

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x

In Re: :
Regular Meeting including :
Application for Concept :
Plan; Prairie Center :
(former St. Charles Mall site):
(Shodeen Group, LLC) . :

-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
St. Charles, Illinois 60174
Tuesday, January 5, 2016
7:01 p.m.

Job No.: 97777

Pages: 1 - 106

Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

2

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3

ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4

2 East Main Street

5

St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6

(630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10

Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11

Reporter and a Notary Public in and for the State of

12

Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

3

PRESENT:

TODD WALLACE, Chairman

TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

BRIAN DOYLE, Member

DAN FRIO, Member

JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

TOM PRETZ, Member

TOM SCHUETZ, Member

MICHELLE SPRUTH, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

CHRIS BONG, Development Engineering Manager

JOHN MC GUIRK, Legal Counsel

DAVID SILVERMAN, Legal Counsel

RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic
Development Director

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

4

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: City of St. Charles Plan
3 Commission will come to order.

4 Tim, roll call.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Spruth.

6 MEMBER SPRUTH: Here.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Doyle.

10 MEMBER DOYLE: Here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Schuetz.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Here.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

14 MEMBER PRETZ: Here.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Frio.

16 MEMBER FRIO: Here.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item 3 on the agenda is
23 presentation of the minutes of December 8th, 2015,

24 Plan Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

5

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

2 MEMBER FRIO: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Moved and seconded. In
4 all favor.

5 (Ayes heard.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes unanimously.

9 Item 4 on your agenda is Prairie Center
10 (former St. Charles Mall site) (Shodeen Group, LLC)
11 application for concept plan review.

12 This agenda item is before the Plan Commission
13 tonight for a concept plan review. Before we begin
14 I would like to provide an introduction to our
15 procedure.

16 The Plan Commission is a body of volunteers
17 which analyze certain development applications and
18 provides recommendations to the City Council. We do
19 this by means of public hearings. Before spending
20 considerable time and money on architects and
21 engineers, we encourage applicants to come before
22 the Planning Commission for a concept plan review.

23 At this point there is no formal application
24 pending. The process for approval has not even

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

6

1 begun. The concept will be reviewed within the
2 framework of the City's policies, plans, and
3 ordinances. This review gives the Plan Commission
4 and the public an opportunity to analyze the concept
5 and provide feedback to the developer. The
6 procedure results in a more informed public and
7 provides valuable information to the potential
8 applicant.

9 The developer will begin with presentation
10 about the project concept. After the presentation
11 has been completed, the Commission members will have
12 the opportunity to ask questions about the proposal.
13 Following the Commission, members of the public will
14 have an opportunity to ask questions and offer
15 comments regarding the proposal.

16 At the end of the discussion, I will poll
17 the Plan Commission asking each member to advise the
18 developer as to which parts of the proposal that
19 member viewed favorably and which parts require
20 revision.

21 A concept plan review does not include a
22 formal vote. After tonight the City will not take
23 any action on this proposal unless the developer
24 submits a formal application to develop this

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

7

1 property.

2 At that point the Plan Commission will hold
3 a public hearing. All property owners within
4 250 feet will be informed of the meeting by certified
5 mail, and signs and notices will be posted as
6 required by law. At the public hearing any person
7 will be given the opportunity to ask questions and
8 offer comments.

9 I would like to emphasize the fact that
10 there are issues the Planning Commission will
11 consider when and if this matter comes before us for
12 a public hearing following the filing of an
13 application by the developer. Those issues include
14 impact on surrounding property, traffic, et cetera.
15 However, those issues are not being considered by
16 the Plan Commission now.

17 The goal of tonight's meeting is to provide
18 the developer with practical feedback about the
19 proposed land use and the specific plan itself.
20 Because that is our goal tonight, I implore upon you
21 to reserve comments and questions about the impact
22 of this development on surrounding properties and
23 the community until after an application has been
24 submitted.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

8

1 There will be a time to be heard about those
2 things but tonight is not time. Rather, I will
3 limit the scope of our meeting tonight to a
4 practical discussion about the specifics of this
5 plan in order to identify issues for the developer
6 to address moving forward.

7 Also, a concept plan review is not meant to
8 be adversarial. We are not here tonight to attack
9 the developer or the plan. Nor is it appropriate to
10 present a different plan. We are here to review
11 plans being presented by the developer, and comments
12 should be given within the context of the
13 developer's plans.

14 I would suggest that if there is something
15 about the plan that you do not agree with that you
16 focus comments on what you would like to see, not
17 simply that you don't like it. That will help keep
18 the discussion constructive.

19 Finally, Plan Commissioners, specifically, I
20 would encourage you to inform the developer items of
21 evidence that you would like to be provided when an
22 application comes before us that would help to
23 answer questions about the development and how it
24 complies with our comprehensive plan and zoning

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

9

1 ordinance. You are familiar with findings of fact,
2 and if you feel the process would benefit from
3 having a traffic study done, for example, then that
4 is something the developer should know in order to
5 prepare a future application.

6 In summary, we are not making a decision on
7 anything tonight. The purpose of the consent plan
8 review is to create a roadmap for the developer to
9 effectively move a development plan forward. I would
10 ask that we all keep that in mind in formulating
11 questions and comments on this plan.

12 Are there any questions?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is the
15 developer ready?

16 MR. SCHUSTER: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: One more thing that I'll
18 note. Everything is being taken down by a court
19 reporter tonight, and for that reason I would ask
20 that only one person speak at a time and that you be
21 identified by me before you speak. Anyone who
22 wishes to speak should stand at the lectern and
23 state your name before you speak and also spell your
24 last name for the court reporter.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

10

1 All right. Go ahead.

2 MR. SCHUSTER: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,
3 members of the Plan Commission. I am Mark Schuster
4 of the law firm of Bazos, Freeman, Kramer, Schuster
5 & Braithwaite in Elgin, Illinois. We represent the
6 owners and prospective developer of the property
7 before you this evening. As you know, that's the
8 property between State Route 38 and Prairie Street
9 and West 14th Street here in the city, the former
10 St. Charles Mall site.

11 With me tonight is Mr. David Patzelt from
12 Shodeen Group, Incorporated, here in St. Charles,
13 and Mr. John McKay from the architectural firm of
14 Nagle Hartray in Chicago.

15 Mr. McKay will take you through a PowerPoint
16 presentation that summarizes the plan -- the three
17 plans that have been submitted as alternatives for
18 development of this site. We're available, of
19 course, to answer any questions and provide any
20 additional information you may require.

21 So without anything further, here's Mr. McKay.

22 MR. MC KAY: Good evening. I'm going to
23 begin with an apology in advance. I'm supposed to
24 be in another meeting in Highland Park at the same

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

11

1 time. So if I leave part way through the meeting, I
2 mean no disrespect to the proceedings here tonight.

3 I'm going to begin by telling you a little
4 bit about Nagle Hartray. I know some of you are
5 probably familiar with our work, especially the work
6 we've been doing for Shodeen in Geneva. That is
7 Dodson Place -- the commercial portion of that is
8 organized around the old Dodson house that's on the
9 site -- it includes the residential directly across
10 the street from that, as well as the Fox River
11 Condominiums in downtown Geneva, and the residences
12 at Mill Creek. We currently have another project
13 under construction out at Mill Creek with Shodeen,
14 as well.

15 So while we are not the author of what
16 you're going to see here tonight, if the project
17 proceeds as the developer would like it to, we will
18 be involved in the design of the project moving
19 forward.

20 Nagle Hartray is -- we are celebrating our
21 50th anniversary this year. We have a very good
22 reputation, long-standing reputation in the
23 architectural community in Chicago, recognized in
24 2009 with the Firm Award that was given by the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

12

1 Chicago chapter of the American Institute of
2 Architects.

3 I've been with the firm for 31 years. It's
4 kind of typical of our firm; we have a lot of mature
5 people in the firm. We are medium in size by
6 intention. It allows people like me to actually
7 work on projects. We enjoy practicing architecture
8 as opposed to just running a business.

9 We have an extensive portfolio that includes
10 both private and public architecture, including many
11 similar housing developments to those that we're
12 going to be talking about here tonight. We've also
13 done a fair amount of work in the public sector, as
14 well, designed village halls, public library
15 buildings, a few which you see illustrated here.

16 I would describe our approach to design as
17 being context sensitive and situational, and by that
18 I mean if you look at the images on this board,
19 hopefully there's enough there to illustrate that we
20 don't have a Nagle Hartray brand that we're going
21 around and putting on communities. What we're
22 really interested in is trying to figure out what's
23 appropriate for the site, the community, the people
24 that we're designing for and coming up with

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

13

1 something that really fosters those goals and
2 objectives in the places that we're designing for.

3 So that's all I'm going to say about us.
4 I'd be happy to answer any questions you have about
5 our firm as we go through this.

6 My presentation is divided into three parts.
7 The first part is providing some context for the
8 project. The second part will speak to the specific
9 development options that are being proposed -- and
10 we would like your feedback on all three of the
11 options here tonight -- and then the final part of
12 the presentation will deal with a comparative
13 analysis of the three options.

14 So the three options. As Mark indicated
15 earlier, I think everybody by this time knows where
16 the site is located. It's shown here on the screen.
17 It's slightly less than 28 acres.

18 The underlying zoning for the site right now
19 is regional business, which is the same zoning as
20 the neighbors immediately to the south and to the
21 southeast. The site is also surrounded by RM-3
22 multifamily zoning and by the community business
23 district that primarily has the Jewel Osco.

24 There's a rather long history associated

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

14

1 with this property. I'm not going to go through
2 everything that you see up here, but it begins with
3 the closing of the St. Charles Mall in 1996, followed
4 by the establishment of a TIF district in 2000, and
5 then most repeatedly the proposal for a town center
6 plan that was recommended for approval by the Plan
7 Commission and rejected by the City Council in 2010.

8 More recently the plans that we're going to
9 be presenting to you tonight have already been
10 presented at two neighborhood meetings.

11 I think when we talk about context,
12 oftentimes a site, the community values, things like
13 that are really at the forefront. I think in this
14 case, though, the history of this project is a very
15 important contextual issue because I think in a way
16 it really illustrates the fundamental problem with
17 developing this site, and that is finding something
18 that is both doable and realistic in terms of the
19 marketplace and from the developer's point of view
20 and at the same time something that is acceptable to
21 the community, something that the community can
22 embrace as a good addition to St. Charles.

23 So the comprehensive plan I think that was
24 done since the last proposal in 2010 does a pretty

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

15

1 good job of identifying what some of these
2 challenges are. It also makes some recommendations
3 for consideration, including mixed uses, retail and
4 residential uses, an active and interesting district,
5 multifamily housing, including townhouses and
6 industrial orientation.

7 There have been a number of things that have
8 been tried and failed at this site, including a list
9 of potential uses on the site that were not felt to
10 be the best use of the site. I think, you know,
11 this has caused the site to be the subject of a CMAP
12 study and studies by the City, including the
13 comprehensive plan update.

14 In the comprehensive plan I think there's a
15 pretty good summary in there that states that the
16 citizenry is split on the appropriate uses of the
17 30-acre former St. Charles Mall site. What is
18 desired by many residents may not be economically
19 feasible, which is likely the primary reason that
20 the site remains vacant. And, again, this is kind
21 of a fundamental challenge of this project.

22 So I'm going to present to you now three
23 development options. These are titled the same way
24 as they are in the staff report. I'm going to start

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

16

1 with the option that I would say is closest in terms
2 of zoning to the existing adjacent zoning on the
3 site but also from the developer's point of view
4 least desirable and move to the option which is
5 probably furthest from the existing adjacent zoning
6 but most desirable by the developer and we think in
7 the best interests of the community.

8 So beginning with the first option, I
9 mentioned that these plans were presented at the
10 two neighborhood meetings. This is the one plan
11 that was not, the one of the three that was not.
12 And the reason that we've added this plan is because
13 some of the comments we heard at the neighborhood
14 meetings were along the lines of doing something
15 that's more consistent with the established
16 neighborhood. And so we thought we would put this
17 in there as another option, and this is the one that
18 we think is closest to what is in the existing
19 neighborhood.

20 It's a rezoning plan but it does not have
21 mixed use. It consists of really just two uses, the
22 regional business use and the multifamily use. The
23 site plan for that would like something like this
24 where the regional business, the outlots, the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

17

1 commercial outlots would be along Lincoln Highway,
2 and then behind that the rest of the site is taken
3 up with walk-up residential. And I'll give you some
4 examples of what we mean by walk-up residential a
5 little later in the presentation.

6 One of the things you can see just in
7 looking at the site plan is the amount of pavement
8 and parking that's required for this kind of walk-up
9 residential. It's a very repetitive type of housing
10 by its very nature. In this particular case there
11 are a total of 433 units. The retail -- there
12 really is no retail other than the restaurants that
13 would be in the outlots along Lincoln Highway.
14 There are a total of 903 parking spaces with this
15 plan.

16 The second plan is also a rezoning plan, but
17 in this case we've added mixed use as a third use on
18 the site, and that's the CBD-1 in the stripe of red
19 that you see through the center of the site there.
20 Otherwise, this is very similar to the other plan.

21 The CBD use 1 allows for mixed use to be
22 added to the site. In this case where you see "B"
23 labeled, that strip of buildings across where you
24 see "B" would be mixed use that would be three stories

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

18

1 of residential above one story of retail space. So
2 those would be the tallest buildings on the site,
3 and I'll come back to that later in the presentation,
4 as well. Those buildings would be a maximum of
5 60 feet high because they're the only four-story
6 buildings on the site. Everything else would be
7 three stories or less.

8 The remainder of the site behind the mixed-
9 use portion is the same type of housing that I
10 talked about with respect to the first plan that I
11 showed. So, again, this is walk-up residential
12 units. It has the same parking issues, if you will,
13 associated with the previous plan.

14 So in this plan there are 454 total units.
15 There's almost 47,000 square feet of retail space by
16 virtue of having the mixed-use component added.
17 Again, there's about 21,000 square feet of restaurant
18 space and almost 1200 cars.

19 The final plan and the one that the developer
20 prefers is the PUD plan. This is really a PUD
21 overlay. It includes the same three uses that were
22 covered in the last plan. It includes the regional
23 business, the CBD-1, and the RM-3 uses, as well.

24 In this plan -- this plan introduces a

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

19

1 different housing type. In this plan what you see
2 labeled as C is on the -- it's labeled as walk-up
3 residential which -- I apologize -- is a mistake.
4 It's not walk-up residential. These are elevator
5 buildings, double-loaded corridor, elevator
6 buildings three stories tall, and I think one of the
7 important features of this housing is that it has
8 below-grade parking.

9 So one of the things you may notice in
10 looking at the site plan is while there is more
11 building area on the site, there is much less paving
12 on the site because so much of the parking is
13 underneath the buildings. This also maintains the
14 CBD-1 use, mixed use where you see labeled B and
15 then, again, the outlots along Lincoln Highway.

16 So now I'm going to go through a comparative
17 analysis. And the staff report I think does a very
18 good job in analyzing these three plans and
19 comparing it to the comprehensive plan. I'm not
20 going to attempt to repeat everything that they had
21 in there. I thought it was done in a very thorough
22 way. I am going to highlight a few of the things
23 that I think are relevant for consideration.

24 With respect to some of the zoning metrics,

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

20

1 the density that is being proposed for the three
2 plans varies from about 15.6 units per acre to
3 22 units per acre. Now, that measurement is taken
4 on the entire site area. That's not a measurement
5 that's taken solely on the area where the residential
6 is located.

7 The ordinance for an RM-3 usage allows for
8 20 units per acre. The building height allowable by
9 the ordinance, which is also based on an RM-3 usage,
10 is 50 feet. The rezoning plan without the mixed
11 use -- so in other words, without any four-story
12 buildings on the site -- would be a total of no more
13 than 48 feet and three stories.

14 The other two plans, the maximum building
15 height would be 60 feet because both of those plans
16 include the four-story buildings for the mixed-use
17 component.

18 Regarding the program, this gives a
19 comparison of the various program elements in the
20 three proposed options.

21 The rezoning without the mixed use has a
22 total of 433 dwelling units. There really is no
23 retail space. The restaurant space is all the
24 outlots along the highway.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

21

1 The rezoning plan with mixed use has
2 454 dwelling units, about 47,000 square feet of
3 retail, and, again, 21,000 square feet of restaurant
4 space.

5 The PUD plan has 609 dwelling units and a
6 total of about 76,000 square feet of commercial space.

7 One of the things that I think is
8 interesting to note is that the PUD plan has the
9 same amount of open space as the rezoning plans
10 despite the higher density and the increase in
11 commercial space because the PUD plan also has far
12 less paved area, dedicated parking lots, and roads.

13 This is a comparison of parking for the
14 three plans. In the rezoning plan without the
15 mixed-use component there are a total of 903 spaces.
16 About 85 percent of those are open-air-surface
17 parking spaces. About 97 of those spaces are in a
18 garage but serve as parking. I think one of the
19 things that's important to note there is that with
20 that type of parking you have garage doors, which
21 will contribute something to the environment, the
22 character that you have of the project.

23 The rezoning plan with the mixed-use
24 component has a total of about 1200 cars, and in

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

22

1 this one because the mixed-use building has below-
2 grade parking, underneath that portion of the
3 building we have 138 cars that will be parked below
4 grade and out of sight. So to speak, total of
5 994 cars in open-air surface parking, and another
6 62 cars in surface garage parking.

7 In the PUD plan there are a total of almost
8 1300 cars. There are six -- it's about evenly split
9 almost. There are 670 cars that are surface parked
10 primarily to serve the retail space, the commercial
11 space that's located on the site. It also includes
12 some visitor parking associated with the
13 residential.

14 I think the significant thing in this plan,
15 as I mentioned before, is that it includes nearly
16 half of the parking in below-grade garage space.

17 Finally, I'd like to close with a comparison
18 in terms of something that really can't be captured
19 in the site plan, really can't be captured yet in
20 the review that the staff has done, but it's something
21 that we know from our experience doing this type of
22 housing, and that has to do with the character of
23 it. This is something that will become clearer if
24 the project were to proceed, but I'm going to go

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

23

1 through a series of slides that basically compare on
2 the left-hand side some of these character features,
3 if you will, for the rezoning plans compared to the
4 PUD plan on the right-hand side.

5 So here in the rezoning plan on the
6 left-hand side. You can see some of the surface
7 parking in front of the buildings that will be
8 fairly dominant, and the lack of that on the PUD plan.

9 Again, I think in terms of quality of
10 building materials and architectural expression the
11 PUD plan proposes a housing type, which by its
12 nature, is a little higher end, which allows for
13 higher-end exterior materials and higher-end
14 architecture.

15 This will be featured on the inside of the
16 buildings, as well. So here you see examples for
17 the interiors in the rezoning plan models compared
18 to the PUD plan model. Again, the kitchen,
19 something we all have some familiarity with.

20 So, finally, I'd like to close with some
21 reasons why we think that the proposed PUD plan is a
22 better fit for this community than the rezoning plans.

23 It's a more upscale residential project.
24 This means that it will have higher rent. It's a

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

24

1 higher construction cost to the developer, as well.

2 It will have better finishes inside and out.

3 The fact that it's an elevator versus a
4 walk-up building means that it will attract a
5 different type of tenancy, as well. This will
6 attract we think fewer family tenants than a walk-up
7 product. It will also more likely to attract empty-
8 nesters. There's less surface parking and more
9 landscaping. I think because there's less parking
10 and pavement there's a good opportunity, a better
11 opportunity to create a pedestrian friendly and
12 neighborhoodlike environment.

13 Okay. The last thing I'm going to do before
14 I sit down is run a short video of the proposed
15 Prairie Center.

16 (Video played.)

17 MR. SCHUSTER: I just have a short closing,
18 if I may.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

20 MR. SCHUSTER: Mark Schuster again.

21 One thing that we've heard from our client
22 is how long this property has been vacant and how
23 much they're ready to proceed with some development.
24 It's a little unusual perhaps to have three slightly

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

25

1 different plans submitted at once, but we think that
2 the Plan No. 3, which sometimes you see referred to
3 as the base plan, really meets all the requirements
4 of the comprehensive plan for this west gateway
5 property, and it meets the requirements of the
6 zoning code and really is a form of development of
7 the highest and best use on this property and would
8 be subject to approval.

9 At the same time, there are some alternatives
10 that might make the plan better, and so though we've
11 submitted all three alternatives at once, it's
12 certainly our hope that the City would find Plan
13 No. 1, the PUD alternative which is what brings us
14 before you for concept review would be the one that
15 meets the final approval. It seems to us that's the
16 best overall plan for the site, lays out what the
17 owner and developer would prefer to construct there.
18 But if that's not the case that the City can support
19 Plan No. 1, we have Plan No. 2, and if that doesn't
20 proceed then Plan No. 3.

21 So what we're really asking and hoping for
22 tonight is comment on all of them, compare one to
23 the other, and your comments here will give some
24 guidance to us and also then to the City Council as

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

26

1 they work their way through the same considerations
2 stepping from one, to the other, to the other in
3 trying to determine which is the one that the City
4 would most prefer.

5 So that's our goal. We hope you comment
6 favorably on all of them. We're here to listen to
7 everything that's said, and you have some options,
8 some differences to consider, and we are looking
9 forward to your comments.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

12 Plan Commissioners, questions.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I just have a couple
14 questions.

15 First of all, sir, I apologize. I didn't
16 catch your name.

17 MR. MC KAY: My apologies. I probably
18 didn't give it to you. Don McKay. I'm a principal
19 with the firm. I've been there 31 years.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Nagle Hartray?

21 MR. MC KAY: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: While you're up
23 there, I have a question regarding parking, a little
24 clarification.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

27

1 In that slide --

2 MR. MC KAY: We seem to be stuck.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, it really
4 centers around the visitor parking in Plan No. 1.

5 MR. MC KAY: The PUD plan, yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And I see that
7 there's no surface parking. All of that parking,
8 that surface parking is in the mixed use and the
9 restaurant retail areas; is that correct?

10 MR. MC KAY: There is some parking for
11 visitors who are visiting the residential buildings.
12 That will be street parking.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So there is some
14 street parking?

15 MR. MC KAY: There is some street parking
16 for visitors, just for visitors. But, typically,
17 the units -- the reason that a three-story building
18 works well with below-grade parking is that you can
19 get one below-grade parking spot for every unit that
20 you have in the building.

21 So there will be a garage dedicated parking
22 spot for every unit that's in the building.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: And maybe you can't
24 answer this. Equal number of street parking? I

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

28

1 don't know how that's laid out. I didn't see it on
2 the plan.

3 MR. MC KAY: No, I would say it's less.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. I see it. He
5 just pointed it out to me. Okay. Thank you.

6 And, Mr. Schuster, I had a question for you.

7 I'll be honest with you, we -- I think we
8 were pretty clear on Plan 1, Plan 2, and Plan 3, but
9 some of our information goes from Plan 3 to Plan 1;
10 some goes from Plan 1 to Plan 3, so I'm trying to
11 unconfuse myself.

12 In your final comments you spoke about
13 initially you say Plan 3 is -- could you go through
14 that one more time?

15 MR. SCHUSTER: I did. I think I said
16 Plan 3 -- I hope I had it right -- is the base plan,
17 which is the rezoning with no mixed use. Plan 2 then
18 adds the CBD-1 layer in between, and Plan 3 is the
19 PUD.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Plan 1.

21 MR. SCHUSTER: Plan 1. I said "3" twice --
22 sorry -- Plan 1 is the PUD. I'm sorry to confuse you.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: We'll get it.

24 MR. SCHUSTER: Okay.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

29

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
3 questions, Plan Commissioners?

4 MEMBER DOYLE: One of the questions that the
5 staff has recommended we consider is the CBD-1 zoning
6 which is part of the concept plan. There's also
7 CBD-2 and back in 2010 and 2011 when we had -- the
8 last time we were here there was a proposal to
9 create a new mixed-use district which was neither
10 CBD-1 or CBD-2.

11 Could you please comment on why you think
12 CBD-1 is the appropriate zoning and maybe elaborate
13 a little bit on your thoughts regarding the staff's
14 question which I'll read here to you?

15 "Should CBD-1 zoning be considered for the
16 site, or should the City consider creating a new
17 mixed-use zoning district similar to CBD-1 that
18 could be applicable to this site and others
19 identified as mixed use in the comprehensive plan?"

20 MR. MC KAY: I think the reason that the
21 CBD-1 zoning was selected for the site is because
22 the developer understood the building type that
23 would make sense in terms of the marketplace. It's
24 something that they've constructed before where you

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

30

1 have retail on the first floor, you have residential
2 above it, and you have parking below grade.

3 And just in looking through your existing
4 zoning ordinance and trying to find something that
5 was as close to that as possible, this is the
6 classification that came closest to that.

7 So I'm not sure that it matters whether it's
8 classified as CBD-1 if it allows for the type of
9 product that the developer has in mind there or
10 whether something new was created that would
11 accomplish the same goal.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: So let me follow up on that.

13 So CBD-1 features ground-level retail,
14 upper-level residential --

15 MR. MC KAY: Correct.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: -- and underground parking?

17 MR. MC KAY: That's correct.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: The PUD concept plan in front
19 of us features numerous residential-only buildings
20 without ground-level retail. Now, would those be
21 part of CBD-1?

22 MR. MC KAY: No. RM-3.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: RM-3. Okay. Thank you.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I had a couple questions.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

31

1 Brian brings something to mind. I guess was
2 thinking of the PUD plan.

3 In your video you show the retail below or
4 first floor. That's Plan 2. Is that correct?
5 Plan 3 does not have that; correct? Excuse me, the
6 PUD plan.

7 MR. MC KAY: The PUD plan does have first-
8 floor retail just in that center section that's
9 labeled "CBD-1," yes.

10 MEMBER SCHUETZ: And Plan 2?

11 MR. MC KAY: Plan 2 has the same thing.

12 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I have a quick question,
13 and I hope it's appropriate but you mentioned the
14 density on the PUD is I think 50 -- let's see, 22 --
15 is that 22 per acre? How does that work? You said
16 22 units per --

17 MR. MC KAY: Per acre.

18 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So what is the adjacent
19 land to that area, the density?

20 MR. MC KAY: It corresponds to RM-3 zoning.
21 So I assume it would be 20 units per acre or less.

22 MEMBER SCHUETZ: So it's very similar?

23 MR. MC KAY: It's very similar.

24 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Okay. Thank you.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

32

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Questions?

2 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: In the PUD are the
3 units, the residential units meant to be condos,
4 apartments?

5 MR. MC KAY: This decision is often driven
6 by what's going on in the marketplace at any moment
7 in time. So they will be built to the quality of
8 condominiums. Given the current market conditions
9 they'll be rental when they start, but should the
10 market conditions warrant, they'll be constructed in
11 a way they can be converted to condominiums down
12 the road.

13 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Other questions?

15 MEMBER SPRUTH: Just on the advertisement
16 side, I noted on the M38 that you have -- Shodeen
17 had advertisements to date on commercial and retail
18 space available presently. Is that correct?

19 MR. PATZELT: David Patzelt, P-a-t-z-e-l-t,
20 17 North First Street, Geneva, Illinois.

21 Yes, that is correct. There was a slide
22 that had -- we had been advertising for retail.
23 These that are listed which included Tilted Kilt,
24 Lifetime Fitness, NASCAR Car Wash, Hardy's Restaurant

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

33

1 are some that have either been presented to City
2 staff for review or have been in contract
3 negotiations to be located on the property, and for
4 one reason or another -- whether they weren't felt
5 to be supported by City staff or couldn't come to
6 terms on the property.

7 So those are the closest retail or restaurants
8 that we have gotten, the closest tenants we have
9 gotten. But the property has been advertised by at
10 least three real estate brokers over the past five,
11 six years.

12 MEMBER SPRUTH: So most recently have you
13 received inquiries in the area for that site of
14 retail?

15 MR. PATZELT: In the last three to six months,
16 yes, there has been one inquiry.

17 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay. You mentioned the
18 building height on the PUD plan, Plan 1, as 48 feet.
19 So that's from ground level; is that correct?

20 MR. PATZELT: That is -- no. Maximum height
21 in the PUD plan, Plan 1, would be 60 feet, and that
22 is really driven by the center core buildings, the
23 mixed-use buildings which have the first-floor
24 retail on them.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

34

1 The buildings that are north of the retail
2 here in this slide shown as "C" would be approximately
3 less than 50 feet.

4 But that chart that was provided to you
5 showed a maximum height of 60 feet, again, because
6 the B buildings are the same in both the PUD plan
7 and the mixed-use plan.

8 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay.

9 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I have a question. In
10 regards to the underground parking, this has been
11 brought up many times, the positive side of it. My
12 concern, my question to you is in regard to the
13 underground parking. How far underground will the
14 parking be?

15 In other words, the floor of the garage will
16 be considering 8 feet below the existing grade, or
17 in other cases that I've seen in developments like
18 this like The Crossings at Geneva near Delnor
19 Hospital, they are about 4 feet below grade, which
20 if you backfill makes the building like a little bit
21 taller than anticipated. So I'm just concerned
22 about that, what you see in regard to how you're
23 going to facilitate that.

24 MR. PATZELT: The finished floor of the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

35

1 first floor to the finished floor of the garage is a
2 10-foot difference. So there's a 10-foot grade
3 between the two finished floors.

4 The first floor has to be level -- or is
5 level for all of those residential units, and we
6 have to meet ADA code, which is a soft slope,
7 1-in-12 slope to get into that first floor.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: It's not the grade at
9 the site now, but it would be backfilled to get up
10 to that level?

11 MR. PATZELT: Correct. So I would say at
12 the front door you're going to have a relatively
13 soft slope to get to that first floor, and then that
14 garage is 10 feet below that.

15 Now, if site itself has slope across it, and
16 if a building is 200 to 300 feet long, and the first
17 floor is level, the grade is falling off, you may
18 see more of the garage at one end or the other.

19 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I know it's a little
20 premature to ask these questions, but I'm just a
21 little concerned about what the grade line will be
22 compared to the natural grade line.

23 MR. PATZELT: I think your concern -- the
24 reason I bring up the ADA slope is that your concern

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

36

1 is that you don't jack up the buildings and pile
2 this dirt up.

3 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: That's what my concern is.

4 MR. PATZELT: We have difficulty doing that
5 because we have to have a 1-in-12 very soft slope to
6 have a wheelchair ramp to get into the building.

7 So this photograph here on the right is a
8 good example of the grade that you would see on
9 the -- on a typical building. The garage entry on
10 this photograph on the right, the left building, the
11 garage is just outside the photograph. So I think
12 it gives you -- in this case the entire garage is
13 buried below ground.

14 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: So the first floor
15 would be pretty close to the grade level? You
16 wouldn't have to walk up four steps on the entryway?

17 MR. PATZELT: Correct.

18 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: We're going to be
19 down here?

20 MR. PATZELT: Yes.

21 If I could back up, Tim, to one of your
22 questions that Don couldn't answer. On Exhibit
23 Sheet 1, in the lower left-hand corner there's a
24 parking breakdown. The overall parking count for

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

37

1 the residential unit is 1.3 spaces per unit. So
2 1.0 of those spaces are in the garage or
3 underground, leaving a .3 parking space per unit
4 would be outside, on-the-street parking.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
6 questions?

7 MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Brian.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a couple questions
10 related to the retail gap analysis profile on page 7
11 of the comprehensive plan.

12 First part of it is for staff. If you could
13 help clarify for me the numbers in this profile, the
14 green numbers that are positive, the text reads that
15 positive indicates indication of a surplus, and
16 negative numbers are leakage within a given retail
17 category.

18 So, for instance, we have a \$29.6 million
19 surplus or leakage in total food and drink.

20 MR. COLBY: I believe the 29.6 that's listed
21 there, that's -- it's a surplus and then there's an
22 opportunity to capture that additional amount. Based
23 on the demographic data, there's that additional
24 buying power that's available in the area.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

38

1 MEMBER DOYLE: So according to our comp plan
2 there is a total opportunity for Randall Road
3 approaching \$290 million, which breaks down to,
4 according to this chart, about roughly \$30 million
5 in food and drink and \$260 million in total retail
6 trade.

7 Now, there are a lot of areas of leakage, a
8 lot of areas of leakage where it says we have too
9 many businesses for the surrounding community to
10 address.

11 One of the things that's confusing about
12 this to me is last time we looked at these data, I
13 think it was presented and part of the analysis was
14 that we were a net importer of restaurant businesses,
15 which meant that we have too many restaurants for
16 the surrounding business to support, which is why
17 some of our restaurants -- why I assume some of our
18 restaurants have a difficult time staying open.
19 This data here actually says the opposite, that we
20 don't have enough restaurants.

21 I think this is a really important point for
22 us to clarify as we move forward, where the
23 opportunity is and where the surplus is.

24 So assuming that we have -- that we are a

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

39

1 net exporter of restaurant businesses, meaning we
2 don't have enough restaurants, then the targeted use
3 for food on the frontage lots seems reasonable.

4 There are many other opportunities, as well,
5 that I would ask to be considered such as nonstore
6 retailers, health and personal care stores which has
7 an opportunity of about 15 million, and motor vehicle
8 and parts dealers which has an opportunity of
9 344 million.

10 Now, maybe that's a little dated since we've
11 had a couple new auto parts and retailers come on
12 line in the last two years, but a big part of the
13 concept plan and what we're considering here is --
14 I'm sorry -- Mr. McKay was it?

15 MR. MC KAY: Yes.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: You pointed out in your
17 preface that a big part of this has to do with what
18 is economically feasible versus what the community
19 desires.

20 MR. MC KAY: Correct.

21 MEMBER DOYLE: So I think that next time we
22 come together -- I don't know if you've had an
23 opportunity to look at these figures in the comp
24 plans, look at maybe the analysis that was done last

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

40

1 time we looked at the town center, but I think
2 that's really a critical fact and critical aspect of
3 the City's deliberation about the suitability and
4 market viability of the proposals in front of us.

5 MR. MC KAY: Sure. What you're saying makes
6 complete sense. I'm not familiar with the details
7 of the examples that you cited but you did say -- if
8 I heard correctly -- Randall Road.

9 MEMBER DOYLE: Yep.

10 MR. MC KAY: So this is -- there are
11 probably two points that are worth making. We have
12 to do more research on this; we have to look into
13 it; I think that's all valid, but there are probably
14 two comments that we can make right offhand.

15 One is that if this property were right on
16 Randall Road, the opportunities would be far
17 different. It's close to Randall Road, but, frankly,
18 that distance makes all the difference in terms of
19 the capability of what this site will attract. I
20 think that is an important factor.

21 I think the other thing about the PUD plan is
22 while we're showing the outlots as being restaurants,
23 which seems to make the most sense for where they're
24 located and that type of usage, I think one of the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

41

1 advantages with plans that include mixed use is that
2 you do get additional retail space that could be
3 either service oriented -- if there was a demand for
4 restaurants, I think it would be great.

5 If one of the things you're trying to create
6 here is a neighborhood, if you could actually get,
7 you know, a restaurant that would be kind of a
8 neighborhood-type restaurant, that would go a long
9 way I think towards achieving some of the other goals.

10 But I think there is flexibility in that
11 plan to allow some of those things to happen if, in
12 fact, the marketplace will support it.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other
14 questions?

15 MEMBER SCHUETZ: I just have a really quick
16 one along the similar lines as Brian.

17 Your experience -- some of those pictures
18 were Geneva. I'm very familiar with those pictures.
19 I've walked it many times and I think it's
20 fantastic. However, we've had a hard time filling
21 our downtown area with retail shops, restaurants,
22 whatever.

23 So what has your experience been if you
24 build a community like this, how do you draw in --

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

42

1 the people that live there, do they support most,
2 all, a quarter, 25 percent, whatever of what's built
3 on the first floor, or how to you draw them in? How
4 do you draw the retail people in? Just in your
5 experience, not this site necessarily, but how would
6 do you that?

7 MR. MC KAY: I think a good example of what
8 you're referring to is out at Mill Creek where
9 there's kind of a dedicated residential community
10 there on the first-floor retail that's kind of the
11 spine of the Mill Creek development that runs down
12 the center of it. So in that case those businesses
13 are supported primarily, if not solely, by the
14 residents of Mill Creek.

15 I think that one of the advantages that you
16 have here is the fact that you are going to draw
17 from outside the neighborhood that's being created.
18 That being said, I think the extent to which you can
19 create something that feels like a neighborhood is
20 going to -- there's going to be a kind of symbiotic
21 reinforcement between the residential and some of
22 the commercial that you're trying to encourage.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: How is that different than
24 downtown? Because there is residential there,

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

43

1 as well.

2 MR. MC KAY: I think, you know, there's a
3 critical mass that you have downtown that you're not
4 going to get in an environment like this.

5 MEMBER SCHUETZ: When I say "downtown," I
6 meant downtown St. Charles.

7 MR. MC KAY: Even so, I think compared to
8 what's being proposed here there's kind of critical
9 mass, the retail/restaurants; you have great
10 pedestrian environment; you have the river.

11 So it's a very different environment. I
12 would not imagine that you're going to recreate
13 something here that would either draw away from
14 downtown -- I mean, frankly, one of the concerns we
15 have in doing retail development where you have a
16 thriving downtown area, to do new retail development
17 on the outside is that it sucks some of the life out
18 of the downtown area.

19 So I think that the uses that we're talking
20 about here are going to serve more the neighborhood
21 that's being created and the adjacent neighbors, the
22 surrounding neighbors. It's going to be very
23 different, though, than saying let's go to downtown
24 St. Charles and see a show and get something to eat

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

44

1 or something like that.

2 Does that make sense?

3 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Yeah. That's kind of what
4 I figured but I was just curious -- we, of course,
5 don't want to have a bunch of first-level storefronts.

6 MR. MC KAY: True. I think your intuition
7 is right.

8 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I have a question, also.
10 You've been able to take a look at the
11 comprehensive plan and the redevelopment
12 alternatives that are shown in there; correct?

13 MR. MC KAY: Yes. Not in great detail but
14 yes, some of the illustrations that show
15 possibilities for how the site might be configured.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: We have three possibilities
17 that are shown in our comprehensive plan: Regional
18 Repositioning, West Neighborhood Center, Comprehensive
19 Mixed-Use Center.

20 MR. MC KAY: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And I'm just curious
22 because I'm envisioning that this is something
23 that's going to become an issue at the application
24 stage as far as, you know, which -- which one of

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

45

1 these fits in with the proposal that's being
2 presented.

3 MR. MC KAY: I think, as presented tonight,
4 none of them exactly so far. But I think that the
5 one that is closest to what the developer is trying
6 to achieve here is the West Neighborhood plan. I
7 think it's one in which you have a kind of network
8 of streets that does create a neighborhood. There's
9 a kind of a hierarchal structure to it, if you will.

10 So I'm not saying that the final plan will
11 look exactly like the illustration that you have
12 there, but I think in terms of character and spirit
13 that's the one that comes closest to what's being
14 proposed.

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I guess one of the other
16 questions as far as the actual site layout itself, I
17 think in all of these plans we have interconnection
18 through adjoining neighborhoods, at the very least,
19 you know, to the neighborhoods to the northeast of
20 this property. Has there been any consideration to
21 incorporating that into this plan?

22 MR. MC KAY: I would say that that is not
23 really being considered at this point but would be
24 considered going forward. I think reinforcing the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

46

1 pedestrian and the vehicular networks is something
2 that helps to make all of this -- it doesn't feel
3 like an isolated community; it helps it feel like
4 the whole thing is tied together.

5 So I think that's a very valid point. I
6 think it's something that in terms of the future
7 planning would have to be done, and I think it makes
8 a lot of sense.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I want to speak to
11 the density just a little bit. I know that's going
12 to come up as the application moves forward.

13 I'm looking at the differences between
14 Plans 1, 2, and 3, and, essentially, the BR zoning
15 stays the same, 5.97 acres. The only difference --
16 there's only a difference between 1 and 2 together
17 and 3. Because in Plan 3 there's 21.67 acres of
18 residential and no mixed use, but there's mixed use
19 in both 1 and 2.

20 So when I looked at 1 and 2, I say, gosh,
21 the land use is very similar. Now, I understand
22 that there's underground parking considered in the
23 residential, so that may increase the density, but
24 that's a 25 percent increase in density between

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

47

1 Plan 2 and Plan 1.

2 How do you -- how do you explain that? I
3 mean, what causes that? What drives that density up
4 so high when the uses are so similar?

5 MR. MC KAY: Well, I'll give my answer and
6 then defer to Dave if he wants to add to this.

7 I think that, as we mentioned, the PUD plan,
8 it's a higher quality product. It costs more to
9 construct, so I think because of that getting more
10 of it makes it easier to make it work in terms of
11 the financial structure for the project.

12 Does that answer the question your question?

13 I think the planning also allows for it.
14 The fact that we don't have as much surface parking,
15 which I think really frees up the land that's
16 available to work with, allows for that kind of
17 density increase on the site, as well.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: I have a few follow-up
19 questions. I'll follow up on that one there.

20 So is there a difference in the proposed
21 ratio of one unit and -- one-bedroom, two-bedroom,
22 three-bedroom units between the plans? Because it's
23 dwelling units.

24 MR. MC KAY: Yes.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

48

1 MEMBER DOYLE: So the square footage of
2 residential space could be the same, but you could
3 have more dwelling units.

4 MR. MC KAY: It will probably be similar.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. To go back, then, to
6 follow up on Chairman Wallace's question about
7 connectivity.

8 In the comprehensive plan all three models,
9 the illustrations, and the notes include references
10 to the Tri-City Center and include -- if you look at
11 them, the concept plans as outlined in the comp plan
12 are -- really are looking for a comprehensive
13 concept plan that addresses the St. Charles Mall
14 Tri-City Center.

15 MR. MC KAY: Yes.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: Tonight we have three plans
17 in front of us that only address the mall. Could
18 you speak to the developer's goals and wishes in
19 relation to Tri-City Center?

20 MR. MC KAY: I'll give that a shot, as well.

21 I think --

22 MEMBER DOYLE: Let me rephrase.

23 MR. MC KAY: I think I can answer it,
24 though. I think I can answer your question.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

49

1 One of the things that's exciting about a
2 project like this, quite frankly, is the size and
3 the ability to create something that, you know,
4 becomes another neighborhood in St. Charles. But I
5 think there's a kind of responsibility with that, as
6 well, which is recognizing the neighbors around you
7 in a way this plan has to address not just the
8 boundaries of the site, but it has to take into
9 consideration what happens across the street, what
10 happens adjacent to it, as well.

11 I think those issues have not been given
12 serious consideration yet in this plan. I think
13 they're valid issues, and they naturally become
14 considerations if the plan were to move forward, but
15 I think up until now it's been more a sense of just
16 trying to figure out what's the right mix on this
17 site, what makes sense to put on this site.

18 I think all the issues that have to do with
19 connectivity to the rest of the neighborhood and
20 getting those things to all work together, those are
21 very valid design issues that should be addressed
22 going forward.

23 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

50

1 questions from Plan Commission members?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. In that case I'd
4 like to proceed on to questions from members of the
5 public.

6 Does anyone have any questions?

7 Yes, sir.

8 MR. NORGAARD: Larry Norgaard, 1214 South
9 6th Street, Charles.

10 I'm not going to cover the differences in
11 the Prairie Center stuff because you said you'd
12 handle that later, but there's a lot of exceptions.
13 We're not meeting the Prairie Center plan.

14 One of the problems we've had --

15 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Wait -- I'm sorry -- say
16 that again.

17 MR. NORGAARD: There's a lot of
18 contradictions to the comprehensive plan, and you
19 said not to touch on that tonight. You've talked
20 about some of them.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: No, I mean -- what I was
22 saying is that we should focus on what the plan is
23 and not the impact upon the surrounding community
24 because that will be covered, you know, when an

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

51

1 application is actually made.

2 MR. NORGAARD: So I'll skip that part, but
3 one of my concerns is we've been fighting since
4 2010 against high density for many reasons. One of
5 those is the information was off at the time. There
6 was no traffic situation or traffic studies.

7 That's an invalid question because the
8 question was at that time the traffic was total day
9 traffic, and you had a shopping mall there that
10 opened after 9:00 in the morning, so it did not
11 conflict with the high school buses crossing Prairie;
12 it did not conflict with two middle schools crossing
13 Prairie, and it did not conflict with two grade
14 school students crossing Prairie. So that would be
15 the same time as commuter traffic, so the study
16 needs to be reevaluated at that point.

17 Another thing that was stated when I was
18 talking going around doing surveys back then is that
19 the service -- cost of the services in the city
20 would not -- they were adequate. We have plenty of
21 electricity, sewer systems are fine, so on and so
22 forth, which is not true.

23 I talked to an individual that worked for
24 the City water and sewage department. He said one

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

52

1 of the two systems -- you've got rain water and raw
2 sewage. One of those systems has been at capacity
3 now for seven years and not dealt with. So there's
4 a tremendous expense if we put high-density
5 developments in that property to one of the those
6 two systems, and that would have to be looked at.
7 It's a cost, a taxpayer cost -- "me" -- unless it
8 goes to the developer.

9 So we are against the high density for those
10 two reasons alone.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Let me just interrupt for
12 a second.

13 I mean, more of what we're looking for is
14 specifically regarding this plan. I mean, the
15 points that you're making are certainly valid
16 points, but really that relates to any plan that
17 would be proposed for this property.

18 Specifically, what we want to know about are
19 the plans that have been presented, what comments do
20 you or questions do you have specifically about
21 those plans and the land use that they're proposing.

22 MR. NORGAARD: Okay. One of the comments
23 that I would have is, first of all, this was
24 proposed so that the TIF -- that this would be for

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

53

1 commercial development, and there's not enough
2 commercial development space there in my opinion.
3 Now, this is all my opinions. Okay?

4 The other thing is that -- just slipped my
5 mind. That's not good.

6 Yes. One of the things, I feel a little bit
7 personally manipulated because we've been fighting
8 the 600-unit plus density since 2010, and we've
9 defeated that all along. Now we have got an option,
10 "We can go with our larger plan, which is what we
11 really want to do because of the income it will
12 produce for us continuously, or we can go with the
13 smaller one," which will give you crap for business.
14 You've got low-cost developments, no elevators, no
15 underground parking; that's all cut out.

16 So that feels like it's manipulation of my
17 thoughts, and I think I'll rest with that since you
18 don't want to get into the other things.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I summarize so I
20 understand?

21 You would like them to look at less density
22 and more commercial?

23 MR. NORGAARD: Yes.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

54

1 MR. NORGAARD: And, also, same high quality
2 for the low density.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.
5 More questions?

6 MR. BOBOWIEC: Craig Bobowiec, B-o-b-o-w-i-e-c.
7 I live on Cedar Street in St. Charles.

8 Ever since the Shodeen company took over
9 this property we keep hearing time and time again
10 that retail can't work and there's no need for
11 retail, but yet at least in the last 15 years never
12 once has he ever drawn out a true retail vision,
13 elevations, and a plan.

14 And I just -- I just find it hard to believe
15 that the few businesses he showed us are some of the
16 few that actually want a freestanding building.
17 What about the like 90 percent of retail out there
18 like that are filled in Geneva Commons that don't
19 want freestanding buildings?

20 You can't sell me that he's exhausted the
21 full benefit of retail possibilities on that
22 property when he's never scaled out a drawing.
23 Because most people would look at it and say, "Well,
24 I could fit here in this shopping plaza or in this

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

55

1 mall" or whatever. And I just for the life of me I
2 cannot buy his argument that we have to waste
3 80 percent of that property with residential and
4 throw away the opportunities. As Brian says, that
5 we still have some obvious -- hundreds of millions
6 of dollars of retail need in this area.

7 Then I also argue with his argument that
8 we're not on the Randall Road corridor when Costco
9 you have to go down Oak Street to gain entrance into
10 it; Meijer's you've got to go up 38 off of Randall
11 Road most of the time to turn in. It's no different
12 if there was retail kitty-corner on the St. Charles
13 Mall property. Going to Batavia Walmart you've got
14 to turn on Fabyan Parkway, drive up to a side
15 entrance to get into the parking lot.

16 So I just don't think their arguments that
17 retail is totally impossible here are viable.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So your comment
19 regarding this particular plan is that you'd like to
20 see more retail?

21 MR. BOBOWIEC: Yeah. I'd like to see like
22 80 percent retail and 20 percent.

23 And then, as Mr. Wallace had stated, in the
24 comp plan it says no freestanding residential on

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

56

1 that property. So, I mean, it doesn't meet the comp
2 plan in any way, shape, or form.

3 So that's my views.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: May I ask a follow-up
5 question real quick?

6 You mentioned drawings. To play devil's
7 advocate, the City has a drawing for the quad, lots
8 of drawings for the quad, and I support the plan for
9 the quad. Do you think that it's reasonable for the
10 City to compel this property owner to take a risk on
11 the basis of a drawing when we have quads still out
12 there?

13 MR. BOBOWIEC: I'm just saying they never
14 really marketed it and really shopped it out to come
15 here and tell us that there's no retail opportunity.

16 Do you think all the stores in the Geneva
17 Commons signed a letter of intent before the thing
18 was ever designed knowing where they could
19 potentially fit into a development here? I mean,
20 you just --

21 MEMBER DOYLE: It's an issue of risk, and I
22 think the point I'm making is that the Plan Commission
23 needs to weigh in good faith the implications that are
24 being presented, which is that the zoning represents

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

57

1 a burden on our development of the property.

2 MR. BOBOWIEC: That's what he's claiming.
3 That's where I'm arguing. How do you claim that
4 when you've never put together a drawing?

5 He did a Towne Center plan; he's this retail
6 plan. It's always retail. Never once has he
7 presented a massive commercial development. It was
8 supposed to be an auto mall, and that never even was
9 drawn out.

10 I mean, it's all smoke and mirrors with no --
11 I mean, I would be more sympathetic to him if he did
12 have a plan for the last five years sitting there on
13 a billboard, and it's all drawn out, and he shows
14 elevations of a beautiful shopping plaza or however
15 they want to design it, and then he comes here and
16 says, you know, "For five or six years we've shown
17 the plan, we've had it designed, and nobody wants to
18 fill it up." But they have never done that. That's
19 my argument.

20 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. That makes sense to
21 me now.

22 MR. PATZELT: Could I offer a comment to try
23 to nip that in the bud right away?

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Sure.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

58

1 MR. PATZELT: We have and I have plans. We
2 have marketed this property through three different
3 occasions, and Don did not touch on it, but he did
4 have in his slide that there were roundtable
5 discussions and I'll start with that.

6 After the Town Centre project went to the no
7 vote, we then called in two different architectural
8 firms and three different real estate -- commercial
9 real estate firms. As a developer and property owner,
10 we are in the retail and office market. We have
11 about a million square feet within our portfolio.
12 We are very interested in continuing to expand that
13 portfolio in retail and commercial.

14 We had a roundtable with two real estate
15 firms asking if there was a plan what and who they
16 could bring as far as retailers, and that ended up
17 bringing -- there was nobody that was interested as
18 far as retail coming to this site.

19 We then contacted a developer who was in the
20 larger mall development business and asked if they
21 would be interested in this property. They drew
22 plans -- worked with us, drew plans. They then sat
23 down with their real estate brokers and asked,
24 "Here's our plan. Who can you get for us," and the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

59

1 answer was, "There's nobody out there. There's
2 nobody that's going to come."

3 So the gentleman doesn't know what happens
4 inside our walls of our building. I have plans;
5 we've drawn many plans; we have several different
6 real estate brokers that have tried to solicit the
7 business, and we've actually tried to truly market
8 this property for straight commercial and it's not
9 happening. It's not there. It's not smoke and
10 mirrors.

11 Thank you -- and I think, if I could add, we
12 had a Dominick's leave on our property south of this
13 property. It sat vacant for quite some time, was
14 marketed. We'd love to fill it up. I can't say
15 that I'm personally proud to say that the best
16 tenant that we could attract was the Salvation Army.
17 I would have thought that in St. Charles and in that
18 area -- and if it is Randall Road, why couldn't we
19 attract some retailer that was better than the
20 Salvation Army?

21 I don't see us attracting large retail to
22 the property. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

24 MS. MALAY: Kim Malay, 526 South 16th Street,

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

60

1 and I'm representing the Near West Neighborhood
2 Association, as well.

3 Just a couple things. First off, kind of
4 the discussion that's just going on here, I think
5 maybe what Mr. Bobowiec failed to mention is that
6 it's not just planning that site. I believe one of
7 you kind of alluded to planning the area that is
8 under his control. And I think that does have to
9 happen.

10 I think retailers, when they come to look at
11 that site, they see blighted areas of retail that
12 aren't seeming to do anything at this point. That
13 discourages them because they look at what's going
14 to happen in the future to that site.

15 So I think a full comprehensive plan of that
16 area is a good thing to have for that site so that
17 we can really start planning, and it needs to be a
18 cooperative effort between the City and the
19 developer.

20 As far as the plan at hand -- and I'm going
21 to say something that Mr. Patzelt said to me a year
22 ago when we met is, this project has to have -- or a
23 project in general has to have a reason to be. And
24 right now that's lacking. It's basically an

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

61

1 apartment complex with some stores or whatever in
2 front of it. There's no sense of community to it
3 yet, and I think, you know, to allude to what you
4 were saying, Mr. Doyle, you need to have that sense
5 of community, that walkability, that feeling like it
6 belongs because it is going up against a residential
7 neighborhood.

8 So I really would encourage us to kind of
9 think out of the box on the design of this plan and
10 not just make it a --

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: So let me just interrupt
12 you. So speaking specifically on the design, what
13 constructive comments can you make to the developer?
14 What changes would you make in order to --

15 MS. MALAY: Make it have more a sense of
16 neighborhood, you know, make it feel like -- I'll
17 use Oak Park and even Chicago neighborhoods where
18 you have apartment buildings but you have that sense
19 of community, the sidewalks, the landscaping, just
20 everything. It's not -- take Savannah, Georgia,
21 even. You've got the square developments, the walk
22 investments; you've got the green space and the
23 walks in the middle of that square.

24 So you have these areas that people can enjoy;

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

62

1 you have the walkability; you have just a feeling
2 like it's a neighborhood and not a complex because
3 that's really what we're looking at right now.

4 MEMBER DOYLE: I just want to say I agree
5 with everything you're saying 100 percent. I do
6 have a question for you.

7 MS. MALAY: Sure.

8 MEMBER DOYLE: So I'm from Oak Park. Are
9 you familiar with the Whiteco project, Whiteco
10 Tower?

11 MS. MALAY: No.

12 MEMBER DOYLE: Well, it was a very -- and I
13 mean very -- controversial proposal. It's a
14 14-story residential LEED certified high-end
15 condominium building in downtown Oak Park.

16 MS. MALAY: Maybe I do. I just didn't know
17 it by that name.

18 MEMBER DOYLE: It has a two-story Trader
19 Joe's in the bottom level. I have a friend who is a
20 developer in Oak Park who lives there. It is a
21 magnificent building. And the community was just
22 fit to be tied when that proposal came forward
23 because it's really big and tall; it's really dense.
24 The intersection of Harlem and Lake is a nightmare

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

63

1 because it's a truck route.

2 So I agree with everything you're saying
3 about the things that are necessary to make for a
4 vibrant, walkable community, and these are the
5 reasons why I supported a Town Centre originally
6 back in 2010 because I saw and I maintain that the
7 potential of that proposal was there with the form-
8 based code, with all of the concessions that we had
9 at that time.

10 And I'll give you a preface of where I'm
11 going to go later tonight. I'm going to say that
12 that's where I really think this needs to go back
13 to. It needs to go back to something that's more --
14 the West Neighborhood Center model is town center or
15 town plaza, whatever you want to name it.

16 But the question -- what we did was we
17 stopped the conversation at the critical junction
18 when the City could have said, okay, "There are a
19 lot of good elements here; there are a lot of things
20 that are compelling about this, it's still too
21 dense, let's continue the conversation."

22 So do you think that that's the direction
23 that the conversation should go?

24 MS. MALAY: I think it has a potential. The

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

64

1 density is still too high, especially for that
2 neighborhood to handle. You know, one thing -- and
3 I believe the City can kind of attest to this
4 because I got my information from them was we have
5 approximately 1600 units in the area as it is versus
6 800 on the other side of town. So we are already
7 housing well over the majority of rental properties
8 on that side of town.

9 So that's something to think about. And a
10 good percentage of that is in that area. You know,
11 when you look at between 64 and 38, we're housing a
12 lot of it, and it does impact property values and
13 that type of thing. But I know we're not here to
14 talk about that today.

15 But the other thing is that I do still feel --
16 I believe it was actually their representative who
17 made the comment about massing, retail massing and
18 that downtown has it. This project isn't producing
19 any of that, and so you are setting any retail up
20 for failure that way.

21 So if we want the other side of 38 to be
22 successful, if we want whatever goes in that side,
23 in our side to be successful, you've got to produce
24 more massing for the retail, as well.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

65

1 Those would be my comments.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I summarize?

3 MS. MALAY: Sure.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Show a creation of a
5 sense of neighborhood, less density, and more retail?

6 MS. MALAY: Right. 80/20, I don't know if
7 that's the case, but I think there's a good -- I
8 think we can come to a compromise on that, but it's
9 got to be something definitely more than what we're
10 getting because it's 80/20 right now in the wrong
11 direction.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Interestingly,
13 everybody's comments are pretty much the same, lower
14 density/more retail.

15 MS. MALAY: Again, if you want success for
16 any of the retail, it's got to have more massing.
17 That's just smart retail planning.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.

20 MS. BELL-LASOTA: Vanessa Bell-LaSota,
21 1610 Howard Street, B-e-l-l, dash, L-a-S-o-t-a.

22 I was encouraged by the two phrases "context
23 sensitive" and "situational approach to design," and
24 that's exactly what everybody is saying, that there

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

66

1 is a context here. This neighborhood is not a Mill
2 Creek quality in terms of space or design. There
3 are, you know, quite a lot of apartment complexes.

4 So my concern in all of the plans was the
5 statement that kept being made as market conditions
6 will prevail that will determine the quality, the
7 high-end, the moderate. That keeps getting tagged
8 to all the plans.

9 So my concern with Plans 1, 2, and 3 is the
10 rollout of the plan in terms of time. That's been a
11 question that will be in the application process I
12 know, but that matters because market conditions
13 will change over time. So my concern is that it
14 rolls out with the number of buildings if we can get
15 a lower density that are consistent with quality.

16 Because there's a transient quality that is
17 a part of our neighborhood that we embrace. So if
18 we're going to build more apartments with turnovers
19 and more rental townhomes, whatever it is, it's the
20 quality of the neighborhood we're talking about,
21 too, not just density but the quality of that
22 density, and that's what matters to me on
23 1610 Howard Street.

24 So my concern is, as we go along, what does

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

67

1 that phrase mean that we're trying to create a
2 neighborhood and yet we're going to let market
3 conditions govern the materials, the quality, and
4 possibly the density and the style, meaning more
5 apartment rentals rather than more of a townhome
6 condominium property.

7 Does that make sense?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: It does. Is there
9 anything specific about any of those plans, though,
10 that you would suggest a change to?

11 MS. BELL-LASOTA: Well, I like the -- as Kim
12 said, when we met as the Near West Neighborhood, the
13 consensus of the group was if we could have our
14 dreams, it would be a 70/30 proposition where
15 70 percent of it was marketed to retail/mixed office
16 and 30 percent towards the back, towards --

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Residential --

18 MS. BELL-LASOTA: -- Century Oaks was
19 residential.

20 My other concern is what kind of residential
21 market will come to the sense of place that's
22 bracketed by still kind of a blighted property
23 towards the Jewel, across the street of 38. Are we
24 really going to be able to draw a Dodson Place

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

68

1 upscale resident unless we ask for certain
2 concessions about the environment that surrounds
3 this property?

4 So I was a little encouraged to see open
5 space with that underground parking, but I still
6 wonder who this market really is.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Dave, could I ask you,
9 would you be able to turn this to the site plan for
10 the PUD? Thank you.

11 All right. Any other questions? Comments?

12 Yes, sir.

13 MR. VARGULICH: Good evening.

14 Peter Vargulich. V -- as in "Victor" --
15 a-r-g-u-l-i-c-h, 503 16th Street. Comments are
16 really pretty minor at this point.

17 In the PUD plan for the residential,
18 certainly the idea of underground parking is
19 beneficial, but the 1.3 spaces per unit seems vastly
20 inconsistent with a suburban market. I don't know
21 that it has to be 2 or 2.2 or something like that.
22 I'm certainly not a proponent of paving more of the
23 world, but having parking that doesn't facilitate
24 the residents -- a little bit that could depend on

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

69

1 the mix of units, and certainly that can be hashed
2 out a little bit more, but I would just be concerned
3 about 1.3 spaces per unit.

4 I would also ask that if you're going to
5 have 55,000 square feet of retail in the Area B and
6 we're looking at creating, you know, spaces in a
7 neighborhood and those kinds of things that there
8 may be a consideration for public open space. All
9 the open space within Area C is private, and the
10 representation in the photos showed it as a gated
11 area or a fenced community.

12 I'm not sure that that's really what they're
13 proposing, but that was what was shown in the picture.
14 And that may be some public open space so if you're
15 doing some shopping and retail that maybe there
16 might be a park that you might want to go and spend
17 some time in as part of the walkability. And if
18 we're still connecting to neighbors to the northeast
19 and further to the north across Prairie that some
20 sort of public open space could be visible.

21 And I would just also offer that density as
22 a topic shouldn't dictate decisions. It should be
23 based on full design review and also the character
24 which you're receiving as far as buildings, the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

70

1 massing, the usability of the property, and 22 units
2 an acre, that doesn't seem overwhelming as an issue.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Dave, do you want to
5 comment on the open space issue?

6 MR. PATZELT: I think the comment was made
7 about the fence. There's -- we are not showing this
8 as a gated community. Perhaps from a photo such as
9 that there's an interpretation that it is gated, but
10 it is not intended to be a gated community.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

12 Other questions?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Going once,
15 going twice.

16 MR. BOBOWIEC: Can I just ask one more
17 question?

18 I just want to ask you about your high-end
19 units. Are they going to include fireplaces?

20 MR. PATZELT: No.

21 MR. BOBOWIEC: Do they include in-unit
22 laundry?

23 MR. PATZELT: Yes.

24 MR. BOBOWIEC: Just stuff like that.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

71

1 Because from your pictures, your cabinetry, they
2 aren't high-end by any means and by any stretch of
3 the imagination. I think what you're trying to sell
4 us on is granite countertops and stainless steel
5 products make an apartment high-end, and if we don't
6 put it in there, then it's not high end.

7 What would the rents be, the difference
8 between the PUD high-end and the lower end for like
9 a two-bedroom apartment?

10 MR. PATZELT: I think somewhere in the range
11 of about 15 to 20 cents a square foot, which is
12 probably a 10 to 15 percent difference.

13 MR. BOBOWIEC: So not a terrible lot.

14 MR. PATZELT: To some people that's quite a
15 bit of difference.

16 MR. BOBOWIEC: All right. But no fireplaces?

17 MR. PATZELT: No fireplaces.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

19 MEMBER DOYLE: I have one more question for
20 the applicant.

21 I was just thinking about the mix of
22 residential uses that are proposed, and it occurred
23 to me I wanted to ask, is there any precedent for a
24 product, residential product that features ground-

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

72

1 level townhomes, so like a two-story townhome on the
2 ground level, like a row house, with upper-level
3 condos or apartments on Levels 3 and 4? Are you
4 familiar with any kind of product like that? And if
5 not, would you be interested in exploring that kind
6 of product?

7 MR. PATZELT: Are you suggesting a two- to
8 three-level living product?

9 MEMBER DOYLE: A four-level living product.

10 MR. PATZELT: Four-level?

11 MEMBER DOYLE: Four-level living product.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Per unit?

13 MEMBER DOYLE: No.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think that's where he --

15 MEMBER DOYLE: A four-level living product
16 with the ground level being primarily townhomes, row
17 homes, and upper levels maybe with a different
18 architectural feature, they would obviously have to
19 have an entrance at some point, so you'd have to
20 break up the row home and have an entrance, but
21 upper levels with high-end apartments and condos.

22 MR. PATZELT: I have seen -- if I'm
23 understanding your description, I have seen
24 residential product like that. We have not developed

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

73

1 or built any product like that.

2 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay. So there is a
3 precedent for that kind of product in general?

4 MR. PATZELT: Yeah.

5 MEMBER DOYLE: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Other
7 questions?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any Plan Commissioner,
10 any questions before we go to comments from the
11 Plan Commission?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Anything from
14 the staff?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay. Then at this time
17 I will poll the Plan Commission, and, Commissioners,
18 I would ask that you let the applicant know the
19 aspects of the plan and specifically which plan you
20 are in favor of, which things you think need
21 improvement, as well as if the application did come
22 before the City, what additional pieces of information
23 or evidence do you think you would need in order to
24 make an informed decision on recommendations to the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

74

1 City Council.

2 So I'll start -- Michelle, if you don't
3 mind, I'm going to start with you.

4 MEMBER SPRUTH: Okay. That's fine.

5 First of all, I provided an outline earlier
6 today just on some comments based on the conceptual
7 plan review. I just want to go over a couple of
8 those points, and a lot of these points have been
9 highlighted throughout the presentation and through
10 the residents here.

11 First of all, I just wanted to commend the
12 applicant on engagement of stakeholders. However,
13 as spoken tonight, there may be some information
14 that they feel has been withheld as part of the
15 process. So it's just very important that there's
16 transparency in the application process and going
17 forward that comments seem to be taken on board and
18 are taken on board.

19 Now, on the -- I'm specifically speaking on
20 PUD Plan 1, and some of the other comments can be
21 actually transferred to the other plans that have
22 been presented.

23 We've talked about pedestrian infrastructure
24 and interconnection between the neighbors. There is

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

75

1 an opportunity for that to be shown on plans and it
2 should have -- it could have been provided at the
3 conceptual phase, this conceptual plan. It's been
4 highlighted numerous times.

5 It's important for that interconnection to
6 be taking place, and I'm sure Shodeen can appreciate
7 that St. Charles prides itself on a sense of
8 community and are very passionate that that spirit
9 is maintained. So that should be taken on board.

10 In regards to the elevations that have been
11 reported, you said 60 feet from ground level. I
12 would recommend going forth that a visual impact
13 assessment be undertaken for the proposed plan.
14 What that would mean is that the affected properties,
15 i.e., sensitive receptors should be -- the applicant
16 should ensure that there's not a negative impact --
17 not a negative visual impact on affected property,
18 and those sensitive receptors can be discussed with
19 the Planning Commission.

20 We talked a lot about architecture. The
21 stakeholders and residents have commented, provided
22 numerous comments on architecture. It's important
23 to tie in themes of the area and also what's already
24 been highlighted as part of the comments so that

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

76

1 that's taken on board.

2 We've talked about public open space. On
3 the plans provided today, there is not enough public
4 open space. There should be more public open space
5 for the neighborhood and the community.

6 There has been some discussion on age-
7 restrictive development. That should be taken on
8 board going forward, and the reason for that is to
9 ensure a nontransient community and to foster
10 integration into the existing community.

11 Next point is -- well, on some of the plans
12 that I briefly mentioned the storm water detention
13 basins as an amenity that can be taken on board
14 going forward.

15 We've talked about the restaurants and the
16 retail space. There is an opportunity to explore
17 using more retail space than what's provided in the
18 plans today. The residents and the stakeholders are
19 certainly willing to discuss a -- I guess discuss
20 more retail and less residential, so that should at
21 least be looked at.

22 I certainly feel that the comments that
23 people provided today are not insurmountable and can
24 be achieved with what we've discussed, and I

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

77

1 certainly look forward to receiving revised plans
2 going forward and taking a look at it.

3 I hope that the applicant certainly takes on
4 board what's been provided both in the neighborhood
5 meetings and the comments as part of this meeting
6 tonight.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right.

8 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: I just want to say I'm
9 excited about this plan. I've lived in this
10 community looking at the Prairie Center for 40 years.
11 I've seen a mall disappear; I've seen restaurants
12 spring up and disappear.

13 So as I said earlier, it's going to be a
14 tough sell in that area, and I think we're
15 approaching a compromise here. We've talked about
16 20 percent retail, 80 percent residential, and then
17 the other way, 80 percent retail and 20 percent
18 commercial. We've got to keep moving to where we
19 can get a balance here that's going to make the
20 community that surrounds this area happy, as well as
21 the developer, and I don't think it's extremes on
22 either end. Maybe 30/70, 40/60, something like
23 that. How those play out, I'll leave that up
24 to you.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

78

1 I'm very concerned about the design and style
2 of it. Michelle touched on that just a bit. The
3 minute I heard that it was going to be the Prairie
4 Center, I've always had a love of architecture, so
5 immediately I was thinking about the styling of these
6 buildings in the prairie school of architecture that
7 was developed by Frank Lloyd Wright. I think that
8 would be an absolute showpiece in this area.

9 Shodeen has done a great job on the
10 developments on Third Street where they blended
11 these buildings into the old hospital down there and
12 picked that theme up of the buildings along Third
13 Street. This is a great opportunity and we could
14 achieve this.

15 The architect was here earlier. Low-pitched
16 roofs on these buildings, that's going to lower the
17 profile, too. That's something that would be
18 desirable. We could also have horizontal emphasis.
19 Right now we're just seeing a square footprint, and
20 I know it's early on in this, but there's all kinds
21 of setbacks in how you could position this, but I
22 hope you would consider that point as far as the
23 prairie school -- the Prairie Center. I think off
24 of 38 that entrance would be a great showcase to

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

79

1 draw people in there if you develop that right with
2 that Prairie Center look.

3 I am also concerned, too, about the number
4 of restaurants along 38. We've got an empty Burger
5 King that's sitting over there rotting away. They've
6 relocated over to Randall Road, and those
7 restaurants along 38 tend to look like fast food
8 restaurants. Maybe it's too early to even say that,
9 too. If we're going to have high-end residences, we
10 would need to upscale that. So perhaps maybe fewer
11 restaurants and another mixed-use unit there that
12 has residences above it.

13 So these are some of the things that I'm
14 concerned with, but I really like that particular
15 architectural style. So those are my comments.

16 MEMBER DOYLE: I'd like to preface my
17 response to the staff questions with a comment about
18 density. These comments have nothing to do with the
19 concept plans in front of us, but they do have to do
20 with the concerns the community has.

21 I grew up in Oak Park, Illinois. I lived
22 there from kindergarten to high school. When I was
23 growing up there from '75 to '88, the Oak Park Mall
24 was as dead as a doornail. It was completely dead.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

80

1 The only thing that kept it alive was the Classic
2 Cinemas theater just like another cinema that we
3 have on the other side of town here.

4 If you get on the train, get off at Harlem
5 and walk through downtown Oak Park, you will see in
6 vivid display how Oak Park responded to that, and as
7 I said before, it's through high-quality, extremely
8 high density tall buildings and a great degree of
9 walkability.

10 So if we had a concept plan that came
11 forward and said, "I want to build an eight-story
12 LEED certified building with a green roof," I would
13 be like, "Wow, that is awesome. That is going to
14 put St. Charles on the map." That's not what --
15 now, Mr. Patzelt, you've said that you don't think
16 that those sorts of proposals are viable in this
17 community. What I'm asking the community to do is
18 reconsider what its goals really are and to push a
19 little outside of our comfort zone and think about
20 the plans that we have in front of us and a real
21 life community that responded to blight and how they
22 did it.

23 So now I'd like to respond to questions that
24 staff recommended.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

81

1 In terms of which plan I prefer, I definitely
2 prefer the PUD plan, and I would go farther and say
3 that I prefer the PUD plan to form-based code, and I
4 think that the alternate plans, to be quite blunt,
5 should die a quick and painful death right now.

6 Does the PUD plan, the concept plan which
7 I'm going to now consider to be the concept plan,
8 does it adequately address the comp plan? Mr. McKay
9 said it. No, none of them really do.

10 I don't think that it is catalytic. I don't
11 think that it strikes the correct balance between
12 residential and retail. I don't think it meets the
13 vision that's outlined in the comp plan. I do think
14 that modifications can be made to make it suitable
15 to the comp plan, and I'll talk about those in a
16 second.

17 Do I think that we should amend the comp
18 plan? I absolutely do not think that. I think the
19 comp plan is the vision of the community. We spent
20 two years making it. I see no reason why we should
21 amend it.

22 Is the proposed land use acceptable? No, it's
23 not. As the concept plan presents it, it is not
24 acceptable. In no circumstances would I support a

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

82

1 map amendment to RM-3. In no circumstances would I
2 support a map amendment that would allow residential
3 home development to be constructed by right.

4 I think that this has to be a PUD application.
5 There are so many -- and there are some really
6 compelling comments that we heard from the public
7 tonight that I think point to the direction that
8 we're aligning towards, and it really necessitates a
9 PUD approach.

10 I agree that the plan that we're talking
11 about really is the West Neighborhood Center. I
12 personally prefer the comprehensive mixed-use
13 center, but I recognize that may be out of reach.

14 The walk-up residential development is the
15 piece that really I can't live with. This concept
16 plan does not provide a street network. It does not
17 provide any sort of streetscape. It does not
18 provide any architectural charm or vibrancy that
19 would support the retail massing, the commercial
20 development that we need. It's a grid of parking
21 lots, and so the proposed land use as detailed in
22 the concept drawings I think needs to be reviewed.

23 The residential unit count, I strongly agree
24 with the comment that was made by Mr. Vargulich -- I

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

83

1 may have mispronounced it -- but we should not be
2 focusing on a raw number. What we should be
3 focusing on is the balance between residential and
4 commercial and architectural quality.

5 600 units might be appropriate if it comes
6 with the amenities and the vibrancy that is going to
7 make this a neighborhood center that will have
8 ground-level retail, that will -- that will provide
9 quality and the amenities that will attract both
10 businesses and the kinds of neighbors that I think
11 we'd all like to see live here.

12 So is the count appropriate? Maybe. I don't
13 know. It really depends on what is its character.

14 The site design. I think the site design is
15 the piece that really needs to be looked at most
16 seriously because the West Neighborhood Center
17 really hinges upon a -- creating a small opportunity
18 for a unique mainstream environment. The Town
19 Centre proposal had that. It had -- the axis of the
20 plan was north/south through the current boulevard
21 entrance up to Prairie, and the axis of this plan is
22 east/west.

23 So you have your retail on the frontage;
24 you've got some mixed use behind it in Section B,

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

84

1 and you've got all this residential that just sort
2 of bleeds out in Zone C.

3 What I'd like to see is the whole site
4 reoriented to a main street grid that features a
5 prominent main street going from the entrance that
6 you have on 38, up through the spine of the property
7 to Prairie Street and, as detailed in the comp plan,
8 with very serious consideration for connectivity to
9 Tri-City Center and continuing that spine all the
10 way down to Randall Road.

11 I think the vision that I have for this site
12 is one where if I'm driving north on Randall Road,
13 and I get to about where the Skippy's is, I'll have
14 a prominent boulevard there that I can turn onto,
15 driving through where the demolished Dominick's was,
16 through maybe sort of a roundabout with townhomes
17 around it, businesses around that, and it's going to
18 direct traffic off of Randall Road up into this
19 parcel and through the parcel along with all of that
20 retail.

21 That's the kind of -- if the problem is that
22 there's no frontage on Randall Road, then the
23 connectivity to Tri-City Center to key to making
24 this parcel successful, and that's why I feel that

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

85

1 the orientation is misaligned.

2 I know -- I'll put in a plug for David, our
3 residential advocate and say that good design
4 features a strong street grid, and this does not have
5 it. So what I'm looking for is something that has a
6 more structured street grid with pedestrian-friendly
7 amenities.

8 As far as the appropriateness of the CBD-1,
9 I think it's probably appropriate because of the
10 comments that were made. It features ground-level
11 retail; it features upper-level residential and
12 underground parking. I don't see any reason right
13 now that I would oppose an alternate mixed-use
14 district.

15 What I would reiterate is that I really have
16 severe reservations about the RM-3 usage. I'd like
17 to see if there is any freestanding residential --
18 and, Craig, to your point, I was really intrigued by
19 your comment at the public meeting about this -- the
20 part of the comp plan that says there shall be no
21 freestanding residential applies specifically to the
22 comprehensive mixed-use plan.

23 If you look at the illustration for the West
24 Neighborhood Center, the illustration itself shows

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

86

1 freestanding multifamily and single-family attached
2 residential development south of the Tri-City Center
3 on Bricher.

4 MR. BOBOWIEC: I'm just saying on that
5 particular parcel. It specifically doesn't allow it
6 on that parcel.

7 MEMBER DOYLE: So I think -- so getting back
8 to my point here -- and this is really why I asked
9 about this product that would feature ground-level
10 or two-story townhomes, row homes on the bottom with
11 high-end apartments or condominiums up top.

12 The problem I think as we talk about this is
13 striking this balance between residential and retail
14 and storefronts. As you get farther into that
15 spine, if you're in the middle where that C is or
16 back farther, and even if that axis there is the
17 main axis, as you're farther in there, I'm guessing
18 you're going to think no one wants to have their
19 first-story storefront in the middle of this parcel
20 when it's back there. So that's why you have it all
21 pushed down to Route 38.

22 But if you could -- you know, if you had the
23 appropriate massing and you could transition from
24 first-floor retail maybe a third of the way in to

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

87

1 first-floor townhomes that maintain a streetscape
2 that feels urban, that feels like it's a neighborhood
3 center with -- with -- possibly with residential off
4 to the side towards the Binny's, that I would be
5 much more comfortable with. Because, again, it has
6 that grid structure, and it has the appropriate
7 massing, and really what it needs is the flexibility
8 to be able to grow with the retail.

9 If you find in five years that all of a
10 sudden you have the opportunity to bring in a
11 two-story Trader Joe's in the middle of this, you
12 want to be able to capitalize on that. How do we
13 make the development form flexible enough that you
14 could do that like we have at the Whiteco Tower in
15 Oak Park.

16 So to conclude, I just want to say that,
17 like Jim, I'm really excited about the fact that
18 this concept is here. I want you to receive my
19 comments constructively and take away from it the
20 vision that we really have that I think is a shared
21 vision, and I think we're closer to getting to that
22 shared vision tonight than we have been at any point.

23 MEMBER SCHUETZ: All right. There's not a
24 lot I can add here but I'll be brief.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

88

1 First, I'd like to say I prefer the Plan 1,
2 which is the PUD, and that would be similar to the
3 West Neighborhood Center.

4 I do not see the density as an issue at all,
5 especially in light of its -- it seems as though the
6 adjacent properties are very similar densities.

7 I do think we should support the comp plan
8 as much as possible and try to keep those visions
9 the same.

10 I believe this project, as I think we all
11 do, needs to be a catalyst for the area and that it
12 be a -- you know, as somebody had said in the
13 audience, comprehensive of the entire area. We want
14 to create the neighborhood center, as Brian
15 mentioned. I grew up in the city of Chicago, not a
16 fancy area where I grew up, but it was the city, and
17 it was a grid pattern and we walked everywhere. We
18 had one car for eight people in my family, and I
19 thought it was great.

20 So I think a pedestrian friendly community
21 and a street grid that's walkable is really critical.
22 Anytime any of us are in a city environment or a
23 community that's walkable, we feel much safer than
24 we do when there's vehicles everywhere.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

89

1 I had mentioned earlier, asked the question
2 about some of these areas that are in Geneva that
3 hopefully the residential that would be above the
4 retail, the residential would support the retail
5 buildings down below, and the retail would support
6 the residential -- needs of those residents above
7 them, whoever that might be. So whatever your
8 product is and whatever the age groups are, if it's
9 mixed or not mixed, I would obviously like to see
10 the retail support that.

11 As far as open space goes, I do appreciate
12 open space and gardens and that kind of thing.
13 However, I think it's important to note that if it's
14 just open space and there's not really a purpose for
15 that open space, then it's just a void in the
16 community and a waste. I've seen so many open
17 spaces that the developers are forced, basically, to
18 have this open space and then nobody uses it. So I
19 think it's critical if there is open space that it
20 have a purpose, and that's about it for me.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

22 Tim.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Well, I'll start off
24 by saying that everybody wants the same thing. We

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

90

1 want this property developed. I don't think anybody
2 in the audience or on this Prairie Center or City
3 staff or counsel that's here disagrees with that.
4 The goal is to get this property developed. It's
5 sat far too long. I'm glad that it's come back in
6 front of us.

7 I have to say that I support Plan 1, the
8 PUD plan.

9 I wanted to speak to density. I'm concerned
10 with density only as it relates to the impact
11 studies, traffic, engineering, schools, and we will
12 have those I expect if and when an application comes
13 to us, and we can consider that at that time.

14 I am not concerned -- the comprehensive
15 plan, I wanted to speak a little bit about that. I
16 heard a couple times tonight that the comprehensive
17 plan does not allow a certain thing, and that's not
18 what the comprehensive plan does. The comprehensive
19 plan is simply a design guideline that we desire to
20 adhere to, but if things change in the marketplace
21 or in land use, then the comprehensive plan may or
22 may not be followed, but I don't support changing
23 the comprehensive plan.

24 If you look back at the old comprehensive

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

91

1 plan, by the time we created the new comprehensive
2 plan, there wasn't much -- didn't much look like the
3 old one. Our community didn't much look like the
4 old comprehensive plan.

5 So far as the land use, I don't know if the
6 proposed land use breakdown is acceptable. We don't
7 have a crystal ball. We don't know how it's going
8 to move forward in the future. It's easy for any of
9 us to say 70/30 or for the developer to say 20/80.
10 I mean, we don't know.

11 So I liked what Brian pointed to, and that
12 was keeping the plan flexible so that it can adjust.
13 I do think that the number one issue that I feel is
14 in this plan is a site design layout. I do feel
15 like it's just kind of a bunch of boxes set on the
16 site. I understand, of course, that this is a
17 concept plan, so nothing is etched in stone at this
18 point.

19 I would not consider rezoning the property.
20 I just don't think that's a good idea. I think the
21 PUD is the best opportunity because of all of the
22 existing land uses surrounding it. It would be very
23 difficult to come up with an exacting zoning for
24 that particular property considering what's all

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

92

1 around it.

2 I expect that we'll see engineering; we'll
3 see the visual impact assessment that Michelle spoke
4 about I think is a great idea. So when we come
5 back, we'll talk about those things.

6 But I'm glad it's here. I'm excited about
7 it. I hope we can get this done this time. I don't
8 think -- from listening to both sides you'd be
9 interested to hear I don't think we're really that
10 far off. I really don't.

11 Everybody who spoke from the neighborhood
12 pretty much came up with the same comments. After
13 all the speaking was done, less density and more
14 commercial were the two themes throughout everybody's
15 talk. That's where we have to try and make this
16 thing somewhat flexible so that we can adjust as the
17 plan moves forward.

18 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I am in agreement
19 with the PUD, and as somebody who is in the business
20 community -- 90 percent of my time that's what I do --
21 I think that our community can support more retail
22 especially in this area. So I would like to see the
23 retail/commercial portion of this higher.

24 I think that we should focus on -- I don't

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

93

1 know where your rents would be for this type of
2 commercial property or retail properties, but it
3 needs to be affordable so we can get some good
4 quality retail merchants in here. It would be nice
5 to see some national chains like a Trader Joe's or
6 some heavy hitters where it's actually destination
7 retail establishments.

8 I do agree with the sense of community and
9 focusing on the integration of the surrounding
10 neighborhoods and the walkability. I think that's
11 enormously important to create a sense of community
12 for this area and to not focus on just the PUD
13 development.

14 I think that's about it. Everything else I
15 really agree with. I think we brought up some good
16 points, and I hope that some of our input has been
17 helpful, and I appreciate the community being here
18 and giving your input. It helps us understand what
19 the need and concerns are. So thank you.

20 MEMBER FRIO: It's tough being down on this
21 end. Thank God for Brian; he covers almost all of
22 the bases before it gets down to our end.

23 I want to thank you for putting something in
24 that spot. As a resident of St. Charles, it is a

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

94

1 black eye, so it would be nice to put something
2 in there.

3 I'm for the PUD. The concern I had is
4 1.3 parking spots per household. You know, if it's
5 a one-bedroom apartment, maybe, you know. I hate to
6 say it, but I've got five cars, so it would never
7 work. So I think that might be an issue, and if you
8 don't have a lot of off -- you know, on-the-street
9 parking for the residents, that could create a
10 problem.

11 The sewage that's -- and I think that could
12 be a big part is the taxpayer -- will our taxes be
13 increased to cover those costs, that's a concern to
14 me. I don't know about you guys, but every year I
15 look at my tax bill, and it just keeps going up and
16 up and up, so I'd like to put a halt on that if we
17 could.

18 The demand for retail, I completely agree
19 with it but I think -- and you guys know this --
20 you're going to have to find the right clientele or
21 business for that. You know, how many restaurants
22 in St. Charles have gone out of business in the last
23 year? So do you want a company to keep going in
24 there every six months to one year, leasing it out?

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

95

1 You see this with the Dominick's that you have. So
2 what kind of business is going to be in there? Is
3 it a need-based for the people that live there? So
4 you can figure it out from there.

5 Density, I don't really have a problem with
6 the density base of it. I agree with Brian hugely
7 that this is more of a -- and he said a park -- more
8 of a Mill Creek kind of thing where the roads are
9 specific versus to me that's just an apartment
10 complex; the density is popped in there as quick as
11 you can. I can see financially, you know, why it
12 would be set up to do it that way, but for the
13 neighborhoods and for appeal, to me it looks more
14 like an apartment complex, and I don't think that's
15 what everybody here is saying they want. They want
16 more of a neighborhood feel with more commercial
17 exposure.

18 Again, the commercial part -- I can't
19 express this more. The commercial part is -- I
20 agree we need retail. The tough part of that is
21 specifically what kind because there is a lot of
22 vacancies in St. Charles when it comes to retail.

23 That's about all. Like I said, God bless
24 Brian for covering all of the bases I pretty much

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

96

1 would have been covering. That's it.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Well, hi. We're almost done.

3 I would like to also thank you for bringing
4 forth the concept plan. I think the thing that
5 probably would excite me the most is seeing or
6 experiencing the day that the shovels actually go
7 into the ground and the project gets going, but I
8 know that we'll get there this time, so I'm looking
9 forward to this.

10 Probably the biggest takeaway from what was
11 said tonight is from what Commissioner Doyle said,
12 which was a lot. There was a lot of information,
13 suggestions, whatever other word you want to use to
14 describe in the words that he used in summarizing at
15 the end here. And my recommendation to you is that
16 when that becomes a printed form to be able to read,
17 read through it several times because I think within
18 that contains really what will be beneficial for
19 everybody as far as the future of the city. And,
20 again, that's my biggest takeaway recommendation
21 for you.

22 The PUD is the plan that I would recommend
23 out of the three. The other two I would kill, also.
24 But I have to say that when I take a look at that

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

97

1 plan, I'm not really excited. And I'm not excited
2 about it because to me it's more a residential
3 development, apartment complex with a facade of
4 business going along with it.

5 And I think how that gets cured is -- and
6 it's been suggested several times -- is that
7 neighborhood, creating the neighborhood. Because
8 when you create that neighborhood, I think the rest
9 of the mix between what percentage of retail/business
10 versus residential, the density will take care of
11 itself, and that would be my biggest recommendation
12 to you.

13 When I take a look at -- and I have a lot of
14 confidence in the Shodeen Group. When I take a look
15 at a website -- and I believe this is your website --
16 and it says in there in the first paragraph,
17 "Shodeen, Incorporated, is wildy recognized by area
18 residents, as well as business and civic leaders as
19 one of the Fox Valley's premier construction
20 management and land development firms."

21 So I know that you can figure this out, and
22 I look forward to seeing your next steps and walking
23 through this process with you so that we can reach
24 that goal of beginning the development so that the

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

98

1 City can realize its revenue share, as well as you
2 from a development perspective start to realize your
3 revenues.

4 And, again, I thank you for bringing this
5 before us tonight.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.

7 I really want for the Prairie Center to be
8 on the front page of Shodeen's brochure 10 years
9 from now. I mean, that's the vision that I have for
10 it. I want it to be your gem, the project that
11 defines your company.

12 I just feel like, you know, the PUD plan is
13 the best of the three, but that's not going to be on
14 the cover of your brochure. And I really think that
15 this is an opportunity, you know, to create a center
16 of activity, a center of -- really a center of
17 culture for an entire area, for the entire region.
18 It has that kind of potential. That's the way that
19 I see it.

20 And in doing that, you know, the goal is to
21 bring in your supply and your demand. It's to bring
22 in the demand in the form of residential and office
23 units and bring in the supply in the form of retail.
24 And, of course, it's not an enclosed environment;

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

99

1 it's obviously going to be affected by the
2 surrounding neighborhood.

3 When I think of -- I mean, I see this as a
4 blank slate and an opportunity to do something
5 special, and that's exactly what Shodeen did with
6 Dodson Place in Geneva. I mean, really, it rose
7 like a Phoenix from a wasteland of a vacant hospital
8 and a bunch of gravel parking lots next to a train
9 station, and now it defines the area. Shodeen did a
10 great job on that and it's a great development, and
11 I think that that is the sort of thing that we can
12 have here.

13 What I see here, there's no connection with
14 adjoining properties. There's no -- it really is a
15 residential island in the middle of an area that
16 should be a mixed-use development, a full,
17 comprehensive mixed-use development.

18 To me there's no possibility of architectural
19 variations in the plan you put forward here, and
20 that's really the kind of thing that I want to see.
21 Because we have established a uniform building
22 arrangement, and to try to put architectural
23 variations into that would look hokey.

24 But echoing what Brian had said is putting a

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

100

1 main thoroughfare through the project similar to
2 what we have in our comprehensive plan with the West
3 Neighborhood Center and then build from that. If
4 you put in a north/south thoroughfare, then you can
5 bring that residential use off of 38. As it is now,
6 we just have a bunch of lanes and parking areas.

7 Yeah, I mean there would be no retail use
8 that would go on Prairie Street; there would be no
9 retail use except for the very southern portion of
10 the property, but if we did bring a north/south
11 connector street through there, then we could have
12 something.

13 And I think that this ties in with open space.
14 The amount of open space to me is not anywhere near
15 as important as the quality. The disconnected
16 fields that are shown here do nothing for me. You
17 could have 20 acres of disconnected fields and say
18 you have a lot of open space, and I would trade it
19 in a second for a one-acre very interesting, very
20 well-planned park or not even a park, just an area.

21 And I think that in Chicagoland I thought
22 off the top of my head of two areas that are very
23 small in area but are very important. Naperville's
24 River Walk is one; Millennium Park in Chicago is

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

101

1 another. Very important open spaces that are very
2 small in quantity and very large in quality, and I
3 think that's really what you have here.

4 I think that the major hurdle going forward
5 as you've heard from nearly everyone is the
6 comprehensive plan. Because as much as you want to
7 shoehorn the PUD plan into the redevelopment
8 alternatives, given the comprehensive plan it really
9 just is not. I think that the comprehensive plan
10 makes it clear that residential use should be
11 secondary to the primary retail and commercial use
12 of this property.

13 And that's where we get to a prominent main
14 street with retail/office being primary, residential
15 being above, a strong and interesting street grid
16 that draws in adjoining properties rather than the
17 way that it is now, they basically loop out
18 adjoining properties. In order to get from the
19 property to the northeast into the development, you
20 have to basically go around it to get in.

21 But working with adjoining property owners
22 to draw people in through, you know, all connection
23 routes from the adjoining properties into this
24 property, that's really what's going to bring it in

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

102

1 and make it an integrated part of the surrounding
2 properties.

3 I may support freestanding residential, but
4 really only where it's abutting the residential to
5 the northeast. The idea of having freestanding
6 residential on the edges near Prairie, Jewel, and
7 Binny's is not agreeable to me. I think that those
8 are areas where mixed use, you know, really would be
9 beneficial to the entire property. As I said before,
10 bringing that main street north/south through the
11 middle would foster that retail massing, making
12 residential ancillary to that.

13 As far as exhibits, things that I think
14 would be important to bring along with an
15 application, one would be a recent traffic study.
16 The profile of our city has changed in the last
17 five years. Traffic patterns have changed.

18 Also, the City needs to have an opportunity
19 to have their expert review that traffic study, and
20 I don't know if that means that we would need it --
21 I mean, you'd have to work with City staff and talk
22 to them about how -- what amount of time the City
23 staff needs in order to get an independent review on
24 that traffic study, as well as an economic impact

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

103

1 study.

2 You've done some of that even in what you're
3 presenting now. We do some of it in the comprehensive
4 plan, but it would take a lot of convincing to tell
5 me that retail use is not in demand with this
6 development and the only possible economically
7 feasible route is nearly completely residential.

8 One other note, the underground parking I
9 think is essential to this plan. Having parking
10 fields would not be a good thing. Having street
11 parking, I think that that's okay only if it's --
12 you know, the way that you've dawn it out in the
13 PUD plan, I think that that is -- that's acceptable
14 to me.

15 And that's it. So thank you very much. I
16 appreciate your time. I hope that we've given you
17 information that's constructive, and, you know, we
18 look forward to having the opportunity to work
19 through this.

20 MR. PATZELT: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. And that
22 concludes Item No. 4 on your agendas.

23 Item 5 is additional business from the Plan
24 Commission members.

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

104

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Staff?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. The weekly
5 development report was in the packet. Any questions
6 on that?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So this item is on
8 the agenda for the planning and development
9 committee this coming Monday the 11th?

10 MR. COLBY: Yes. That is correct.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: At 7:00 p.m.

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: And meeting announcements
13 are in the agenda. Any additional comment from
14 members of the public?

15 MR. COLBY: If I could make one comment
16 regarding meeting announcements. The January 19th
17 meeting of the Plan Commission will be canceled,
18 which is our next meeting.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

20 MEMBER PRETZ: And I will not be here for
21 the February 2nd meeting.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Did you hear that, Russ?

23 MR. COLBY: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any other

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

105

1 public comment?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a
4 motion to adjourn?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

6 MEMBER SCHUETZ: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any discussion on the
8 motion?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: None.

10 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All in favor.

11 (Ayes heard.)

12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the
15 St. Charles Planning Commission is adjourned at
16 9:19 p.m.

17 (Off the record at 9:19 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Regular Meeting - Concept Plan; Prairie Center
Conducted on January 5, 2016

106

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and affixed my notarial seal this 7th day of
January, 2016.

My commission expires: October 16, 2017



Notary Public in and for the
State of Illinois