end to the right.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: 15 Horne Street, are
16 you the third house up?

17 MS. SPIERS: I'm in the corner, second house
18 from 1101 Geneva.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: The second house up.
20 Okay.

21 MS. SPIERS: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Got you.

23 MS. SPIERS: Thank you.

24 We have a deciduous tree, I believe, in the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

94

1 northwest corner. First of all, you said that that
2 was heavily landscaped. It is not. There is nothing
3 in that corner, and we are not far set back. We are
4 close.

5 The current house that's on that lot, how
6 high is that, the house you want to take down? Does
7 anyone know?

8 MR. MARSHALL: It's over 30 feet. It's two
9 stories plus a roof.

10 MS. SPIERS: So do you know the current
11 height?

12 MR. MARSHALL: I don't know it exactly, but
13 it's two stories plus a roof. So it's probably about
14 30 feet.

15 MS. SPIERS: So on this plan you're showing
16 33 1/2 feet, Building 4.

17 MR. MARSHALL: It will not be over the top
18 of that hill there.

19 MS. SPIERS: Okay. According to the current
20 structure of the residential home that's on there now
21 and Building 4, what is going to be the height
22 difference?

23 MR. MARSHALL: It will be lower than that.

24 MS. SPIERS: How much lower, do you know?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

95

1 MR. MARSHALL: This is a Concept Plan.
2 Approximately, I'd say, about 10 feet lower than that,
3 10 to 15 feet lower.

4 MS. SPIERS: And currently from that corner,
5 how far in would that go? I'm thinking -- I'm seeing
6 here 50 feet, roughly.

7 Is it in the same position as that house?

8 MR. MARSHALL: It's a little farther south
9 than that house. That house wraps a little farther
10 north around the tree, I believe.

11 MS. SPIERS: The character integrity of what
12 we love in that area is that, first of all, it's dark,
13 it's quiet, and our view.

14 By putting these four massive buildings in
15 there, we lose all that. I don't know what type of
16 lighting, if that would even be an issue, but we're
17 talking significantly -- what -- 12 families versus
18 one family on that lot. That changes things quite a
19 bit.

20 That corner has no landscaping. It
21 definitely has no evergreens in that area. It's a
22 deciduous tree. It's not healthy at that end. I'd
23 like to see something done about that.

24 But furthermore, what I'm really going to be

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

96

1 avid about suggesting -- I'm hoping that you have an
2 open ear for this because we all love our properties
3 and we love our views. My home particularly is a
4 wrap-around with all glass walls. I'm going to lose
5 my privacy with all these homes. I enjoy looking out
6 and seeing the empty space that I see now.

7 I would love to propose, if I may -- I would
8 love to see -- I see many different options on this
9 lot. I think that's great. These buildings look
10 terrific; but instead of putting up four buildings and
11 especially four and five so far to the back and all
12 these issues that we're talking about, why can't we
13 just stick the buildings closer to Geneva on Route 31
14 and add more green space in the back where these
15 residents are, maybe put in three buildings up toward
16 the front and leave the whole back area open for these
17 particular residents to enjoy their space with bigger
18 backyards?

19 Just some options to consider. It's not
20 that we don't mind what you're doing here. It's just
21 that there's so much of what's going on and what
22 you're doing to take away from our homes that we want
23 to retire in and enjoy, just like you may yours.

24 We love our space. It's just Buildings 4

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

97

1 and 3 that we're just hugely concerned about right
2 now.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you. Thanks
4 very much.

5 MS. SPIERS: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes?

7 MS. MUSSER: I'm Jeannette Musser. I spoke
8 previously.

9 I do have a question for the Committee
10 about -- there are some talking points that were on
11 the agenda tonight about the Comprehensive Plan and
12 how this fits into the Comprehensive Plan for the
13 City.

14 Are you going to address those?

15 It seems like we started off this
16 conversation with "This is a done deal."

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think we're not
18 real clear.

19 MS. MUSSER: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What we're doing tonight
21 is a Concept Plan review.

22 MS. MUSSER: But on the agenda it said
23 there were certain things about the Comprehensive Plan
24 that --

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

98

1 MS. JOHNSON: She's referring to the Staff
2 Report. There were a few excerpts from the
3 Comprehensive Plan that we included in the Staff
4 Report.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: What we asked for our
6 Staff to provide is a report basically giving us an
7 idea of what the property is currently zoned, what the
8 proposal is, what the relevant parts of the
9 Comprehensive Plan are, you know.

10 Sure. I mean, we're happy to take a look at
11 the Comprehensive Plan and see what it is, but as far
12 as saying that it's a done deal --

13 MS. MUSSER: I didn't mean that. It started
14 off as -- okay. There's no talk about maintaining
15 this as a single-family area?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: This is a concept.
17 If they came back to us with a plan, that could come
18 under discussion. Until that point, we're just
19 telling them what we think of their plan.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: One other thing, too --
21 and I'm hoping, Staff, you may be able to help me with
22 this. If this is zoned RS-3 and RS-3 is, I believe,
23 8,400 square foot minimum lot size, and we're talking
24 about 1.857 acres, that's nine and a half lots.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

99

1 I mean, so what we're talking about is
2 there's no way that the City could force the property
3 owner to retain one single-family house on this
4 property.

5 MS. MUSSER: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That's always the thing
7 to keep in mind. There is underlying zoning already.
8 If he wanted to tear it down and build eight houses on
9 it that would comply with what zoning is right now, he
10 could do that without doing anything.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: He wouldn't have to
12 come to us.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: He wouldn't have to come
14 to us. He wouldn't have to come to the City Council.
15 All he'd have to do is pull a building permit and do
16 it.

17 I mean, that's the other thing to consider
18 when looking at what they're bringing in. It's
19 something that -- at this point in the review, as a
20 Plan Commission we let them know what we think of the
21 plan from the perspective of what the Comprehensive
22 Plan has, what the underlying zoning is, what the
23 proposed zoning is.

24 Now, if the underlying zoning says they

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

100

1 can have eight dwelling units and they come in and
2 say, "We want 50," that's really where our antenna
3 go up and we say, "Hey, wait a minute. That's
4 completely out of line with what the underlying
5 zoning is."

6 But the other thing as far as, you know,
7 presenting evidence against the application, the
8 public hearing is really the forum to do that, you
9 know, to bring in the evidence and say, "Look, you
10 know, here's what we have. There's going to be this
11 effect; there's going to be that effect."

12 It really gives everybody a fair opportunity
13 to be able to present and rebut all of that
14 information.

15 MS. MUSSER: I do have a question about
16 that, though. That's why I asked about the
17 Comprehensive Plan.

18 A couple mentions have been made of the
19 Brownstones, and it seems to be -- Building 3 and 4
20 are very similar in the footprint of the Brownstones
21 in St. Charles. The Comprehensive Plan does mention
22 that as you get more towards the commercial area, that
23 densities can increase.

24 I guess I'm asking Marshall Architects and

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

101

1 Mr. McNally, Building 3 and 4, is that very similar to
2 the Brownstones, which are in a commercial area?

3 That cross section of the back half of the
4 property, is it as concentrated as the Brownstones?
5 Because this is in a residential neighborhood, and the
6 size and scope of that building seems to be more like
7 what you have in the Brownstones in the commercial
8 area.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Could you speak to
10 that, Tim?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, those are very similar
12 to the Brownstone size, except that they're buried
13 into the hill where the Brownstones are built on a
14 flat lot.

15 The Brownstones are all above grade, all
16 sides around, where this site, the east side would
17 appear to be the height of the Brownstones, where the
18 west side and the north side and even most of the
19 south side will be sunken into the hill. So it will
20 be quite different looking from those sides.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Dan, can you pull up the
22 second-to-last page? Right there. You just went past
23 it. Go back one. Yeah, that one right there.

24 MR. MARSHALL: That's the north side of

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

102

1 Building 4.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Building 4?

3 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So that really shows
5 the best of what we're talking about as far as the
6 height?

7 MR. MARSHALL: The retaining walls -- this
8 hill is a flowered hill. My renderer likes flowers.

9 Actually, the terrace, when we talk about
10 retaining walls being 10 feet tall, they are not
11 10 feet tall. They are 3 feet tall in a series of
12 terraces to break down that grade gently.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Is this what would
14 be visible from the house on Horne Street?

15 MR. MARSHALL: Yes. This is a section of
16 the hill. So you wouldn't see into the hill like
17 this. You would see the top of the hill as it exists
18 and the tree as it exists.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And this building at
20 this elevation?

21 MR. MARSHALL: Actually, you wouldn't even
22 see the left half of this building because this wall
23 wraps around like a U around this. So really what you
24 see is the hill. The very top part right at the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

103

1 chimney there, that hill is all you see because we
2 would cut down that view from the top of the hill
3 south.

4 So this is like in a little alcove. If I
5 can go back to the plan, if that's okay, you see how
6 that hill where the big tree is stays as it is, and
7 then we cut into that hill.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Just one second.

9 MR. ARENDS: Our 3 and 4 roof lines, are
10 they staggered? Is 3 below 4?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Slightly, a couple feet, but
12 not dramatically.

13 MR. ARENDS: Thank you.

14 MR. MARSHALL: The buildings, unlike the
15 Brownstones, are flat. These buildings, each unit
16 steps down a little bit as it goes. That's what
17 staggers them.

18 MEMBER PRETZ: When you're saying "each
19 unit," you're talking about like in Building 4, each
20 of those units drops down.

21 MR. MARSHALL: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You can see that if you
23 look on the last -- actually, if you go to the last
24 page, you can kind of see where it's high and then low

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

104

1 as you go from left to right. You see it kind of
2 goes down.

3 MR. MARSHALL: The left half is higher than
4 the right, and on the front you'll see it's actually
5 the --

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You can see that on the
7 front, the east elevation there.

8 MR. MARSHALL: That drives me crazy because
9 it looks crooked on the page.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Stop right there. I'm
11 a little confused.

12 Units 3 and 4, let's say -- this may be
13 Unit 4 on the north side. I don't know if it is or
14 not.

15 MR. MARSHALL: I did this as a combined
16 because they're pretty much the same on the east side.

17 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Going from the north
18 to the south, just for illustration, this would be
19 Unit 4.

20 Unit 3, would the ridge lines be even lower
21 than this one? You're stepping down a little further
22 as you go down grade?

23 MR. MARSHALL: We're very preliminary on our
24 grading right now, but right now what we're playing

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

105

1 around with is that the south end of Building 4 and
2 the north end of Building 3 are level. There's a
3 little grass in there, a little landscaping in between
4 there, and then they start stepping again.

5 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So as we get to the far
6 end of Building 3 on the south end, the ridge line
7 will be significantly lower than the ridge line on
8 Building 4 at the north end?

9 MR. MARSHALL: Correct.

10 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: How about 1 and 2? Is
11 there a difference there?

12 MR. MARSHALL: There's a difference in the
13 height of those, but the units within 1 and 2 are the
14 same. They're the same.

15 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: As they are located on
16 the grade, they would drop somewhat?

17 MR. MARSHALL: Right, yes.

18 We can't get too drastic with it because
19 there's driveways, and the code limits how much slope
20 we can do and the practicality of that with our
21 weather.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes, sir?

23 MR. MUSSER: I have a question about does
24 this depict -- we've been talking about the north end

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

106

1 like crazy.

2 Does this depict the south end properly, if
3 I can find it? Excuse me.

4 MR. MARSHALL: You're saying that picture?

5 MR. MUSSER: This is the Brownstones.

6 MR. MARSHALL: No, that does not depict it
7 properly because that shows the three stories
8 completely out of the ground.

9 It also shows, from my judgment on this
10 aerial, if that's the same picture --

11 MR. MUSSER: Yes.

12 MR. MARSHALL: -- our building isn't that
13 far south, I don't believe. That driveway is right up
14 against the property line, and we're off that property
15 line.

16 So that hole right there, which I believe
17 is the hole that Maurice is talking about plugging
18 with the evergreens, the building wouldn't be in
19 that location. It would be a little shifted to the
20 left.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: What is that? Is
22 that a Photoshop thing?

23 MR. MUSSER: Basically, yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wow. You can get in

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

107

1 big trouble for that.

2 MR. MUSSER: Thank you.

3 MS. JONES: If you could just minimize it.

4 MR. MUSSER: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes?

6 MS. SPIERS: I'm just curious as to the
7 square footage of these units and the cost at which
8 you put yourself in.

9 MR. MCNALLY: The square footage, the units
10 are right around 2,900 square feet, first and second
11 floor.

12 As far as the cost is concerned, we have not
13 put a cost to them yet because I'm talking to
14 potential customers and getting their feelings of what
15 they'll want in the units and, you know, the finishes
16 that they'll want to put in there. So we have not put
17 a price to them yet.

18 MS. SPIERS: Are you looking at gas- or
19 wood-burning fireplaces?

20 MR. MCNALLY: Wood-burning.

21 MS. SPIERS: I would love to hear gas.

22 Mr. MCNALLY: Okay. You don't like the
23 smell of wood?

24 MS. SPIERS: That all rises up. It gets

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

108

1 real smoky in that area. Just 12 more units back
2 there, it seems to get locked up.

3 I see some heads going like this.

4 MR. MCNALLY: Again, as I'm talking to the
5 customers and getting their opinions, maybe 3 quarters
6 of them want gas.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?
8 Yes, sir?

9 MR. THORNHILL: I'm John Thornhill. I live
10 at 44 White Oak Circle in The Oaks, and I've been very
11 familiar with this property, Hillcroft, for quite some
12 time.

13 I should also disclose that I've done work
14 for Mr. McNally as a land development consultant for
15 a number of years; and for the past six or seven
16 years, as was mentioned earlier, we've been directly
17 involved with the redevelopment of The Oaks in
18 St. Charles.

19 As you've seen all the devastation over the
20 last few months, we've had our share of impact of
21 development.

22 Just to share with some of the folks that
23 are here, I realize I have a dual role here. I'm an
24 advocate for this project. Let me state that from the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

109

1 outset, and the reason I can say that is because the
2 sentiment of our Board is to support this
3 wholeheartedly. We feel it will add value to the
4 property, which is quite undervalued considering what
5 its potential really is.

6 In the case of The Oaks, we had to put in
7 well over a million and a half dollars of resources
8 into redeveloping what we can see from Route 31, and
9 that just touches the surface of what's actually in
10 the ground.

11 What precipitated that project was the need
12 for a storm sewer system. For many years, people
13 downstream of Willowgate had gotten siltation from
14 McKinley Street as well as The Oaks. The Oaks'
15 contribution came from particulates that were
16 suspended, did not settle out until those waters ended
17 up in calmer areas, principally in Willowgate, the
18 Willowgate decorative ponds.

19 In the course of our design, much of our
20 focus of attention had to do with controlled
21 sedimentation. That was the problem we had for our
22 own residents. We have 75 residents that live in
23 The Oaks. We are optimistic that our drainage
24 problems have been solved without any further impact

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

110

1 on downstream waters.

2 Now, coincidentally, the detention basin that
3 we put in, the outlet control structure was modified
4 slightly at the direction of the Willowgate engineer;
5 and those tiny holes you'll see at the riser collect
6 continually leaves and other debris, which causes the
7 water to run across the road occasionally.

8 We've since modified more in keeping with
9 what our original design was so that we don't have the
10 water running across the road anymore.

11 But to address the issue of the one
12 gentleman that talked about the detention basin that
13 was shown on the earlier rendering, the detention
14 basin that's shown is a stand-alone facility designed
15 to accommodate the impervious surface that's being
16 created on Hillcroft.

17 As mentioned earlier, all of that is
18 regulated by the County Stormwater Ordinance, which
19 has been signed on by the City. The City regulated
20 our development, The Oaks, just the way they will
21 regulate Hillcroft in its discharge.

22 As far as the runoff, I think this one
23 gentleman was getting at runoff coefficients. The
24 difference between runoff over grass and runoff over

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

111

1 pavement, that is all quantifiable; and the engineer
2 who is with us could address that more fully if
3 there's an interest in doing so.

4 But all of those factors lead into the
5 design of the detention basin; and as was mentioned
6 earlier, the discharge from a developed site cannot
7 exceed what originally emanated from that same site as
8 a consequence of development. So that concern should
9 be alleviated.

10 I always like to get these advance notices
11 from adjacent property owners, and the video that came
12 out with the PowerPoint was illustrative of the site
13 and the concerns of other people.

14 I've been in the land development consulting
15 business for probably 30-plus years, and I never am
16 without people who show up at hearings or meetings
17 without some concern. I'm always happy to get letters
18 beforehand so I know exactly what to address.

19 I'm familiar with this property. I used
20 to walk my dog here quite a lot until we had to
21 put him down, unfortunately; but along the west side
22 of the property, as many of you have noticed,
23 there's a driveway that's been there for probably
24 40 years.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

112

1 That driveway surely had an impact on the
2 growth of the deciduous trees along the west side of
3 the property, which are generally along the property
4 line.

5 There are probably eight or ten cedar
6 trees -- quite large cedar trees that provide almost
7 continuous screening, except for the southernmost
8 area, the southernmost 50 feet or so, which was shown
9 on the last photograph that was on the screen.

10 The deciduous trees are something that we've
11 been very concerned about in The Oaks as well because
12 in the course of our work, we destroyed a lot of
13 habitat for trees. So far we haven't lost a one, but
14 I'm sure we're going to in the next few months. So
15 far things are still leafing out.

16 Something else I have discovered in the
17 course of reviewing the video, in 1967 when the Fox
18 Glade PUD Unit 1, I believe it is, which is where
19 the McKinley Street development occurred, that was
20 all approved for four-dwelling-units-per-acre
21 density.

22 As you go east into The Oaks area, which was
23 also developed by Kimball Hill, the allowed density
24 was eight units per acre. When you go across the

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

113

1 street into the Willowgate area, the approved density
2 was 17 dwelling units per acre.

3 Now, if you look at a map of the area from
4 Horne Street on south to Wheeler Park, you'll see in
5 fact a difference in the densities of parcels of land
6 as you go from north to south, and that has been borne
7 out repeatedly through history where most recently
8 about two months ago you reviewed a plan for a
9 three-unit townhouse, which I'm not sure where that is
10 in the process right now.

11 We attended the meeting for it here and saw
12 no difficulty with it, except for the clearance from
13 the side yard. We thought that might impact the
14 drainage area.

15 But the point I want to make is that the
16 trend of development is high density along Route 31;
17 and as the one lady pointed out, I think she was
18 referring to a transitional strategy in going from
19 heavily commercialized areas or high-traffic areas
20 further away toward residential areas, there should be
21 a transitioning effect.

22 Getting back to the original, if you can
23 picture the map from Horne Street going south, the
24 properties to the west are the lower densities, such

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

114

1 as the four dwelling units per acre along McKinley and
2 Fox Glade Court.

3 As you go east towards the river through
4 Willowgate, you've got the 17 dwelling units per acre,
5 much higher density.

6 The Hillcroft property is basically in the
7 middle. Its density is about six and a half dwelling
8 units per acre, even less dense than The Oaks, which
9 is eight dwelling units per acre permitted.

10 So to sum up everything that has been said
11 so far, I'm reminded of what Mrs. Farris must have
12 thought, who used to live at the southwest corner of
13 Horne Street and Route 31, and the Crissys, who owned
14 Hillcroft at the time when Kimball Hill came in with
15 their proposal for all these high densities.

16 If it wasn't for that developer, Kimball
17 Hill, that came to the City and represented what they
18 could do to enhance the living options for people in
19 St. Charles, many of these folks wouldn't be here
20 today. What Mr. McNally is wanting to do is simply
21 afford that same opportunity for other people in the
22 future.

23 The lifestyle of our society has changed
24 dramatically since the '60s and '70s. As he

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

115

1 indicated, 2,900 square feet is a reasonable size
2 dwelling unit. Many of these, as I understand it,
3 will be occupied by people who may not spend the
4 entire year in residence.

5 So the impact on services will be minimal,
6 but that tax collection will be perpetual. That is
7 one thing that will help all of us. Raise the
8 valuation of this property from what it is now. It
9 will lessen the burden on everybody else.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

12 Any other questions? Comments?

13 At this point I'll go back to the Plan
14 Commission and poll the Plan Commissioners to let the
15 applicant know what they do and do not like about the
16 proposed Concept Plan. This is with the goal of
17 allowing the applicant to come away from here with
18 ideas of what should be changed when they come in for
19 the application itself.

20 So before we do that, Staff, do you have
21 anything else?

22 MS. JOHNSON: No.

23 MR. COLBY: No.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: You go first?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

116

1 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Go ahead.

3 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I like Mrs. Spiers'
4 idea a lot. I think that even though it sounds
5 practical, I appreciate your concerns. I appreciate
6 your home and your view and everybody else's.

7 I would recommend that maybe other options
8 be looked at in terms of affecting your view and the
9 trees and all of the other things you talked about.
10 That's it.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tom?

12 MEMBER PRETZ: I'd like to thank the
13 residents for coming out and giving your concerns
14 relative to the development.

15 I believe the applicant, though, has
16 indicated that he is more than willing to sit down and
17 chat with each of you about your concerns and about
18 the ultimate project that I assume they will bring
19 forward.

20 I think it would behoove you to take
21 full advantage of that to be able to express that
22 one on one with him or whatever forum he's going to
23 use.

24 I think that the Concept Plan by itself is a

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

117

1 nice transition between west to east and north to
2 south for use of that property.

3 As far as I can see, from my perspective, I
4 don't have any real issues with the concept at this
5 stage, but I would like to strongly state that it is
6 important with the neighbors to take your concerns at
7 the highest value and implement something into your
8 future project in order to accommodate some of their
9 concerns.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I think that the
12 residents have done the yeoman's job on expressing
13 their concern for the shock that it will bring to
14 their enjoyment of living right now. You really have
15 done a nice job.

16 Mr. Arends, I think you found your engineer
17 right there.

18 What I think the applicant needs to concern
19 himself with is the stormwater treatment, the tree
20 line. You've spent some time looking at ways to
21 preserve what's there, using the 150-foot spear, if
22 that means moving the retaining wall, whatever needs
23 to be done to mitigate that.

24 The concept that Ms. Spiers had about

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

118

1 perhaps increasing the density in the front as opposed
2 to the back might be helpful to mitigate some of that
3 shock to the system of the existing residents.

4 I will say to the existing residents
5 something that the engineer pointed out, and that is
6 it's not going to be an empty lot. So somehow there
7 has to be a middle ground for everybody to say, "This
8 will be acceptable," and I guarantee you -- when this
9 property is built out, I guarantee you it will not
10 look like it does now. It's just not going to be the
11 same.

12 So to mimic what Tom had to say, go
13 meet with them; and make a point of meeting with
14 the residents because I think each of you can have
15 your concerns, while not satisfied, at least answered.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Tom?

17 MEMBER SCHUETZ: As a homeowner in
18 St. Charles like yourselves, I can certainly
19 appreciate your concerns as a homeowner.

20 I do want to say to the potential developer
21 here that I do like the facades very much. I've
22 always been a fan of the Brownstones on the river. I
23 would seriously consider the density, as has been
24 brought up several times. I won't go into that and

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

119

1 repeat it because we discussed it.

2 The tree line is a big concern of mine. I'm
3 sure most of you know, but just rolling a bulldozer or
4 tractor, whatever you want to call it, over the roots
5 of an oak tree will kill it. You don't even have to
6 dig it. Just rolling it over will kill the nodule,
7 the air pocket. So consider that.

8 But I think it would be a great buffer on 31
9 to all of you, and maybe it would actually enhance.
10 I'm assuming there's road noise currently. I don't
11 know. I don't live there, but maybe that would
12 diffuse some of that.

13 But consider the density I think would be my
14 biggest concern.

15 MEMBER DOYLE: My first impression of the
16 Concept Plan is that the architectural drawings are
17 beautiful. The architectural quality really appears
18 to be exemplary.

19 I'd like to second what Tim said as well as
20 Tom regarding the preparedness of members of the
21 community. I've never seen members of the community
22 come out with a presentation and with the detail that
23 you did.

24 It's going to be an interesting process if

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

120

1 this goes forward because we have two very
2 well-prepared interests in the room here tonight.

3 Regarding density and regarding the
4 Comprehensive Plan text, I do believe that the City
5 will need to consider the language of the
6 Comprehensive Plan, which the land use does say that
7 the intent here is to preserve the character of the
8 City's existing single-family residential
9 neighborhoods.

10 While I recognize that there may be a trend
11 here for properties along Route 31 to become
12 multifamily, that's not what the language of the
13 Comprehensive Plan says.

14 So if the City were to contemplate
15 encouraging facilitating that trend, we would want to
16 also consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan
17 or I guess consider the indications of what it is that
18 we're supporting because, again, I do believe --
19 because we just completed the Comprehensive Plan
20 within the last 18 months, we do need to give that
21 weight.

22 Another thing I would say is that
23 regarding -- it was mentioned a PUD application might
24 be the vehicle that this would come forward through.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

121

1 It's my strong opinion -- and this is what's in the
2 language of the ordinance -- that PUDs should not be
3 used to intensify land use.

4 PUDs should be used as a means for the City
5 and the developer to creatively negotiate relief from
6 certain rigidity in the zoning in return for
7 developmental quality that exceeds the standards that
8 are in the zoning.

9 So exceptional architectural quality or
10 exceptional landscaping, exceptional stormwater
11 management innovations, these would be the kinds of
12 things that I would want to see a PUD application
13 address, that it's not simply an attempt to intensify
14 land use but an attempt to be creative about how
15 development is pursued.

16 Finally, I would comment that in the Staff
17 Memo on Page 5, the setbacks that are specified here,
18 Concept Plan and minimum front yard setback is listed
19 as 40.8 feet, whereas the RM proposed zoning is -- the
20 underlying zoning would be a minimum of 30 feet for
21 front yard setback.

22 We didn't talk about this during our
23 discussion. I don't know if it's because of grading
24 or other factors, but that's 10 feet that is possible

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

122

1 to move buildings towards Route 31.

2 I think the thing that I'm most impressed by
3 in terms of concerns that the community members
4 brought forward are the old-growth trees and the need
5 to preserve those.

6 So if moving the property forward so that it
7 would still be within the setback of a 30-foot front
8 yard setback and get away from that drip line that has
9 been mentioned, I would really encourage the applicant
10 to -- or it's not an application yet. It's a Concept
11 Plan, but the proposed developer to work with
12 residents on those concerns.

13 Again, to conclude, I think that you have a
14 really exceptional Concept Plan here in terms of the
15 architectural quality. I think putting the buildings
16 into the ground to mitigate height concerns is really
17 a benefit. I hope that you can work creatively with
18 the members of the community to resolve those
19 concerns.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: James?

21 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: All right. To start
22 with, the first thing that I was concerned about after
23 seeing this lot, which is a challenge to say the
24 least, was the water problem. I think that's been

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

123

1 addressed tonight.

2 As we go forward, we've heard that
3 controlled by the Kane County -- and I'm not sure of
4 the title of that organization, but how they would
5 make certain that it would be no worse. So that's
6 good.

7 I have no idea about the tree line so much.
8 A citizen brought that to our attention. I think
9 that's a concern which we're going to have to look at
10 as you go forward, also. I personally have no
11 problems with the change from --

12 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you speak
13 into the microphone, please?

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Jim, hold the mic a
15 little closer. The court reporter can't hear you.

16 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I'm sorry.

17 I am comfortable with the change from the
18 RS-3 to the RM-1. I think the transition there is
19 fine. That doesn't upset me as you move forward.

20 I think, as has been stated previously, that
21 the architecture is elegant, that it's well done, that
22 it would be an enhancement to the community, great
23 curb appeal. I think that's going to be a nice
24 feature.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

124

1 What's difficult about this whole thing is
2 we're talking in three dimensions here. We have this
3 high knoll that flows down to Route 31.

4 I would suggest, if you go forward with
5 this, if you bring it to the Plan Commission, that you
6 present it in a three-dimension model so you can see
7 the elevational changes as you go up and how you
8 intend to place these buildings nestled into the hill
9 to create the lower profile. I think that's critical
10 at this point.

11 Most of the time we're talking about a
12 flat piece of property without the height dimension
13 and drop-off. I think that's crucial as we move
14 forward.

15 So all in all, I think you're on the right
16 path, but you've heard from the citizens and what we
17 have suggested. Let's go forward.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
19 That concludes our Concept Plan review, which is
20 Item 5 on the agenda. Thank you, everybody.

21 Item 8, meeting announcements. Our next
22 meeting is --

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: You didn't comment.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I echo everyone else.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

125

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: "Like he said."

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I kind of forgot. So let
3 me back up just a second.

4 I think that the architecture on what you're
5 proposing is horrendous. I'm kidding. I think it's
6 beautiful.

7 MR. MARSHALL: One out of six is not bad.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think what you guys are
9 proposing is beautiful. I agree about the -- I think
10 that the grading from what you're presenting here
11 is -- I mean, I think it's a great use of a very
12 difficult property to be able to fit the buildings in
13 like you're proposing.

14 I do agree, I'd like for you to take a look
15 at moving the buildings and, if at all possible,
16 moving them to the east in an effort to try to
17 minimize the impact on the tree line and the old
18 growth that is back there, if there is a way to do
19 that.

20 I don't quite share the concern about the
21 Comprehensive Plan as it relates to single-family
22 homes because I think that the die has been cast in
23 this area where we have adjoining on two of four
24 sides.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

126

1 On two of the four sides we have multifamily
2 housing that's existed for quite some time, and I
3 don't really see any other use of this property other
4 than the multifamily that's being proposed.

5 I really can't imagine -- and one of the
6 first things I think was said is that this property is
7 going to be developed. It's going to be developed
8 somehow, and I can't imagine a more beautiful
9 development than what they're proposing.

10 The fact that you have someone who owns this
11 property who is so willing to work with the neighbors
12 going forward in addressing concerns I think is really
13 important here.

14 I would encourage everyone to take him up on
15 that because I know that he's serious when he says
16 that. It's not just something to say. He's going to
17 work with neighbors to make sure it's a project that
18 everyone can be proud of when it's done.

19 So I look forward to seeing the application
20 come back. Good luck.

21 MR. MCNALLY: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: That concludes Item 5 on
23 your agenda.

24 Item 8 is Meeting Announcements. Plan

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

127

1 Commission two weeks from today.

2 Russ, do you have any indication whether
3 we're going to be having meetings the next three
4 meetings?

5 MR. COLBY: Yes. We expect at least the
6 next two that have been scheduled.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: All right. When
8 will the Salvation Army item be on the Planning and
9 Development agenda?

10 MR. COLBY: It could be on the agenda for
11 next Monday. That will be for the applicant to decide
12 if they want to revise their plan to address the
13 concerns that have been raised during the public
14 hearing.

15 If they do, they may not have that ready in
16 time, in which case it might be on the June meeting
17 date; but the Concept Plan for Hillcroft will be on
18 the P and D agenda on next Monday.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Planning and Development
20 Committee additional business from Plan Commission
21 members? Staff?

22 MR. COLBY: No.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Citizens? All right.
24 Seeing none, is there a motion to adjourn?

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

128

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

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor?

(The ayes were thereupon heard.)

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed?

The St. Charles Plan Commission is adjourned
at 9:35 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:35 P.M.

REGULAR MEETING
CONDUCTED ON TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015

129

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS.
3 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)
4

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

13
14 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my
15 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 12th day of
16 May, 2015.

17
18
19

20 
21 Notary Public

22
23 My Commission Expires
24 July 25, 2017.